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**Introduction**

The Indiana Watershed Leadership Academy (IWLA) is an in-depth, six month, training program for watershed professionals and volunteers. The purpose of this academy is to provide participants with opportunities to learn and put to use skills and knowledge to lead a watershed group through the challenging process of developing and implementing a watershed plan.

The Indiana Watershed Leadership Academy is funded in part by a grant from the Indiana Department of Environmental Management and is guided by a diverse and broad advisory committee of conservation and environmental organizations and agencies (Appendix A). The content of the academy curriculum benefits greatly from lessons developed by The Ohio State University and their successful watershed academy. Additional technical, social, and financial lesson modules were developed through collaborative efforts between the Indiana Watershed Leadership Project Team and the multi-stakeholder advisory committee. The academy combined distance education lesson modules, with three face-to-face group training sessions, and an in depth learning project.

The distance learning part of the academy is comprised of required and elective modules (Table 1). Each lesson module had both basic and advanced levels for the assignments, allowing the participants to select the appropriate level based on their experience in the subject area. Participants were required to complete 7 required lesson modules and 3 additional elective modules.
Table 1. Modules for the distance learning part of the IWLA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required Modules</th>
<th>Elective Modules</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1. Introduction to Watershed Planning &amp; Management*</td>
<td>E1. Organizing Your Watershed Group*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2. Stakeholder Involvement*</td>
<td>E2. Running Effective Meetings*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3. Strategic Planning</td>
<td>E3. Group Facilitation Skills*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4. Watershed Inventory</td>
<td>E4. Understanding the Clean Water Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5. Understanding Planning and Local Officials</td>
<td>E5. Defining Issues &amp; Problems in Your Watershed*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E9. Evaluating Your Efforts*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E10. Sustaining Your Watershed Group Financially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E11. Estimating Environmental &amp; Economic Benefits*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Module is adapted with permission from the Ohio Watershed Academy, The Ohio State University.

Participants were also involved in the three face-to-face sessions that occurred over the course of the academy. The face-to-face sessions were designed to provide opportunities for participants to network with other watershed professionals, create personal relationships with other watershed professionals, to learn from each other, and to go further in-depth on various watershed topics. The face-to-face sessions were 1-3 days in length.

This report provides results from evaluations of the first Indiana Watershed Leadership Academy and recommendations for the future.
**Distance Learning**

Participants were required to complete seven required modules and three elective modules in the distance learning portion of the IWLA. Each module included several readings with additional readings suggested if the participant wanted to explore that topic further. The participants were required to complete assignments that were designed to relate directly to their watershed planning and restoration efforts: 1) Introduction to Watershed Planning & Management, 2) Stakeholder Involvement, 3) Strategic Planning and Visioning for Your Organization, 4) Watershed Inventory, 5) Understanding Planning and Local Officials, 6) Mapping your Watershed Using GIS, and 7) Implementation & Outreach.


The assignments were of a “hands-on” nature and the participants were encouraged to work with their watershed group, stakeholders, local officials, and others in their community and as part of the assignments. Every participant in the academy was also required to complete an in-depth learning project on a topic of their choosing.
After completing each module, participants were asked a series of questions regarding their experience with the module. They completed evaluations for both the required modules and the elective modules. The questions participants were asked to answer were:

- The required reading and assignment contributed to my learning. (1= Strongly Disagree, 5= Strongly Agree)
- Were you able to work on activities that contribute to your personal or career goals as a result of completing the module? (1= Strongly Disagree, 5= Strongly Agree)
- The module was too elementary (1= Strongly Agree, 5= Strongly Disagree recoded)
- The module was a valuable learning experience (1= Strongly Disagree, 5= Strongly Agree)
- The content of this module matched my educational objectives. (1= Strongly Disagree, 5= Strongly Agree)
- This module helped me better understand the subject matter. (1= Strongly Disagree, 5= Strongly Agree)
- Overall I would rate the effectiveness of the module on a scale of 1 to 5 (1 being poor and 5 being excellent) as: (1=poor, 5=excellent)
- What comments or recommendations do you have for improving this module?
- I invested enough time and energy on this module to meet or exceed the requirements. (1= Strongly Disagree, 5= Strongly Agree)
- How many hours did you spend on this module? (1-8+ hours)
- Was this too much time, too little time, or about right for this module? (1= too little time, 2= about the right amount of time, 3= too much time)

The highest rated of the required modules was Watershed Inventory with an overall mean of 4.39, followed by Mapping your Watershed Using GIS (4.25), Stakeholder Involvement (4.06), Implementation and Outreach (3.98) and Understanding Planning and Local Officials (3.96) (Table 2). The Strategic Planning module had the lowest overall mean at 3.79. For the elective modules, Estimating Pollutant Load Reductions for BMPs had the highest overall rating with a
mean of 4.69 followed by Understanding Drainage Policy and Practice, (4.53) Developing Goals and Objectives (4.50), Understanding the Clean Water Act (4.41), Evaluating Your Efforts (4.13), Defining Issues and Problems on your Watershed (3.94), Sustaining Your Watershed Group Financially (3.94), Group Facilitation Skills (3.92), and Organizing your Watershed Group (3.81). The Running Effective Meetings module had the lowest rating for the elective modules with a mean of 3.7. No one evaluated the Estimating Environmental & Economic Benefits elective module.

The percentage of time participants spent on the distance learning modules and rating of time spent on each module can be seen in Table 3. Most respondents completed the required modules in 5 hours or less, which is the time commitment that participants were told at the beginning that they should expect to be spending on each of the two week modules. The module that took participants the most time to complete was the Water Inventory module (R4). For all of the required modules, most respondents (58%-82%) felt that the time spent was appropriate, with the exception of R6 (Mapping Your Watershed Using GIS) and R4 (Watershed Inventory) where a higher proportion indicated that the time spent on the module was too much (30-33%).
### Table 2. Evaluation of Distance Learning Modules.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Module Title</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Contribute to goals</th>
<th>Module Difficulty</th>
<th>Module Value</th>
<th>Content Objectives</th>
<th>Subject Matter Attainment</th>
<th>Rate the Module</th>
<th>Time Investment</th>
<th>Overall Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R3. Strategic Planning</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4. Watershed Inventory</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>4.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5. Understanding Planning and Local Officials</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7. Implementation and Outreach</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1. Organizing your Watershed Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2. Running Effective Meetings</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3. Group Facilitation Skills</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E5. Defining Issues &amp; Problems in your Watershed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E6. Developing Goals &amp; Objectives</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E7. Understanding Drainage Policy &amp; Practice</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E8. Estimating Pollutant Load Reductions for BMPs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E9. Evaluating Your Efforts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E10. Sustaining Your Watershed Group Financially</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Mean</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Percentages of time participants spent on the distance learning modules, and rating of time spent on each module.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours Spent on Modules (1-8)</th>
<th>Required Modules</th>
<th>Elective Modules</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>R3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 hour</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3 hours</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 hours</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5 hours</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6 hours</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-7 hours</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-8 hours</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8+ hours</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Spent Appropriate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just right amount of time</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too Much Time</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too Little time</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Just right amount of time: 82% for R2, 73% for R3, 60% for R4, 93% for R5, 58% for R6, 72% for R7.
Too Much Time: 6% for E1, 18% for E2, 30% for E3, 17% for E4, 33% for E5, 18% for E6.
Too Little time: 12% for E7, 9% for E8, 10% for E9, 0% for E10.
Recommendations for the Distance Learning Portion of the IWLA

When analyzing the distance learning modules, it can be assumed that a mean agreement of 4.0 or above means that the participants agreed or strongly agreed with the evaluation questions, and benefited from the module. However, ratings of less than a 4.0 suggest these modules may need to be revised to ensure the highest satisfaction for future participants of the IWLA. The areas that should be revised are listed below in Table 4.

- The Strategic Planning module received a rating lower than 4.0 on every question and the Running Effective Meetings module received a rating lower than 4.0 on every question except Contribute to Goals and Time Investment. These two modules should be revised in order to provide the participants of the IWLA the best possible experience when working on these modules and their outcomes.

- The Watershed Inventory module took 60% of the participants 8 hours or more to complete. This module should be shortened by removing some of the components, creating two separate modules, or by adjusting the time requirements and expectations. Also, one-third of the participants felt that they spent too much time on the Mapping Your Watershed Using GIS module. Again, this module should be shortened by removing some of the components of the module or the time requirements should be adjusted.

- In the open ended question, participants made comments that it was hard to complete all of the assignments and evaluations due to slow Internet connections. You should recommend to participants that it would be beneficial to have a high speed internet connection for the duration of the Academy.

- Another option may be to provide all the assignments and links on paper, and let the participants e-mail their assignments to a main organizer. This would also relieve some of the confusion participants had with WedCT.
Table 4. Areas in modules which did not receive 4.0 or higher mean agreements on 2006 evaluations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Contribute to Goals</th>
<th>Module Value</th>
<th>Content Objectives</th>
<th>Subject Matter Attainment</th>
<th>Rate the Module</th>
<th>Time Investment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Strategic Planning</td>
<td>• Strategic Planning</td>
<td>• Strategic Planning</td>
<td>• Strategic Planning</td>
<td>• Strategic Planning</td>
<td>• Strategic Planning</td>
<td>• Strategic Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Stakeholder Involvement</td>
<td>• Watershed Inventory</td>
<td>• Running Effective Meetings</td>
<td>• Running Effective Meetings</td>
<td>• Implementation &amp; Outreach</td>
<td>• Implementation &amp; Outreach</td>
<td>• Stakeholder Involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Understanding Planning and Local Officials</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Organizing your Watershed Group</td>
<td>• Group Facilitation Skills</td>
<td>• Organizing your Watershed Group</td>
<td>• Organizing your Watershed Group</td>
<td>• Sustaining your Watershed Group Financially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mapping Your Watershed Using GIS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Running Effective Meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Face-to-Face Sessions

The face-to-face sessions were held in order to add another learning dimension to the IWLA as they offered an opportunity to delve further into topics covered in the distance learning portion of the academy. The desired outcomes of the January face-to-face session included: 1) getting to know each other, 2) learning about what has worked or not worked for other participants, 3) understanding how the academy works, 4) learning about different stakeholder involvement options and their effectiveness, 5) understanding strategies for working well with local officials, 6) gaining knowledge of how to use strategic planning with your watershed group, and 7) understanding how to conduct a useful watershed inventory. The desired outcomes for the April face-to-face session included: 1) knowing what GIS and GPS tools are available and how to use them effectively in watershed efforts, 2) learning about successful watershed implementation projects, 3) learning strategies for working with local officials to achieve watershed goals, 4) experiencing how to use a river float trip to increase stakeholders’ awareness, 5) understanding key information about drainage policy and practice and strategies for working with drainage boards and landowners, 6) experiencing fish species sampling techniques and identification, and finally, 7) getting to know each other, develop a larger network of peers, and have fun!

For the face-to-face sessions, participants evaluated learning relative to the objectives of the sessions and the logistics of the meetings. Participants were asked to what extent they agreed with the 13 questions listed in Table 5. on a scale of 1=Strongly Disagree to 5= Strongly Agree.

For the January 26-27 IWLA Face-to-Face session evaluations, every question received a rating of 4.0 or above suggesting that participants were satisfied with both the content and the logistics of this face-to-face session. Of the questions regarding content of the sessions, “The meeting
facilitated knowledge among participants”, had the highest overall rating with a mean agreement of 4.76. “I found new contacts and opportunities for future collaboration had the second highest mean with a 4.67, and “I understand what the IWLA entails and what is expected of me” and “I got to know other students in the IWLA during this meeting” were third with mean agreements of 4.62. Followed closely behind those questions were “I gained a working knowledge of strategies for involving stakeholders in watershed planning” (4.57), “I gained a working knowledge of how to conduct a useful watershed inventory” (4.55), and “I gained a working knowledge of how to use strategic planning with my watershed group”(4.52). The two questions with the lowest mean agreements were “I gained a working knowledge of which stakeholder involvement strategies have been successful” and “I gained a working knowledge of strategies for involving local officials in watershed planning”. Even though these two had the lowest mean agreements for this face-to-face session, their high agreements suggest that these aspects of the content do not need to be changed.

The logistics part of the January face-to-face session again saw all questions with mean agreements higher than 4.0. The highest overall mean agreement was for the question “I was satisfied with the course materials” with a mean of 4.76. “I was satisfied with the meals served during the meeting had a mean agreement of 4.38”, “I was satisfied with the meeting rooms” had a mean agreement of 4.36, and “I was satisfied with the overnight facilities” had a mean agreement of 4.10.
Table 5. January face-to-face session evaluation means.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I got to know other students in the IWLA during this meeting.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The meeting facilitated knowledge sharing among participants.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I found new contacts and opportunities for future collaboration.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I understand what the IWLA entails and what is expected of me.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I gained a working knowledge of strategies for involving stakeholders in watershed planning.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I gained a working knowledge of which stakeholder involvement strategies have been successful.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I gained a working knowledge of strategies for involving local officials in watershed planning.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I gained a working knowledge of how to use strategic planning with my watershed group.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I gained a working knowledge of how to conduct a useful watershed inventory.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I was satisfied with the overnight room facilities.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I was satisfied with the meeting rooms.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I was satisfied with the course materials.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>I was satisfied with the meals served during the meeting.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participants were also given a chance to provide additional information about the face-to-face sessions during a series of open ended questions. We were interested in finding out which sessions the participants thought were the most beneficial to them, what changes they would like to see for the next meeting, and any additional thoughts they had regarding their first face-to-face session. A complete list of the comments made on this portion of the evaluation can be found in Appendix E, but summaries of the open ended comments suggested that the strategic planning presentation (6/33 comments), the stakeholder involvement presentation (7/33 comments), the local officials’ panel (6/33 comments), the watershed inventory (8/33 comments), and networking (6/33 comments) were the most beneficial sessions at the January face-to-face meeting.

When asked what changes they would like to see for the next meeting, 7 out of 21 commented that they would like to see more networking and organized discussion. There were 5 people who commented on needing more room at meeting tables, not being able to see presenters from their seats, etc., 3 who commented on being unsatisfied sleeping accommodations, (they didn’t like the bunk beds), 2 who commented that panels could be more structured by using prepared questions, 2 who suggested the need for off-topic breaks, and 2 who would like to see more hands-on activities
Recommendations for the January Face-to-Face Session

The first face-to-face session had high agreement means for the questions asked on the evaluations. Our recommendations for this face-to-face session would be to keep the content as is, and to change a few things about the logistics of the meeting.

- Although overnight facilities did receive a high mean agreement, there were some participants who commented on the open-ended comments section about not liking the bunk beds. If you could provide overnight arrangements for those who may not be able to sleep comfortably in bunk beds, this would be appreciated by participants.

- Arrange rooms in a way that everyone will be able to see presenters. Allow the participants to switch tables at different sessions in order to get to know other participants.

- Provide sufficient time so that participants can network. Networking can also be done while doing more hands-on activities.

- Some also feel that panels could be more structured by using prepared questions. These questions can be developed by the group, and can be asked by a moderator.
For the April 12-14 IWLA Face-to-Face session evaluations, sixteen questions were asked, and again, participants were asked to what extent they agreed with each question (1=Strongly Disagree, 5 = Strongly Agree) (Table 6). The questions regarding logistics of this session had higher mean agreements in general than the content related questions. “I was satisfied with the meals served during the meeting” had the highest mean agreement with a mean of 4.90. The question “I was satisfied with the meeting rooms had the second highest agreement with a mean of 4.62 and “I was satisfied with the overnight room facilities” had the third highest agreement among participants with a mean of 4.58. “I was satisfied with the course materials” had an overall mean agreement of 4.19.

The content related questions with the highest mean agreements were: “I got to know other students in the IWLA during this meeting” (4.57), “The meeting facilitated knowledge sharing among participants” (4.48), “I found new contacts” (4.24), “I learned fish species sampling and identification” (4.24), and “I learned how to plan a river float trip to increase stakeholders’ awareness of watershed goals and issues” (4.19).

The rest of the questions in this evaluation had overall mean agreements lower than 4.0, meaning that the participants in general did not agree or strongly agree with the questions but in fact where more neutral towards the questions. The mean agreements lower than 4.0, were seen on “I know what GIS tools are available and how to use them effectively in watershed efforts”(3.95), “I learned effective conflict management strategies”(3.95), “I learned strategies for working with local officials (plan commissions) to achieve watershed goals”(3.86), “I learned about successful watershed implementation projects”(3.81), and I know what GPS tools are available and how to
use them effectively in watershed efforts (3.75). The questions “I understand strategies for
working with drainage boards and landowners”, and “I understand key information about
drainage policy and practice” were the least salient with participants with means of 3.62 and 3.57
respectively.
Table 6. April face-to-face session evaluations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>I got to know other students in the IWLA during this meeting.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>The meeting facilitated knowledge sharing among participants.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>I found new contacts and opportunities for future collaboration.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>I know what GIS tools are available and how to use them effectively in watershed efforts.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>I know what GPS tools are available and how to use them effectively in watershed efforts.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>I learned about successful watershed implementation projects.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>I learned strategies for working with local officials (plan commissions) to achieve watershed goals.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>I learned fish species sampling and identification techniques.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>I learned effective conflict management strategies.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>I understand key information about drainage policy and practice.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>I understand strategies for working with drainage boards and landowners.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>I learned how to plan a river float trip to increase stakeholders’ awareness of watershed goals and issues.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>I was satisfied with the overnight room facilities.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>I was satisfied with the meeting rooms.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>I was satisfied with the course materials.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>I was satisfied with the meals served during the meeting.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participants were also given a chance to provide additional information about the face-to-face sessions during a series of open ended questions. We were interested in knowing which sessions were the most beneficial, what should be done differently at the next IWLA meeting, and any other topics on which participants commented. A complete list of the comments made on this portion of the evaluation can be found in Appendix F, but summaries of the open ended comments suggest that the GIS (13/44 comments), GPS (5/44 comments), fish sampling (6/44 comments), plans commissions (2/44 comments), and conflict management sessions (2/44 comments), along with the float trip (6/44 comments), and learning from other watershed groups (6/44 comments) were the most beneficial sessions at this face-to-face meeting.

Some of the aspects that participants would like to see done differently in future IWLA meetings include: more time for sessions (3/25 comments), more information regarding the topics covered (4/25 comments), more assistance needed for sessions (6/25 comments), changes in the facilities (4/25 comments), different organization of the schedule (3/25 comments), and having more resources available to them at the face-to-face session (2/25 comments).
Recommendations for the April Face-to-Face Session

- There were many questions on this face-to-face evaluation that received lower than a 4.0 out of 5.0 mean agreement from the participants, suggesting that the participants did not fully grasp all of the objectives set out for these sessions. Some areas that may need to be revised are:
  - GIS session
  - GPS session
  - Understanding watershed implementation projects
  - Strategies for working with local officials
  - Conflict management strategies
  - Understanding key information about drainage policy and practice
  - Strategies for working with drainage boards and landowners

- Even though the participants were satisfied overall with the facilities at the FFA Leadership Center in Trafalgar IN, participants seemed to be even more satisfied with the facilities at Camp Tecumseh. If you kept these two facilities as your meeting places, it would work out well for the participants. Another participant’s suggestion would be to seek out facilities in Southern Indiana.

- The sessions that dealt with computers and technology witnessed a variety of learning curves. For sessions such as GPS and GIS, there may need to be two different paces of the session, one for beginners who need more assistance, and one for more advanced users of this software.

- On the open-ended comment section of the evaluation, some commented on being tired after the canoe float. Perhaps this should be rescheduled to be the last session of the day.
For the June 6, 2006 face-to-face session, participants were asked to answer questions related to their entire experience in the IWLA. The questions and answers were used to facilitate a group discussion. The questions that participants were asked to provide answers to included:

- Recall that you began the Academy by developing your “Best Possible Outcomes” for your watershed and for your participation in the Academy. How has this Academy already helped you meet your goals and Best Possible Outcomes?
- How do you expect it will help you meet your goals and Best Possible Outcomes in the next 6 months?
- Name something in the course that you found particularly helpful.
- Name something that has hindered your learning and that you would like to see changed.

Each participant answered these questions in written and typed form, and their full responses can be found in Appendix G. To summarize the responses of the participants, the academy helped meet goals and Best Possible Outcomes by: providing networking opportunities, integrating “hard science” with social science, providing information on where to access information and resources, providing a better understanding of certain policies relating to watershed management, showing watershed groups how to involve community and other stakeholders, and providing details of creating, and implementing a watershed plan.

Participants expect to meet their goals and Best Possible Outcomes in the next 6 months by: using GIS, working on watershed plans, monitoring and water quality testing, acquiring needed information, and encouraging more participation and outreach within their organizations. Aspects of the course that participants found particularly helpful include: face-to-face sessions,
networking, learning GIS/GPS, identifying stakeholders, and knowing whereto find resources.

Issues that have hindered the participant’s learning include: different skill levels when it comes to computers, WebCT and internet connections, time able to devote to the course, and lack of feedback on assignments.

Conclusion

The Indiana Watershed Leadership Academy, which ran from January 2006 to June 2006, helped participants from across the state learn more about watershed issues, acquire or enhance skills that will help watershed groups more effectively manage waters in their regions, and to network and share ideas with fellow watershed professionals. Participants were able to do this by engaging in distance learning and face-to-face sessions.
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Syllabus: Indiana Watershed Leadership Academy 2006

Introduction

Welcome to the first Indiana Watershed Leadership Academy class, an in-depth training program for watershed professionals and volunteers. The purpose of this academy is to provide you with opportunities to learn and put to use skills and knowledge to lead a watershed group through the challenging process of developing and implementing a watershed plan.

The Indiana Watershed Leadership Academy is funded in part by a grant from the Indiana Department of Environmental Management and is guided by a diverse and broad advisory committee of conservation and environmental organizations and agencies. The content of the academy curriculum benefits greatly from lessons developed by The Ohio State University and their successful watershed academy. Additional technical, social, and financial lesson modules were developed through collaborative efforts between the Indiana Watershed Leadership Project Team and the multi-stakeholder advisory committee. The academy combines distance education lesson modules, with face-to-face group training sessions.

Primary Academy Contacts

Brent Ladd will be your primary contact for any questions regarding the Indiana Watershed Leadership Academy. Brent is a water quality specialist with the Agricultural and Biological Engineering Department on the West Lafayette campus of Purdue University. You can contact Brent via e-mail laddb@purdue.edu or by phone 765-496-6331.

Jane Frankenberger, Associate Professor of Agricultural and Biological Engineering and the State Extension Water Quality Engineer, is helping to lead the academy efforts, and will be an instructor for several of the technical lesson modules. For questions on GIS, calculating load reductions, inventorying a watershed, or drainage issues, contact Jane by email: frankenb@purdue.edu.

Shorna Broussard, Assistant Professor of Forestry and Natural Resources, is leading program research efforts on watershed groups in Indiana, and will be instructing stakeholder and advanced stakeholder lesson modules. For information about the program's survey of watershed groups, or questions about human dimensions of watershed efforts contact Shorna by email: broussar@purdue.edu.

Lesson Modules (Distance Education)

Each lesson module in the academy contains a list of background readings. Some of these readings are labeled "Required" — you should complete these readings in order to complete the module. All of the required readings will be made available to you on-line.
Other background readings are offered under the heading "Additional Resources," for those who wish to learn more about a particular topic.

Most lesson modules have a basic and advanced level for the assignments. If you feel you already have advanced experience and skills for a particular lesson module topic, please just let us know. We don’t want anyone doing “busywork”.

Assignments

The academy assignments have been designed to relate directly to your watershed planning and restoration efforts. Therefore, assignments are of a “hands-on” nature and you will be encouraged to work with your watershed group, stakeholders, local officials, and others in your community as part of the assignments. Although you are ultimately responsible for writing and submitting your own assignments, we strongly encourage you to work with these people as a critical part of the learning experience.

There are seven required lesson modules and you will choose three additional elective lesson modules. You are required to complete ten lesson modules order to graduate and receive your professional certificate in watershed management. The required modules are Introduction to Watershed Planning & Management, Stakeholder Involvement, Strategic Planning & Visioning for Your Organization, Watershed Inventory: Data Collection with a Purpose, Advanced Stakeholder Involvement, Mapping Your Watershed Using GIS, and Implementation & Outreach: Moving from Awareness to Action.

Refer to the academy WebCT calendar for assignment due-dates (a schedule is also at the end of this syllabus. The WebCT calendar may not be complete until after the first week)

Overdue assignments should be submitted for credit but will not be reviewed.

Most lesson module assignments have more than one option. Basic and advanced options are provided. You should complete only one of the options. Indicate clearly which option you have selected when you submit your assignment.

Assignments should be single-spaced and in MS Word format. They should be submitted by noon on the due date.

Instructions for Submitting Assignments

All assignments are to be submitted as an attached Microsoft Word file online via WebCT. If you do not have Microsoft Word, then upload the assignment as a plain text file.

It is VERY IMPORTANT that you name your assignment documents carefully, and do not use spaces. Please name your document as your last name followed by the assignment number. When appropriate, also identify the option you selected. For example, if Brent Ladd submits Assignment R5-1 (Option B), he will name his file laddR5-1b.doc
Review and Feedback on Assignments

Rather than assigning a number or letter grade to your work, we will keep a record of completed assignments. If you have not sufficiently completed an assignment, you will be asked to re-submit the assignment, incorporating the necessary changes.

You must submit ten complete module assignments to receive your professional certificate in watershed management at the final face-to-face meeting.

Although you will be evaluated solely on the basis of the successful completion of each assignment, we strongly encourage you to submit assignments by the due date to assure that they will be reviewed.

We recognize that you probably have a full time job, family responsibilities, and certain circumstances may make it impossible for you to submit an assignment on time. In these instances, contact Brent as soon as possible to arrange for a suitable alternative deadline.

In-Depth Learning Project

Every participant in the academy will complete an in-depth learning project to be presented during the graduation session. This project provides an opportunity to create your own learning experience on a topic of your choosing. You may complete the project on your own, but group projects are encouraged. Plan to spend 8-10 hours total on the in-depth project. More details about the in-depth learning project will be discussed at the first face-to-face meeting on January 26-27. For examples of in-depth learning projects from the Ohio Watershed Academy, go to http://ohiowatersheds.osu.edu/owa/projects/

Face-to-Face Sessions

In order to create opportunities for participants to learn from each other, develop new professional relationships, and go more in-depth on watershed topics, we have included three face-to-face meetings in the academy curriculum. Two of these face to face sessions require overnight stays, and the graduation ceremony and project presentation session is notify us as soon as possible if you are unable to attend a face-to-face meeting. Refer to the Academy WebCT Calendar for date, time, and location of the face-to-face meetings (A schedule is also at the end of this syllabus).

Indiana Watershed Leadership Academy Listserv

As a registered participant in the Indiana Watershed Leadership Academy, you will be subscribed to the Academy listserv. This email list will allow you to receive regular updates, reminders, and notices. You are also free to contribute to the listserv to seek advice or to pass along news and information that you feel would be relevant to your fellow students. Some lesson modules will require the use of the listserv for exchanging problems and solutions with fellow participants. To post messages to the listserv send them to: iwla@ecn.purdue.edu.
Time Commitment

We recognize that you probably hold a full time job, may have family and community responsibilities, and that additional work outside of these can be difficult to accomplish.

This academy has been developed to directly benefit and aid in the day to day work of watershed professionals and volunteers. In this way, the academy will help you in your daily watershed management duties. Lesson modules have assignments due approximately every two weeks, and each assignment will involve about 3 or 4 hours of your time. In addition you will be involved in completing an in-depth lesson project involving about 8-10 hours of your time. This covers the distance learning portion of the academy. The three face-to-face class sessions add up to six days total over the five month period that the academy is in session. The skills and knowledge gained, the relationships built, and recognition of being a graduate of this academy will be the rewards for the time and effort you bring to the academy.

Other

In addition to the academy, the Indiana Watershed Leadership Program is a project that is also creating opportunities for the exchange of knowledge through listserv, a statewide conference, and periodic workshops. Through these efforts we hope to strengthen watershed support networks in Indiana, and increase the capacity of communities to address watershed management issues. Read more about the program at the Web site: http://www.purdue.edu/watershed
Schedule 2006 Indiana Watershed Leadership Academy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required Modules</th>
<th>Elective Modules</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1. Introduction to Watershed Planning &amp; Management*</td>
<td>E1. Organizing Your Watershed Group*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2. Stakeholder Involvement*</td>
<td>E2. Running Effective Meetings*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4. Watershed Inventory</td>
<td>E4. Understanding the Clean Water Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5. Advanced Stakeholder Involvement</td>
<td>E5. Defining Issues &amp; Problems in Your Watershed*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Module is adapted with permission from the Ohio Watershed Academy, The Ohio State University.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates 2006</th>
<th>Module &amp; Due Date</th>
<th>Topic Leaders/Resource People</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 9-12</td>
<td>Introduction to Watershed Planning and Management (R1). Assignment due Jan. 12</td>
<td>Brent Ladd Jane Frankenberger Shorna Broussard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 12-23</td>
<td>Stakeholder Involvement (R2) Assignment due Jan. 23</td>
<td>Shorna Broussard* Bob McCormick Janet Ayres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 23-25</td>
<td>Group meeting preparation</td>
<td>Brent Ladd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 26 – 27</td>
<td>Group Meeting – Indiana FFA Leadership Center, Trafalgar ** Major Topics:** Stakeholder Involvement Strategic Planning &amp; Visioning Local Watershed Projects Discussion Watershed Inventory Peer-to-Peer Networking</td>
<td>Shorna Broussard Janet Ayres Jane Frankenberger Rae Schnapp (Bean Blossom Creek) Gabe Robertson &amp; Tara Wesseler (Young’s Creek) Sarah Brichford (Wildcat Creek) Jennifer Boyle (SE Indiana Watersheds)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Range</td>
<td>Activity Description</td>
<td>Responsible Party(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 28 – February 13</td>
<td>Choose one of the elective modules E1, E2, E3, E4, E5, E6</td>
<td>Assignment due Feb. 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 13 – 27</td>
<td>Choose one of the elective modules E1, E2, E3, E4, E5, E6</td>
<td>Assignment due Feb. 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 27 – March 13</td>
<td>Strategic Planning &amp; Visioning (R3)</td>
<td>Janet Ayres*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assignment due March 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 13 – 27</td>
<td>Watershed Inventory: Data Collection with a Purpose (R4)</td>
<td>J. Frankenberger*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assignment due March 27</td>
<td>Lyn Crighton, Kent Tracey, Jennifer Boyle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 27 – April 10</td>
<td>Advanced Stakeholder Involvement (R5)</td>
<td>Shorna Broussard*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assignment due April 10</td>
<td>Bob McCormick, Janet Ayres, Linda Prokopy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Depth Project</td>
<td>Submit your specific project topic and general outline of what you will do. If</td>
<td>Brent Ladd, Jane Frankenberger, Shorna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic and Outline:</td>
<td>you are part of a group project, only one person will submit this with names of</td>
<td>Broussard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 10</td>
<td>group members. Due April 10.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 12 – 14</td>
<td>Group Meeting – Tecumseh Leadership Center, Brookston</td>
<td>Jane Frankenberger, Shorna Broussard, Bob</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Major Topics:</td>
<td>McCormick, Janet Ayres, Reggie Korthals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implementation &amp; Outreach</td>
<td>Ron James, Chad Watts, DeeDee Sigler,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mapping Your Watershed Using GIS</td>
<td>Tony Bailey, Others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advanced Stakeholder Involvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drainage Policy &amp; Practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sustaining Your Watershed Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Financially</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Watershed Projects Panel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15 – May 1</td>
<td>Mapping Your Watershed Using GIS (R6)</td>
<td>J. Frankenberger*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assignment due May 1</td>
<td>Larry Theller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1 – 15</td>
<td>Implementation &amp; Outreach (R7)</td>
<td>Jennifer Boyle, DeeDee Sigler, Janet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assignment due May 1</td>
<td>Ayres, Tony Bailey, Jill Reinhart, Duane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>McCoy, Watershed Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Range</td>
<td>Activity Description</td>
<td>Responsible Parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| May 15 – 29      | Choose an elective module: E7, E8, E9, E10, E11  
*Assignment due May 29*                                                                 |                                             |
| May 29 – June 5  | Complete in-depth learning projects.  
*Due June 5*                                                                                           | Brent Ladd  
Jane Frankenberger  
Shorna Broussard |
| June 6           | Group meeting, NREC Center, Indianapolis.  
*Major Topics:*  
- Project presentations  
- Graduation ceremony  
- Academy evaluation  
*Projects due June 5* | Director(s) of State Agencies  
Indiana State House Rep  
Jane Frankenberger  
Shorna Broussard  
Brent Ladd  
Other Steering Committee Members |
Appendix C. Agenda for group meeting, January 26 - 27
Indiana FFA Leadership Center, Trafalgar, IN

THEME: Involving Community in Watershed Planning

Desired outcomes for this session:
1. Get to know each other
2. Learn about what has worked or not worked for other participants
3. Understand how the academy works
4. Learn about different stakeholder involvement options and their effectiveness
5. Understand strategies for working well with local officials
6. Gain knowledge of how to use strategic planning with your watershed group
7. Understand how to conduct a useful watershed inventory

Thursday (Jan. 26):
12:30-1:00 Arrive and check into rooms.

1:00-2:00 Introductions

2:00-2:25 The big picture of the Indiana Watershed Leadership Academy (Jane Frankenberger)

2:25-2:30 stretch/quick break

Watersheds: What’s Happening, What’s Working, What’s Not Working

2:30-4:00 Stakeholder Involvement in Current Watershed Groups
Discussion leaders on stakeholder involvement:
  Tara Wesseler, Young’s Creek, Stakeholders and 319 projects
  Rae Schnapp, Bean Blossom Creek, Involving citizen groups
  Sarah Brichford, Wildcat Creek Guardians, Sustaining volunteers
  Jennifer Boyle, Watershed Specialist for SE Indiana, Strategies for involving key, but disinterested stakeholders

4:00-4:15 Break (snack/drink)

4:15-4:45 Stakeholder involvement strategies: What the research shows. (Shorna Broussard)

4:45-5:45 Engaging Local Officials in Watershed Planning
Panel:
  Jack Rhoda, President, Wildcat Creek Watershed Alliance, & Lafayette City Council, District 4
  K.D. Benson, Tippecanoe County Commissioner, District 2, Lauramie Creek Watershed Group
  Bob Thompson, Porter County Plan Commission Director
5:45 Break

6:00-7:00 Dinner

7:00-8:00 Small group networking discussions

Evening Relax, card games, network.

**Planning a Vision for Your Watershed, and Data Collection with a Purpose**

Friday (Jan. 27)

7:00-8:00 Breakfast

8:00-9:00 Introduction to in-depth learning projects, course information, additional group meeting options (Brent Ladd)

9:00-12:00 Strategic planning & visioning session (Janet Ayres)
    (break at ~10:30)

12:00-1:00 Lunch

1:00-2:30 Conducting a watershed inventory (Jane Frankenberger)

2:30-3:00 Evaluations & conclusion of meeting
Information you need to know about the meeting, and the facilities:

First of all, we want to create a relaxed and informal atmosphere. Please dress comfortably! Jeans, tennis shoes, casual shirts are encouraged. Leave the ties and coats at home.

The FFA Center is in a wooded, camp-like setting. This won’t be like the Hilton, but it does offer us a private, quiet setting. The sleeping rooms are arranged to sleep up to four people with two sets of bunk beds. You will share a room with one other person (we will have the list of roommates when you arrive next Thursday). There will be a women’s wing of rooms, and a men’s wing. Each wing has two shared rest room/shower facilities.

Please note that bed linens are provided with one bottom sheet, a pillow, and a blanket. Feel free to bring any additional blanket, sleeping bag, pillow, etc. that you might want.

Meals are banquet style. I’ve been told there will be options for those who prefer vegetarian meals. There looks to be plenty of food for the meals.

Feel free to bring non-perishable snacks such as chips and nuts for the evening. There are a few vending machines available as well.

Feel free to bring cards for card games in the evening, etc.

The Center is a non-alcoholic facility...so please don’t bring alcohol.

The Center has a non-smoking policy on the grounds

And, they ask that we leave our water guns and water balloons at home (darn!).

Quiet hours are 11pm – 7am.
Appendix D. Agenda for group meeting, April 12-14
“Watershed Boot Camp II”: Indiana Watershed Leadership Academy
April 12-14, Tecumseh Leadership Center, Brookston, IN

Directions: http://www.camptecumseh.org/tlc/pdf/Directions.pdf

Information you need to know about the meeting, and the facilities:

Please dress comfortably! Jeans, shorts, tennis shoes, casual shirts are encouraged. Leave the ties and coats at home. We have a number of outdoor activities planned. PLEASE BE PREPARED FOR RAIN, AS WELL AS COOL & WARM WEATHER. We are planning a canoe trip on the Tippecanoe River, and depending on water temperatures and depth MAY be able to search for mussel species. We will also plan on being outdoors for GPS, and fish sampling sessions.

The Tecumseh Leadership Center is in a wooded setting, with a small lake and areas for outdoor activities. Juices, softdrinks, and coffee will be provided self-serve around the clock anytime you want it, along with fresh fruit to snack on. The sleeping rooms are basic but pleasant (much better than the FFA Center in my opinion). You will share a room with up to two other people. There will be a women’s wing of rooms, and a men’s wing. Each wing has very clean, modern restroom/shower facilities (towels provided).

Please note that bed linens are provided with one bottom sheet, a pillow, and a blanket. You might want to bring any additional blanket, sleeping bag, stuffed animal, pillow, etc. that you need for your comfort.

There are no alarm clocks in the rooms.

Meals are banquet style. There looks to be plenty of food for the meals. Feel free to bring non-perishable snacks such as chips and nuts for the evening.

Please bring your academy binder/notebook.

Please bring games, guitars, drums, stories for around the evening fires. There are several outdoor games available, including a volleyball area. I believe the lake has a small row boat available, but I will need to double check with the staff on our use of the boat(s).

The Center is a non-alcoholic facility with a policy of no alcohol, firearms, or other weapons. Smoking in buildings is prohibited. Please use the stations outside to dispose of cigarette butts.

General and Emergency CONTACT PHONE NUMBER AT TECUMSEH LEADERSHIP CENTER: 765-564-2898
**THEME: Putting Plans Into Action**

**Desired Outcomes:**

1. Know what GIS and GPS tools are available and how to use them effectively in watershed efforts
2. Learn about successful watershed implementation projects
3. Learn strategies for working with local officials to achieve watershed goals
4. Experience how to use a river float trip to increase stakeholders’ awareness
5. Understand key information about drainage policy and practice and strategies for working with drainage boards and landowners
6. Experience fish species sampling techniques and identification
7. Get to know each other, develop a larger network of peers, have fun!

**Wednesday (April 12)**

12:30 – 1:00 Arrive and check into rooms (please eat lunch before arriving)

- Welcome, introductions, overview of session
- Invited watershed projects panel: Implementing watershed restoration & protection
- Working with local officials: Advanced stakeholder involvement and conflict resolution strategies

Dinner

Evening Free time, Fire outside weather permitting (demo of hand drill method of fire making)
Sunset: 8:19 PM

**Thursday (April 13)**

Sunrise: 7:10 AM Morning hike, relax on the deck, sleep in
Breakfast

- Using Global Positioning System (GPS) tools in watershed management
- Tippecanoe river project: Biodiversity, restoration, and protection

Lunch

- Getting stakeholders and local officials out on the water
- Canoe trip on Tippecanoe River
- Mapping your watershed using Geographic Information System tools

Dinner

Evening:
S’mores around the fire, storytelling, music.
Time for in-depth project teams to meet
Sunset: 8:20 PM, Full Moon

**Friday (April 14)**
Sunrise: 7:09 AM

**Breakfast**

- Understanding drainage policy and practice for working with drainage boards, surveyors, and landowners
- Fish species sampling techniques and identification

**Lunch**

- Evaluation, Questions, Deadlines, Final session (presentations-graduation) - June 6.

Alternative time for river float trip if needed 1 – 3 Friday.
Appendix E. Agenda for group meeting, June 6
Indiana Watershed Leadership Academy Graduation Ceremony:
9 – 9:45  Academy Students Only Evaluation Discussion
10:00 Welcome, Introductions, Format for the Day
10:15 – 12:30  Presentations on In-Depth Learning Projects
12:30 – 1:15  Buffet Lunch
1:15 – 3:00  Presentations continue
3:00 – 4:00  Recognition of Watershed Academy Participants & Awarding of Professional Certificates in Watershed Management

Schedule of Presentations:
10 minutes per presentation (with time for one question and a two minute transition between presenters). Please hold additional questions until breaks and lunch. Each presentation receives written comments from peers and advisory committee.

Education & Awareness
10:15 Discover the Wildcat Program to teach youth and adults in the watershed (Sarah Brichford)
10:30 Where does the rain end up in our watershed? A teaching tool for youth and adults (Holly LaSalle)
10:45 A ‘WebQuest’ service learning project on watersheds for high school students (Mickey Penrod)
11:00 How to start your watershed project off on the right foot (Angie Brown)
11:15 Creating a meaningful watershed project Web site (Gwen Dieter)
11:30 Using Google Maps for a virtual watershed tour (Blair Borries)

Management, Restoration, and Benefits
11:45 "Clean up After Your Pet: Dog-gone-it", This is easy as 1-2-3 (or Developing and establishing a canine park for Greencastle) (Glen Morrow, Sue Crafton, Susan Grivas)
12:00 Management of bedding and manure from a public horse facility on Little Blue (Noell Krughoff)
12:15 Mapping portage routes in the Maumee River valley for recreation and historic value (Ron James & Julie O’Beirne)

Analysis, Data, & Regulatory
1:15 Understanding Indiana water quality standards (Julie Diehm & Brandon Snoddy)
1:30 Overview of sedimentation models USLE and RUSLE for soil loss modeling. (Sarah Sauter)
1:45 Decision making and location mapping for volunteer water testing efforts (Kevin Jayne)
2:00 Watershed uses of 2005 color infrared orthophotography imagery (Cindy Beckner)
2:15 Inventorying the lower Mississinewa (Mike Guebert)

Community & Stakeholder Involvement
2:30 Creating a proposal and approval to gain a Clean Community designation in Indiana (Kathy Dillon)
2:45 Cost-sharing and alliances with other organizations (John Ulmer & Lora Shrake)
Appendix F: January Face to Face Session Open Ended Comments
What session(s) was/were most beneficial to you? In what ways?

- I was inspired by Janet Ayres and her talk about strategic planning
- All of them – I mostly needed to confirm that I was on the right track and see what I needed to change in the future
- The “conducting a watershed inventory” was probably the most useful
- Elected officials panel
- Janet Ayres session was very beneficial! – good ideas about group building
- Shorna’s stakeholders – interesting to see the types of stakeholders and how their involvement impacts successful groups
- Panel of officials – question/answer period
- Take home resources
- Stakeholder involvement strategies, great information, I hope to get more volunteers involved in bringing stakeholders to the table
- Conducting a watershed inventory – wonderful information on the process of watershed inventory!
- Conflict resolution/Help bring people to the same page to focus
- Networking
- Janet Ayres session on strategic planning was particularly beneficial
- Engaging local officials – possible insight into BMP planning (Porter Co.)
- Watershed inventory – magnitude of task
- Strategic planning. It was good to have the basic concepts and then apply the ideas to various projects
- Stakeholder involvement strategies – good ideas that I can use
- All group interaction sessions – networking
- Land use inventory session – great info for future unit [? Illegible]
- Strategic planning
- Hearing all the local officials was helpful
- Hearing others’ experiences was also useful
- Involving local officials/the panel Thursday. I am always looking for better ways to engage my local officials
- I found Janet Ayres was very informative and down to earth/honest.
- Involving local officials. I never knew what it was like to meet a local official that is concerned about the environment
- Inventory – I didn’t realize how much was involved & what else we could do
- Strategic planning – but I wish that it was a more “how to” than basic intro – I could read a basic intro
- Stakeholder involvement – Janet Ayres very helpful with social aspect
- Inventory resources
- Stakeholder involvement – hearing input from others – established watershed groups – struggling watersheds
- Interactions of group and watershed inventory
- Janet Ayres had not heard this talk before so enjoyed new ground
- Shorna’s social interactions ppt. I’d like to follow and learn more about this
- Inventory – gives a guideline/framework for what info to acquire and when/how to access it
What should we do differently at the next IWLA meeting?
- Sharing was great but as always, there are a few who dominate. Perhaps get a handle on these people.
- Great mixup; change hands on.
- More organized networking/ mingleing (sp?)
- Needed slightly more room at tables.
- No Bunkbeds! We don’t need a Hilton, but them bunks were low clearance.
- Consider an activity break between classes. 4 hours of class is kind of long. Walk was nice, but perhaps an informative break, etc.
- Continue to emphasize keeping the groups moving on topic. The longer we are on our own, the more likely discussions are to get off track.
- Not coffee, water available throughout mtg (not just @ breaks)
- “Force” mix & match seating after each period of informal discussion (i.e. not after sessions but after meals)
- Have mixers so people can change tables. Then we’d get to know other people better.
- All is well.
- Seating arrangement for meeting required some folks to have to turn around as their backs were to presenters. Round tables good for meals, poor for presentations.
- Have some planned structured group afternoon or evening activity like nature hike, history, etc. that is off topic from watershed stuff.
- It might be helpful to have more large group activities rather than smaller table activities.
- Better bed availability.
- More fried chicken.
- More space for meeting & socializing after meeting w/o disturbing people sleeping.
- Breaks don’t need to be 15-20 minutes.
- Great format – no recommendations at this time.
- Hands-on activities.
- More time with engaging local officials maybe set questions format – group creates set questions for officials to answer.
- Have 5 people at 5 tables, & switch tables daily (or ½ daily) – this would help us get to know more members and facilitate more diverse sharing.
- For panel, have prepared questions from moderator for panelists to answer in turn (to give diverse response).

Other comments
- It was great! I am learning so much.
- I appreciate the later start for this meeting so that some of us traveling great distances have plenty of time to get here on a normal schedule. Great Job-Just glad I’m part of such a positive group.
- I have begun laying groundwork for communication. I hope the group will network and help one another in our (mis)adventures in Watershed Planning and Management.
- It was great/Handouts are wonderful!
- The planners did a nice job. I’ve learned a lot!
- Great experience – good job by all.
- Great experience! Looking forward to the next one.
- Possible copies of established newsletter.
Appendix G. April Face to Face Session Open Ended Comments
What session(s) was/were the most beneficial to you? In what ways?

- Fish sampling - showed/demonstrated techniques I had not had the opportunity to observe until now.
- Float trip - gets me to the zen of things - that’s the reason I do what I do.
- GIS and GPS - Good overview of procedures that will enhance their use in watershed projects and improve both the quality of the project and the quality of the presentation of the project.
- Presentations on watershed projects (Tina, Jane, Chad) - canoe trip was fun but I’d like more info (See #19)
- Excellent examples for idea generators for my project. Please obtain and post the ppts. On IWLA website
- Stakeholder Involvement (working with government officials). Learned about Governments’ place in environmental management
- GIS - The ability to do mapping and use the maps for planning is invaluable to the future of our group
- GIS/software use/commissioner/canoeing
- Implement projects/inventory discussion
- Power
- Working with plan commissions - gave me a better understanding of what plan commissions do
- Conflict management
- GIS
- Methods of Presentation
- Fish Sampling
- Presentations from other watershed groups. I learned about techniques and strategies I have never heard of before
- Working with local officials: role-playing was especially helpful. It makes it more comfortable doing these real-life events
- Introduction to the GIS/GPS software - needed more time to work on examples with assistance
- Hands on sessions - fish sampling and canoe trip
- GIS - it was nice to see what free materials are available
- Conflict Resolution - great idea, but more hands on, interactive examples
- River trip and fish sampling - always interesting to do hands-on
- Legal Issues - a little dry but important to know
- GIS - take home and class instruction
- Just learning interests of other participants and their strengths for future “use and help”
- Drainage and GIS - both relate strongly to my current work tasks
- Fish shocking and river trip - very relevant to my tasks
- The successful implementations - it was good to hear the strategies of other groups and to get contracts for future collaborations
- The free/networking time to connect with other watershed leaders
- Canoe float - got me comfortable with canoeing again
- Fish sampling
- GPS tools
- GIS and GPS I didn’t know anything about this and now I think I can actually do more with this.
- GIS - would have preferred more in depth lesson on GIS than the GPS session
- GIS
- Importing Data and queries
- GIS/GPS - Hands on work always helps maintain knowledge base
What should we do differently at the next IWLA meeting?

- Spend more time on the river
- More time with GIS and GPS
- Just a little more time (slower) on GIS, be sure the GPS units work. Although the prior IGIS module and then mapping w/GIS after this section is a very good idea.
- More action oriented workshops, canoeing, fire starting
- More structured networking
- More of the same
- Training for water monitoring
- Courses/lectures could be better organized. GPS/GIS was disorganized and could have been better prepared
- Run computer training from CD only so everyone is at the same environment and pace better.
- GIS- example, probably tried to do too much maybe a demo of process, students more simple single area/part of program
- Come down to Southern Indiana sometime
- Canoeing should be the last session. Many people were too tired to effectively participate in the final session afterwards
- Allow more time for hands on assistance with the computer training
- Maybe add some vegetation identification vs. water quality /environment.
- More effective use of time after dinner in future overnight sessions
- Break-out sessions for people with similar issues
- GIS/GPS good topic! Maybe some pre-exercises to get us up to speed. There is so much I need to know- but equipment and time didn’t allow it
- Graduate
- Re-work the drainage discussion-especially related to the legal issues. I couldn’t follow the presentation
- Quiet hours designated for overnights
- Better mattresses
- Cooler temperatures (in rooms)
- GPS could have been a little better organized. At times I struggled to keep up with understanding.
- I would like to of had the GIS meeting before the watershed inventory lesson. It would have been helpful to flesh out the info to see where my gaps were.
- Have handouts of powerpoint info.

Other comments?

- Good Job
- Use evenings for topic discussions among students. (networking)
- I would like more info on the organization of canoe float trips. (Could Ron, Chad, and Blair post their information please?)
- Could you provide some resources and contact info for topics such as fish, macroinvert, monitoring. (like the sheet on GIS resources)
- Perhaps we could create an alumni that could have a modest fee or be free, that would allow this years class to remain networked with one another, future students and future publications and programs
- Really enjoyed these three days. Environment was terrific.
- Accommodations were much better than Trafalgar! Food was better too!
Sort of obvious, double check materials to avoid so many oppps’s.
Thank you so much for this!
Take home materials are very helpful- There is a tremendous amount of information to learn and take home materials enhance the learning effect
Add water quality monitoring training
Add grant guidance requirements vs. monitoring
This was an excellent meeting. Thanks for all your hard work. I’ve learned a lot. The sharing among participants is valuable!
Having a great time learning! All of the instructors are so patient.
Nice weather
Enjoyable sessions
Slow down computer use lecture and be more descriptive of where you are clicking
Have internet access (during class periods only)
I really appreciate this opportunity
The canoe trip would have been better at the end of the day. Coming back to classes after canoeing was hard
On Friday I would have preferred to have finished the session before lunch
Would have been nice to have internet connection
Appendix H. June Face-to-Face Session Evaluation Responses
Recall that you began the Academy by developing your “Best Possible Outcomes” for your watershed and for your participation in the Academy. How has this Academy already helped you meet your goals and Best Possible Outcomes?

- Better understanding of the process of doing a plan and producing a product; Integrating social science and “hard science” of doing watershed management; networking and support from other watershed groups.

- Through the watershed academy, I have better understood how to connect with citizens in my watershed/watershed group, in order to be effective. I better understand drainage policy, the Clean Water Act, and conflict resolution, which I hope makes me a better leader. I wanted to make contact with other watershed professionals to obtain advice and support and the INLA has definitely helped with that. Overall, I feel more confident in my position and better able to lead my group to success.

- It put me in contact with a lot of sources that I could use, i.e., people, websites, books, etc., and gave me an idea of what I needed to accomplish my goals. Sometimes you don’t know what to ask, so the class gave me an “outline” of steps to take and how to move forward.

- The academy guided me to resources I was not aware of when I started this program. It helped me achieve certain tasks easier because I had a better idea of how to obtain the information I needed.

- I have learned new tools to help me with my outreach efforts. Some of the specifics, resource material, how to motivate better, time management and more importantly, the networking this has allowed from all different angles.

- It has given me new tools and direction, along with the complete understanding of what should be in a Watershed plan and where to get this information.

- Our group best case is to begin development of a plan and collaborate with community members. While we really did not get to this point of stakeholder development, I (we) really now understand the steps and methods of planning, and more importantly, the ways to integrate science and sociology, and the difficulties of seeing that occur. I have personally begun to learn so much about how people think and behave, and how to involve stakeholders.

- It has helped me to focus on what tasks are important. It has also helped to point out possible problems and pitfalls and how to avoid them.
  - It has helped with the process of planning and implementation in that resources were presented that allows the process to proceed more smoothly.
  - Networking with people who have “been there, done that” helps gain insight in the process.
  - The whole class has been an awakening in how to proceed to a successful outcome.

- I gained many useful ideas to use in our meetings – more places to look for resources.
Networking, resources – helped to focus on tasks.

We are doing a much better job on the management side of the organization. We are now more aware of the things we need to do. We are actively working on forming committees.

It has helped to better categorize/define goal “areas”. Education is a good, general thing everyone is for. Are we educating land owners on BMP practices, local government officials on water policy, citizens on wise water conservation practices, or kids on the importance of water as a resource? Each audience requires separate planning and a separate approach. The Academy has given me the tools to better frame the discussion and address the specific audiences.

Have met others involved in watershed management that can help me with suggestions (discussions, etc.). The network is growing! Will likely be starting 319 implementation goals this year and my experience in this area have really been broadened by perspectives of Academy participants.

I learned the importance of verbalizing the best outcome in a vision statement. Once you say it you have a road map for getting there. I also learned about techniques that bring people’s visions together into a unified effort. This all points to realizing my hope that the plan will be used and not forgotten.

How do you expect it will help you meet your goals and Best Possible Outcomes in the next 6 months?

I will really just continue in the path that I am already taking. However, there is a specific task in our 319 contract that I was nervous/unsure of how to accomplish (conducting a conference on the combined needs of drainage and pollution prevention). As a result of the IWLA, I now feel confident that I can organize a conference for county surveyors and other drainage professionals around the state that will inform them of ways to be environmentally sensitive in their drainage solutions.

The GIS layers were helpful in “seeing” the whole watershed, and will be a big help in the next months.

It will continue to serve as a guide to acquiring the information I need to meet goals. Also, I now know 20 other people to whom I can go to for advice should I need direction or assistance.

Actually I have already utilized several of the new skills. I will continue with the organization modules learned and try to continue to learn GIS (which is great for mapping).

We will finish writing our watershed plan this next year. I feel that attending the Academy will give us a direction when we implement our strategy(-ies) for addressing the problems we find.
This will help, but it will take much more than 6 months. Next fall I will begin (continue) inventorying and monitoring. It will be a much longer process to involve stakeholders, and honestly I need help from someone to coordinate such an effort.

I am better prepared to begin my new grant and focus on important issues and the optimal order to accomplish them. Greater knowledge of resources.

Better planning of the project. Management of time and information. More stakeholder involvement to assure ownership. Understanding of data gained.

Plan to start ESPI/GIS.

More application of GIS.

We will implement water quality testing program, this will assist us in planning. The ability to create maps is invaluable.

We are fortunate that the Eagle Creek Watershed Alliance has gotten off to such a good start, in that we have active dynamic committees and are getting the word out about our activities. The lessons learned in the Academy will help us keep the interest level high so that we can actually make some noticeable improvements to water quality in Eagle Creek Watershed.

Will recruit others for leadership in the organization who want to participate in the Academy. Will use strategies learned in assignments and discussions to coordinate group activities (meetings, on-stream activities, parlor interaction, etc.).

I’m excited about our Watershed Management Plan. We’re developing attainable goals with realistic objectives. I don’t think it will be just an exercise to satisfy the language in the 319 grant, but will be a useful, workable document.

Name something in the course that you found particularly helpful.

Face-to-face and internet-required communications – this “forced” networking – has been really great. I also really appreciated the “social” topics – organizing meetings, conflict resolution – as well as the strategic planning. I wish we could have done even more with strategic planning! I also appreciated your willingness to work around technological issues.

Getting to meet other individuals working on watersheds. Everyone was at different stages. It was nice to know others had the same questions and were confused on how to get things going. It was also nice to have others who had already gone through some of these stages and could help with their experiences.

The two most helpful modules for me were:
- Identifying stakeholders.
- Understanding drainage policy.
- For me the face to face sessions were the most helpful. They presented a lot of good information and also time for feedback.

- The GIS training was helpful, but there was so much more……

- The most helpful part is the breadth of resources compiled to help me understand stakeholder involvement, planning goals and action plans, group facilitation, etc. But, the specific resources and materials related to watershed inventories will be helpful very soon.

- GIS information and resources. Also, information on successful integration of stakeholders into projects. I liked having the freedom through electives to focus on special interests.

- Where to find the maps and how to use them for situations you are working on. Who you should be networking with to assure success.

- Technical assignments and face/face meetings.

- Videos on line.

- Learning how to use GIS, GPS, and strategic planning. Also, learning how to seek stakeholders and funding.

- The GIS/mapping work. This is a powerful presentation tool to let people “see” the watershed and its issues and threats. The other tool I particularly like is the STEP-L modeling tool. This will help us a lot in being able to estimate the best return on our investment of both volunteer time and funds when evaluating different courses of action.

- The GIS session really helped me understand what is available currently and how I can access this powerful technology without tremendous expense and time commitment. Drainage will help me with an education item in my watershed plan.

- Meeting others who are working in so many different ways to improve water quality is very helpful. I gained perspective on the tasks still before my watershed group. People have shared ideas I’ve already put into practice. Also beginning to learn technical aspects like manipulating GIS software to create maps, working with GPS equipment, hearing about legal aspects all have been helpful. I know I need to learn more.
Name something that has hindered your learning and that you would like to see changed.

- I don’t understand the use of WebCT, and I know it was a big problem for some. Could we simply email assignments?

- Unfortunately, I am not as computer literate as some of the others in the class. During the GIS section I struggled to get things to work and spent a lot of time trying to figure things out, even though I was familiar to some degree with GIS.

- The lack of feedback on assignments has been the biggest hindrance. There was a long delay between submitting assignments and receiving grades/comments. Of the 10 modules I submitted, I have only received comments back on 5 of them. Either the grading process needs to be improved or fewer assignments need to be required. Feedback is critical to the learning process.

- Not everyone is computer savvy, so I would say that some of the skills required were very difficult from a remote location. Maybe at the very beginning of the next academy class, a short lesson explaining what skills would be needed or a remedial class for those not as advanced with their computer skills.

- Internet access was limited to doing the work at the office (dial-up at home). Then the computers were Federal, so downloading some programs were prohibited (ArcView/ArcExplorer). However, I felt this section was very helpful and important.

- This has been a particularly busy 6 months in my life, nevertheless, I felt my involvement in IWLA would be important in the success of future watershed planning efforts. This has proven true. So, I wonder if extending the program (same content) over a longer period, say start in September or October and run through June.

- The only thing that hindered my learning was the amount of time that I had available to devote to the projects.

- The computer situation was frustrating when things should have worked, but learner, such as myself, was such a novice, it didn’t run accordingly. Dial-up modems – too slow for process.

- Would like to see 2 different academies. One focused for county, and one focused for urban.

- Computer challenges, WebCT is difficult, different skill levels. Shift to more electives, less required to suit different skill levels. Should state at sign up minimum requirements or equipment available.

- Only time – I wish I had fewer commitments while I was taking this course. Actually, in the syllabus, indicate when you will need to go to meetings or meet with government officials, so appointments can be arranged in order to meet deadlines more appropriately.

- A bit better instructional organization. For example, in the GIS training, it would have been better to run the training from a CD that everyone had the same data, programs, etc. on so that Larry had a chance of being in control. Then, afterward address the individual issues to get the
software loaded on individuals’ laptops. Time. I perhaps had some luxury of not trying to do this course and work full time, but it was always easy to fall into the “wow this is really neat…” trap and end up being pushed to get the actual required work for the specific assignment done. This might have been due to underestimating the course expectations of this age/experience group of people versus say an undergraduate audience.

- Personal schedule was very busy this spring. Otherwise, topics and sessions were all interesting and appropriate I thought.

- I need more practice with things like GIS and GPS. I would like to work at a computer with others doing the same thing so I can ask questions. We tried to do this at Camp Tecumseh, but the equipment wasn’t working properly. I think it would be really helpful to me to go to a Purdue computer lab and work on a project with others who know more than I do.
Appendix I. Distance Learning Open-ended Comments
E1. Organizing Your Watershed Group
- This module just made me stop & logically think through all the steps of organization.
- It was very helpful to me as designed.

E2. Running Effective Meetings
- I found the information presented to be helpful in leading meetings.
- I think the questions do not reflect my assessment of the assessment. The module was easy, I usually don't complain when somethings easier than I expected but the reading was too easy. I do think the subject material was relevant, and I will utilize the techniques that were described. I think the reading could be more challenging and have some additional depth.
- Any time I have to find a meeting to attend, I need more than two weeks to plan. I was fortunate on the timing of this module.
- I thought it was pretty good as it is.
- For someone who has NEVER conducted a public meeting this would be a very helpful module. Completing this module did cause me to evaluate the importance of the agenda. Upon completion of this module I felt that I should have chosen a module that challenged me more.

E3. Group Facilitation Skills
- This was a good module, but probably not the best one for me. Although I did gain some new information from it and the working agenda was beneficial, I don't believe many of the facilitation strategies are very applicable for the types of watershed meetings I attend.
- For those of us who do not find module E2 helpful, having to complete a "working agenda" for E3 was a bit out of place. I would consider changing this portion of the assignment.

E4. Understanding the Clean Water Act
- I think that it would have been nice to have had a list of the sections and their subject matter (i.e. section 319 is nonpoint source pollution).
- It was fine.
- No recommendations for improvement. This module forced me to learn to navigate the GIS data that is available to my organization. Tools that will be instrumental in involving stakeholders in assessment of the watershed. It was eye opening to learn how much information is available in a relatively efficient manner.
- Took a lot of time to read the CWA -- but I went over it fairly well - including most of Indiana’s. It was pretty technical - but I believe it was time well spent. I was interrupted many times during my reading & that added to my time considerably.

E5. Defining Issues & Problems in Your Watershed
- Good, too bad we don't have an organized watershed group to date.
- I could have possibly benefited from seeing more written examples of actual problem statements. I had a difficult time following the problem analysis outline. I also had problems getting the links to the problem analysis outline to work.

E6. Developing Goals & Objectives
- Double check the references to completion of specific module numbers. I did not feel that it was matching our class module numbering system.

E7. Understanding Drainage Policy and Practice
- I’m not sure that I really found a good answer for the optional question that was part of e7-2(A) - that would have been useful as a watershed coordinator. Also, I think that there should be a link to the Indiana Drainage Code, so that we can read it, if need be.
- I recommend putting the Drainage Law in Indiana handout from Professor Harrison on line. I couldn't find my copy. Can I get another copy of his material that we received at Camp Tecumseh?
E8. Estimating Pollutant Load Reductions for BMPs
  o Perhaps provide more web resources for evaluating the effectiveness of BMP with regard to load reductions.

E10. Sustaining Your Watershed Group Financially
  o This module would be better done as a group project. This would give students an opportunity to experience a committee environment.

R2. Stakeholder Involvement
  o As we are early in our specific watershed project it was difficult for me to complete. I feel that it may be a better exercise for me (my organization) to complete at a later date. I feel that if you were just entering watershed planning this was perhaps a little more difficult to grasp. Definitely better as a group (staff, steering committee, etc.) activity.
  o Perhaps more examples for assessing and identifying Stakeholders
  o I thought that the module was very helpful. A suggestion for option B: our watershed group has already asked the question “who needs to be involved” - however, I found that it was helpful to go through who already IS involved as well as try to determine who needs to be involved.
  o There might be a discussion on individual personalities of stakeholders. Example perhaps an environmental group stakeholder would be good to have, but the individual who would represent that group is generally disruptive at meetings. Do you skip that representation or try to deal with it?
  o I not only was able to compile a list of stakeholders, but it increased my awareness of my role in the watershed.
  o I felt this was a worthwhile module - but we are just already past this point and so it was mostly just review for me.
  o I found this information to be very helpful and would not suggest improvement.
  o The module was helpful and effective in guiding me to begin thinking about the stakeholders I hope to involve in my watershed project. I am sure it is hard to design a module that is perfect for a group as diverse as this one with varying levels of experience. For me, with little experience, this module was perfect.
  o Possibly clarify how students should complete the projects if they do not have an established watershed group or board.
  o I think this was a good module and needs no improvements. Although it was a basic assignment, it was important to start the thinking process for stakeholder involvement and contribution.
  o Since it asks for input from the current stakeholders, it might be good to allow an extended period of time to do that. Perhaps turn the assignment in at a designated time, and then revisit the topic in a month to find out what the stakeholders thought.
  o None that I can think of.
  o Good additional reading

R3. Strategic Planning
  o Too many links to other areas -- I found it a bit overwhelming. Very informative just too much to take in all at once.
  o This assignment was mostly just review for me. I have been involved with the SWCD for many years and strategic planning is almost second nature with us, as we almost always use this with our projects. I do feel that it is important to know and understand the process.
  o Module was VERY heavily linked and sometimes it was difficult where you were and why you were there, plus some links seemed redundant.
  o All the links contained in the reading seemed somewhat overwhelming. Although the information was good, the reading went from link to link that never felt completed. It was hard to tell where to stop reading as there was always another link to follow.
  o The required reading material was somewhat hard to follow. There were several links? and I had some error messages when I tried to use some of them.
  o This module might be better suited after going through strategic planning!
  o I did not have enough time to set up a meeting.
I thought that this was a good introduction for the topic - but I wish that it could have been carried through. My project is in the position of needing to carry out a strategic plan, but even though I understand the background information, I still couldn't sit down and develop one.

**R4. Watershed Inventory**
- This took an extreme amount of time to read all the assignment material, gather all data, write reports and do the driving / mapping. I may just be slow - but I tried to be very accurate.
- This is a HUGE topic. Sorting out what we have and don't have is important, but some of our projects are at the stage where staff does not have time to work on this and even though it should be a priority for boards and committees, it is not.
- This module was helpful in reassessing the inventory and focusing on areas that we need to obtain additional information.
- Might fix the video transitions somewhat.
- The information for the novice was great but the work load for the assignment was quite lengthy.
- This module seemed to take more time than the other modules have needed. Maybe increase the time to complete the module, especially since there is the potential for quite a bit of field work needing completed to complete the assignment properly.
- This assignment took a long time to complete but it was worth it!
- This module was very difficult for me to complete "on time". It was not just an educational excercise but a working document for our watershed so I (we) spent quite a bit of time perusing sites, etc.

**R5. Understanding Planning & Local Officials**
- It was difficult for me to work through this module because we work closely with the local Plan Commission - it seemed a bit elementary to me. Even the option B was not challenging enough!
- It gave me an excuse to meet the Planning Directors in both counties. This face to face contact was valuable in itself.
- Important information to know - & know where to find it
- I found this assignment enlightening as to how old the working document was and how much has changed since its inception.
- I am a member of the plan commission and also was very involved when we updated our comprehensive plan and zoning ordinance. I understand the need for the module because most are not as familiar.

**R6. GIS**
- The instruction videos regarding using GIS and how to complete the assignment were very helpful. I found having the cd with the videos important.
- This is such a difficult subject to get a grasp on in such a short amount of time. Our watershed group works closely with County GIS and I rarely have a need for real mapping capabilities. I was glad to be able to hear the terminology used, and become exposed to "streaming servers," but I almost think that this should be an elective topic.
- I need more face to face time to understand how to manipulate GIS layers. I think going to a computer lab with others where I could spend some time working on the project would have been much more helpful. I'm sorry I wasn't able to complete this module with better results.
- The videos were VERY important and better than an in person presentation because you could go back when a "what did he just do?" came up - which in an in person setting might not be possible. (It was difficult if you fell behind up at Camp Tecumseh.)
- Making sure all file extensions are compatible with Windows, etc.
- I think the module was a good introduction to GIS, however, I think it should have been availbale sooner. This was an important module to many GIS beginners and some may have required a little more time.
- I need to spend a lot more time practicing this skill but I am a novice in GIS.
- Spend more time on it in the classroom time available. There were a lot of different learning levels. Maybe assessing the level of ability of where the students are would help. Perhaps the assignment could be structured for beginner and advanced.
This was the hardest module for me because of the dial-up connection at home and the limited use of ArcView (with no instruction) at the office. There has to be a way to address this. The Video section on the CD was helpful but even where to go on that was confusing. I spent well over 12 hours on this module - and that is conservative at the least. There needs to be someway to get everyone on the same page and still be able to use what they have available. Even with the speed bumps - I thought it was worth the aggravation.

R7. Implementation and Outreach

- I particularly liked the stages of learning model.
- I really liked the interactive portion of this module - I think that should stay, even if groups have not begun BMP implementation.