

Governor Martin O'Malley's

# Maryland Partnership for Children in Nature

**John R. Griffin, Chair**

**Secretary, Maryland Department of Natural Resources**

**Nancy S. Grasmick, Chair**

**State Superintendent of Schools,**

**Maryland State Department of Education**

---

February 26, 2009

North Point State Park

10 a.m. - 1 p.m.

- I. Welcome (Sec. Griffin & Dr. Grasmick)
- II. Summary Report (Griffin)
  - a. The report was changed to reflect the executive Order and to more closely match what the Governor outlined and to capture substance of the workgroups.
  - b. Once the report is completed, it can serve multiple purposes:
    - i. i.e. parts that support the Sarbanes bill can be pulled out
  - c. Grasmick: gratitude to everyone that did work – impacting the lives of 1 million children. Education is dynamic. Report is an important beginning point. As we implement it we will see what changes need to be made. A living document that will articulate the emerging needs of environmental education. This process is reflective a learning community.
- III. Feedback from the Partnership
  - a. Partnership was given time to review the document
  - b. The workgroups agreed that the plans should be submitted as appendixes
  - c. Don Baugh – comment about process
    - i. Going to be tough for folks to process in 30 minutes
    - ii. Don't want to rush the product and lose important pieces of the workgroups.
  - d. Tracy Bowen – when are we trying to have this ready?
    - i. Asap (Griffin/Grasmick)
    - ii. Volunteered to do a good scrutiny of the plan and see if the workgroups are reflected in here.
  - e. Mark Herzog also volunteered to review the draft. A lot has been lost in terms of what the EL group recommended
  - f. Grasmick – important to capture the workgroup work. Needs to have integrity and fidelity in what the workgroups did.
  - g. Grasmick – more of an editorial exercise.
  - h. Jackie Carrera – worked in the two silos with great details. Trick was to merge the two together and went straight to the Exec. Summary. Now we

have the merged recommendations as well as the silos and neither one is done very well. Is it a plan, recommendation, or strategy? Are the 8 recommendations actual recommendations or are they the priorities?

- i. Heather White – it is important that we keep this as a national model. The other version of the plan said up front and center that this is an integrated effort and that was important.
- j. Grasmick – once we finish this discussion, is this plan the integration of two visions? Are we comfortable that within 2 weeks we could have a revision?
- k. Griffin – no one was trying to water down the recommendations. The integration needs to be worked on.
- l. Tracey Bowen – the problem is not how to integrate it, it's how to communicate it. Look at the 3 overarching themes and discuss that right now for us to work with when we go back. The 3 themes encompass what the two workgroups have done. Make sure the intent and content is there.
- m. Don Baugh – A crisp report to use as a model nationally.
- n. Becky Bell – overlap is at PD, endorsements, on the school grounds.
- o. Jackie Carrera – through graphics or call-outs emphasize the important parts
- p. Cathie Shanks – under strategy, the recommendations are referenced
- q. Griffin – take the first 3 pages and use that as the “marketing” piece.
- r. Gary Heath – the plan has a long way to go before he can take it to the Nevada Dept. of Ed. Not enough in there to guide the discussion. If we have to depend on it being in the appendixes, it may not pass. Other states are talking more comprehensive/concrete approaches.
- s. Grasmick – the important information is embedded in the appendixes, but not reflected on the summary. Gary Heath agreed.
- t. Becky Bell – Gov's education priorities are STEM, technology, sustainability, and global warming. Environmental Science Standards is different from the Environmental Literacy standards. We have the pieces in the social studies and science standards. EL standards have additional partners and details that need to be reflected.
- u. Gabriel Albernoz – would be valuable to have more background info about the process, that would help this serve as a national model.
- v. Griffin -- need to find a balance where the Exec Summary is short enough that people will read but also reflects the workgroup main points.
- w. Sarah Bodor – the bold statements (recommendations) are what made Maryland a national model. But now they are not organized around those bold statements.
- x. Gary Heath – is the chart put in the EL report?
- y. Sarah Bodor– the recommendations from EL, don't fit neatly into a, b, c, d....so the EL workgroup couldn't write the plan accordingly.
- z. Darlene Pisani. – the first 4 pages should be the summary that reflects the spirit of the document. The rest should be a strategic plan that gets your point across but is still palatable
- aa. Heather has a fact sheet about potential funding through stimulus package.

bb. March 15 deadline.

- IV. The Partnership welcomed First Lady, Katie O'Malley.
- V. Jackie Carrera and Mark Herzog gave an overview presentation to the First Lady.
- VI. Dr. Grasmick and Sec. Griffin thanked the co-chairs for their hard work on putting this plan together.