

<b>Rubric- Implementation Plan</b>		<b>Alabama</b>
<b>Score</b>	<b>Definition</b>	<b>2</b>
0	The plan does not address any of the key questions	p. 3- Implementation Plan, p. 10- Funding plan, addresses possible funding sources and some model programs, but does not address new or existing laws or bylaws
1	X	
2	The plan answers SOME of the key questions	
3	X	
4	The plan answers ALL key questions about implementation. "Will new or existing state laws, by-laws, or other specific requirements for environmental education be part of the implementation process? Will model programs be identified and replication supported? How will existing federal education funds such as Title II or Title V, Perkins grants, IDEA or STEM funding be integrated into an implementation plan? Is new dedicated funding required?" (NAAEE, 2008, p.8).	

<b>Alaska</b>	<b>Arizona</b>	<b>Arkansas</b>	<b>California</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>
<p>pgs. 40-41 address all key questions regarding funding and laws, (model programs are listed in separate objectives). Specific details are listed in Implementation Timeline on pgs 42-57 including a timeline for each objective listed in ELP</p>	<p>No ELP</p>	<p>ELP in writing phase</p>	<p>Strategy 5 &amp;6 describe implementation and funding plan, implementation plan does not mention model schools. Funding plan does not address any of the funding opportunities listed in criteria, but does address funding sources within CA.</p>

<b>Colorado</b>	<b>Connecticut</b>	<b>DC</b>	<b>Delaware</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>
Discusses existing law, and identifies model program (appendix C), but does not address any funding specifics	Sections on Implementation and Funding are broken down by three different groups, educators, community partners and government on pages 12, 15, 16-17. Between the sections, all questions regarding new policy development, model programs, and funding are addressed.	Objective 6 addresses model programs and legislation (NCLI, RTTT, A Vision for Sustainability, etc.), but does not mention funding sources.	ELP in writing phase

<b>Florida</b>	<b>Georgia</b>	<b>Hawaii</b>	<b>Idaho</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>
<p>Section 3 notes Green schools program, and section 6: implementation plan notes steps in the implementation process but does not mention specific funding or laws/by-laws</p>	<p>ELP in writing phase</p>	<p>pgs. 55-60 provide very detailed funding plan including expected costs of EE programming and hiring an EL coordinator. Addresses some of the areas where funding can be acquired. Mentions working with legislators to pass laws to support EE. Model programs addressed in separate sections. HELP also provides a detailed implementation plan pgs. 61-68</p>	<p>Implementation section on pg. 9 does not specifically address any questions regarding laws/by-laws, funding sources or identifying/replicating model programs</p>

<b>Illinois</b>	<b>Indiana</b>	<b>Iowa</b>	<b>Kansas</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>
<p>Grants and Long-term funding section addresses some possible funding sources but not in detail. Environmental learning sites and centers section address some model program identification and support. There is no specific implementation section, it appears that implementation plans are listed throughout other sections but with no detail on steps toward implementation rather just partners and goal completion dates. Existing state laws are addressed in the introduction but no plans for new laws/by-laws are part of implementation of plan.</p>	<p>Plan does not address any of the key questions</p>	<p>Implementation section addresses funding sources in-state and matched to federal NCLI funds, but does not address the other funding sources listed. Does not address model programs, and does not address new/existing state laws/by-laws</p>	<p>Does not have implementation section, but does address some funding and model program replication throughout different objectives. No information further political action other than EO that is already in place</p>

<b>Kentucky</b>	<b>Louisiana</b>	<b>Maine</b>	<b>Maryland</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>
<p>each "goal" of the plan has recommendations for implementation, there is a separate "goal" addressing funding and implementation, and Kentucky has a separate document detailing implementation of their plan in detail.</p> <p><a href="http://education.ky.gov/curriculum/conpro/science/Documents/KELP%20Implementation%20Plan_2012.pdf">http://education.ky.gov/curriculum/conpro/science/Documents/KELP%20Implementation%20Plan_2012.pdf</a></p>	<p>Does not address any of the key questions</p>	<p>Key Area 5: Addresses short and long term goals in terms of implementation and funding, but does not address the specific key questions such as state laws, model programs, and existing federal funds.</p>	<p>No implementation plan, no ELP</p>

<b>Massachusetts</b>	<b>Michigan</b>	<b>Minnesota</b>	<b>Mississippi</b>
<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
ELP in writing phase	Implementation plan does not explicitly answer any questions about continued funding sources, laws/by-laws, or model program replication	ELP in writing phase	ELP in writing phase

<b>Missouri</b>	<b>Montana</b>	<b>Nebraska</b>	<b>Nevada</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>
<p>Goal 4: provides a very detailed plan for creating agencies/structures to support EL if funding is received. Also details other possible funding sources, including possible use of fines collected from violating state environmental laws. Model programs are supported in separate section on Green Ribbon Schools. However, the plan does not address laws or by-laws, or any political action, related to advancing the ELP or EE on the state level</p>	<p>Not yet begun writing</p>	<p>Does not address implementation, only some potential funding sources</p>	<p>P. 17-19 discuss the adoption and implementation plan. Requires the hiring of an EL coordinator, and outlines specific funding sources. Section does not address specific laws or by-laws in place or the need to pursue new policy action. Also does not address model program replication</p>

<b>New Hampshire</b>	<b>New Jersey</b>	<b>New Mexico</b>	<b>New York</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>
<p>pg. 21- Implementation and Funding sections offer very little detailed information. Some vague references to funding sources, but nothing addressing federal funds. Also does not address new or existing state laws/by-laws or replication of model programs</p>	<p>A Call to Action discusses some strategic planning in terms of funding and laws that would support the NJ ELP when finalized but does not address all key questions</p>	<p>While mostly a plan to plan, the implementation section does address all key questions in regards to legislative action and funding sources. Model programs are identified in a separate section in detail, and are also part of the "facilities" section of the ELP</p>	<p>Does not address implementation plan or funding plan. "In addition the committee is continuing to work with NYS elected officials to determine the best pathway for adoption (Legislative effort, Executive Order, or other mechanism)." p.21</p>

<b>North Carolina</b>	<b>North Dakota</b>	<b>Ohio</b>	<b>Oklahoma</b>
<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>
<p>Does not address any of the specific questions outlined. States that funding sources will be identified as appropriate.</p>	<p>Not yet begun writing</p>	<p>Implementation plan section does not have much detail, but aspects of implementation are spread throughout document. NCLIA act funding is mentioned, Appendix C lists potential funding sources. Does not appear to mention new or existing state laws to support ELP</p>	<p>Document mentions the importance of identifying funding to continue the master plan, but does not explicitly answer any of the key questions according to NAAEE guidelines</p>

<b>Oregon</b>	<b>Pennsylvania</b>	<b>Rhode Island</b>	<b>South Carolina</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>
Ch.6: ELP Implementation, timeline broken into annual quarters in 2011 and then years to 2014 for step by step implementation planning	pg. 10- Funding and Implementation- explicitly addresses all key questions	Implementation plan discusses goals to move forward with RIDE (Dept of ED in approval of ELP), also with legislation for RI Children in Nature. Does not discuss any funding sources or model programs	ELP in writing phase

<b>South Dakota</b>	<b>Tennessee</b>	<b>Texas</b>	<b>Utah</b>
<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
No details provided for any of the key questions on implementation of the plan	Does not address new/existing state laws by-laws as part of implementation process, does not address existing federal education funds (does address state/other grant funding)	Goal IV, Objective 1: does not address any specific key questions	ELP in writing phase

<b>Vermont</b>	<b>Virginia</b>	<b>Washington</b>	<b>West Virginia</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>
<p>Roadmap focuses on model programs throughout the state. Small section at the end gives suggestions for continued support but no details are provided.</p>	<p>ELP in writing stage</p>	<p>Implementation and funding section of ELP addresses funding questions very thoroughly, however does not address new/existing state laws/legislation. It also does not address identifying model EE programs.</p>	<p>ELP in writing phase</p>

<b>Wisconsin</b>	<b>Wyoming</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>
WI ELP provides detailed funding plan, however does not mention legislative action in terms if new or existing state laws/by-laws or model program replication	Writing stage of ELP

<b>Rubic: Process Transparency</b>		<b>Alabama</b>	<b>Alaska</b>
<b>Score</b>	<b>Definition</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>
0	No Review of ELP	<p>"Task Force members attended state, regional, and national conferences; listened to and read statements from interested individuals and groups from throughout the state; used each member's academic and experiential knowledge; and discussed issues among themselves and with colleagues." p. preface</p>	<p>SEEO website provides link to public comment on draft of ELP. Because SELP is in draft phase, state has only had one opportunity for public comment. (update if final draft allows for comments)</p>
1	At least one stage of review by invited guests		
2	All stages of review by invited guests		
3	At least one stage of review is open to public comment		
4	All stages of review open to public comments (NCLI 2015 Bill, states that ELP should include 'input from the public')		

<b>Arizona</b>	<b>Arkansas</b>	<b>California</b>	<b>Colorado</b>
<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>
No ELP	ELP in writing phase	p. 9 "The task force also held two listening sessions to solicit input from a wider range of stakeholders" - at the STEM Symposium and Green California Schools Summit	"input from over 600 coloradans"- cover page of plan, "facilitation of task force meetings, small group meetings, focus groups and leadership meetings, and with the help of a multistakeholder survey, the ELP was developed, starting in September 2010" p. 5

<b>Connecticut</b>	<b>DC</b>	<b>Delaware</b>	<b>Florida</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>
<p>"A series of informational and input sessions took place in the spring of 2010 at various venues (e.g., state educator conferences and workshops, open forums, etc.)"..."A time for public comment on the CT ELP was available in the fall of 2010 prior to its completion." (p. 7)</p>	<p>No documented evidence of review</p>	<p>ELP in writing phase</p>	<p>NAAEE ELP update website, updated 5/2014 states " Initially a wiki was used as a place for any Floridian to make comments on suggested plan inclusions. The wiki was replaced by this website", public comment on both draft and final</p>

<b>Georgia</b>	<b>Hawaii</b>	<b>Idaho</b>	<b>Illinois</b>
<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>
ELP in writing phase	"Special thanks to the 100+ people who attended the planning and community meetings and/or reviewed and commented on this document." (p. ii)-- appears to only have one revision cycle	pg. 13-16 lists the stakeholders invited to a public forum meeting for feedback and review	"The state agencies also posted drafts of the plan for public comment online and at two comment sessions on April 13 and October 21, 2010, and received over 200 comments on its goals, objectives and strategies."

<b>Indiana</b>	<b>Iowa</b>	<b>Kansas</b>	<b>Kentucky</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>
<p>ELP notes contributors and asks for additional contributors to continue working on the plan</p>	<p>"Follow-up sessions were also held in July, 2010 to receive feedback from stakeholders in central Iowa (Linn County), northeast Iowa (Fayette County) and northwest Iowa (Dickinson County)."- ELP listed as work in progress, but notes more than one stakeholder review session on different drafts of plan</p>	<p>Pg. 8 provides a list of people (and respective organizational ties) who reviewed the ELPK</p>	<p>"Using regional focus groups, educator and administrator surveys, presentations at state educator conferences and individual conversations, the working group compiled information to draft Kentucky's Environmental Literacy Plan. A final draft of the plan was presented to the task force for remaining revisions and approval. Following a period for public comment, the plan was presented to the Kentucky Board of Education for adoption and approved for implementation" (p.13)</p>

<b>Louisiana</b>	<b>Maine</b>	<b>Maryland</b>	<b>Massachusetts</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<p>ELP documents use of stakeholder input in development and draft review (on acknowledgements page, and pg. 4), NAAEE ELP website notes that draft is open for public comment.</p>	<p>"In 2013, Maine Audubon convened a stakeholder group of educators to review research findings in environmental/place-based/sustainability/STEM education. The result was to summarize the key insights for effective teaching and learning and to establish research-based principles and practices for effective environmental literacy experiences" MEEA website</p>	<p>No state ELP</p>	<p>ELP in writing phase</p>

<b>Michigan</b>	<b>Minnesota</b>	<b>Mississippi</b>	<b>Missouri</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>
<p>"Surveys and other recognized best practices for conducting public input will be used to collect feedback on the Plan" (p. 19)</p>	<p>ELP in writing phase</p>	<p>ELP in writing phase</p>	<p>MEEA website and draft plan indicate first and second review of ELP open to public comment (and lists what suggestions were made in 1st review)</p>

<b>Montana</b>	<b>Nebraska</b>	<b>Nevada</b>	<b>New Hampshire</b>
<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>
Not yet begun writing	"refined by soliciting feedback from stakeholder groups"	"Feedback has been solicited through summits, meetings, on-line review, and state-wide conferences." (p. 4)	pg. 10-11 detail the work of NHEEA to get stakeholder, teacher and public comment on draft and final versions of ELP

<b>New Jersey</b>	<b>New Mexico</b>	<b>New York</b>	<b>North Carolina</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>
<p>Website of SEEO reflects at least one round of public comment on draft of ELP as part of the Call to Action</p>	<p>Plan notes "Over two hundred contributors provided input and revisions to the document since 2011.", SEEO website also asks for continued input to drafts</p>	<p>"The committee is finalizing the draft and will circulate for public comment via the NYSOEA website." p. 21</p>	<p>Final draft open to public comment; prior drafts reviewed by 'working group' and key stakeholders</p>

<b>North Dakota</b>	<b>Ohio</b>	<b>Oklahoma</b>	<b>Oregon</b>
<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>
Not yet begun writing	"Thanks go out to the over 200 Ohioans who read drafts of this Plan and contributed comments and suggestions." pg. 40	Document mentions several focus groups and a variety of people that were involved in review process. Unclear as whether draft and final document were reviewed by public comment.	" the general public convening working groups and providing feedback were essential to the success of this report"-OELTF

<b>Pennsylvania</b>	<b>Rhode Island</b>	<b>South Carolina</b>	<b>South Dakota</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>
<p>"For this initiative, vital partners were invited to participate in the development of the state's Environmental Literacy Plan (ELP)" (pg. 1)</p>	<p>"The steering committee later provided detailed feedback on the first draft of the ELP" (pg. 5)</p>	<p>ELP in writing phase</p>	<p>EECSD website "A series of listening sessions were held around the state to gather input from various sectors in the autumn/winter of 2011/2012."..."The plan was drafted and released for comment and then again revised"</p>

<b>Tennessee</b>	<b>Texas</b>	<b>Utah</b>	<b>Vermont</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>
Final Draft open to public review on website for time frame	no information on review available	ELP in writing phase	"From January through April 2010, public dialogues were held in each of Vermont's 14 counties." Also invites comments on final draft of Roadmap

<b>Virginia</b>	<b>Washington</b>	<b>West Virginia</b>	<b>Wisconsin</b>
<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>
ELP in writing stage	<p>"The committee wrote and reviewed sections of the Plan and vetted the draft Plan with stakeholder groups. Broad statewide input was gathered through focus groups and an online survey, ensuring that the Plan represents the range of expertise and perspectives unique to Washington State." (pg. 5)</p>	ELP in writing stage	p. 7 details more than one review by "working groups" and "stakeholders", does not mention opportunity for public comment

**Wyoming**

**0**

ELP in writing stage

<b>Rubric- Assessment Plan</b>		<b>Alabama</b>	<b>Alaska</b>
<b>Score</b>	<b>Definition</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>
0	No assessment plan is described	<p>p. 9-10 outline specific ways in which alabama intends to "conduct assessments for all program activities, including teacher and student participation", including monitoring access of EE podcasts, ALEX system, and EE related student science fair projects</p>	<p>Alaska ELP, in curriculum/content standards section describes the plan to identify areas of state academic standard areas currently assessed that related to EL concepts and track them (p. 27). Does not give specific detail on reporting measurements or annual report card. Other sections detail using counts of students in nonformal EL programs.</p>
1	X		
2	Describes only some of the methods; or does not outline reporting of measurements		
3	X		
4	Describes the methods that the state education agency will use annually to measure environmental literacy: traditional assessments, counts of student participation or performance, and other mechanisms. Should be reported annually, possibly on a state education agency's federally mandated report card (NAAEE, 2008).		

<b>Arizona</b>	<b>Arkansas</b>	<b>California</b>	<b>Colorado</b>
<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>
No ELP	ELP in writing phase	"Establish environmental literacy learning outcomes for the state of california that are linked to the EP&Cs", "Integrate assessment of student learning in environmental literacy with emerging state assessments" (p. 26)	P. 23 notes reporting of "assessment data" from environmental education programs, but there is no mention of reporting data/assessment by Pk-12 teachers/schools districts/formal programs

Connecticut	DC	Delaware	Florida
2	4	0	4
<p>Describes areas where research needs to be done to plan assessment methods but not in significant enough detail to be implemented without further planning.</p>	<p>Objective 4: sets timeline for designating science standards that contain EL concepts, item development for DC CAS tests, evaluate CCSS for possible EL concept correlation, monitor NGSS adoption, and promote EL in non-test driven opportunities all in progress.</p>	<p>ELP in writing phase</p>	<p>Assessment section is mostly a plan to plan, "5.1. Within 6 months, work with the new DOE STEM office to select proxy instruments for measuring EL from existing assessment methods (e.g., Biology end of course exam and 8th grade FCAT Science assessment).", implementation update notes that DOE is looking into tracking Environmental STEM enrollment starting in middle school. Also, notes that <b>section 5.4. seeks to identify existing EL assessment tools such as NELA</b></p>

<b>Georgia</b>	<b>Hawaii</b>	<b>Idaho</b>	<b>Illinois</b>
<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>
ELP in writing phase	pg. 45-50: Assessment section details developing a formal tool to measure EL consistent with HIDOE K-12 assessment schedule and reporting on a 2-3 year schedule as appropriate, also discusses assessment from informal EL programs through Hawaii Green Schools program. Also, mentions the development of a tool to assess the HELP	p. 9 outlines some areas where IDEEA would begin to look for assessment of students and of plan. No specific details are provided.	"State assessment that includes environmental education: Although there is not a specific assessment for environmental education, there are many questions in the State's standardized tests that are related to environmental education", Pg. 15 also discusses evaluation of ELP but without any specific details

<b>Indiana</b>	<b>Iowa</b>	<b>Kansas</b>	<b>Kentucky</b>
<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>
No assessment plan is described	pg. 6 includes several areas of possible assessment of environmental literacy, but does not include plan for reporting of measurements	pg. 32-33 outline working with KSBE to identify areas to measure EL in current assessments. Does state that measurements would be on state report card every year. Also mentions participations counts in informal EL programs. <a href="#">Separate webpage includes the "Environmental Literacy Assessment for Kansas Middle/High School Students" (found at <a href="http://www.kacee.org/ks-environmental-literacy-assessment">http://www.kacee.org/ks-environmental-literacy-assessment</a>)</a>	P. 24-25 outlines goals for identifying areas of environmental literacy in current assessments. Also notes that "Existing environmental literacy assessments can be reviewed for possible modification and use" (p.25). KELP states that KDE has a negotiated assessment contract and that customised assessments may be able to be negotiated when KY adopts new science standards.

<b>Louisiana</b>	<b>Maine</b>	<b>Maryland</b>	<b>Massachusetts</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<p>"The LDOE will continue to assess environmental concepts as part of the grades three through eight statewide assessments and as part of the Biology I EOC assessment at the high school level" (p. 12). Gives no additional detail on assessing explicit EL concepts, or reporting.</p>	<p>Key Area 3: Outlines short term and long term assessment strategies including tracking LA, Math and science performance for students with EE and without EE programming, also outlines the plan for DOE to work with MEEA to "create a common measurement tool for assessing changes in teacher understanding of pedagogical practices in EL education" p.8. Does NOT outline plan for specific measurement of EL measures or reporting EL measures</p>	<p>No ELP</p>	<p>ELP in writing phase</p>

<b>Michigan</b>	<b>Minnesota</b>	<b>Mississippi</b>	<b>Missouri</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>
<p>"Action 5.4.1. Examine existing frameworks for assessing environmental literacy (including the framework developed by the North American Alliance for Environmental Education) then develop draft assessments that reflect the goals of this Plan.</p> <p>Action 5.4.2. Identify best assessment practices from other states and determine if they could be used in Michigan."</p>	ELP in writing phase	ELP in writing phase	<p>Stretegy 4; Objective 1 and 2, discuss use of current assessments and creation of a "no stakes" web based assessment, but does not give specific detail or reporting of measurements</p>

<b>Montana</b>	<b>Nebraska</b>	<b>Nevada</b>	<b>New Hampshire</b>
<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>
Not yet begun writing	Address some of the assessment plan but with no specific detail regarding mechanism for assessment or reporting	Describes all aspects of assessment plan, broken into formal and informal education, as well as Knowledge and Skills, Actions and Behavior. Includes areas where counts of participation can be examined, traditional assessment areas reported and the use of student portfolios for measuring skills, actions and behavior areas.	pg. 21 discusses exploring NECAPs for areas that can be linked to EL for assessment purposes. No details on reporting basis or on determining counts of participation in informal EL programs.

<b>New Jersey</b>	<b>New Mexico</b>	<b>New York</b>	<b>North Carolina</b>
<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>
<p>The Call to Action notes as a goal to develop "Methods for measuring and reporting on student progress regarding environmental literacy performance and achievement in grades pre-K-12;" (pg. 21) but no further detail is provided</p>	<p>pg. 18- lays out "Assessment" plan but does not provide any detail in terms of specific assessment methods or reporting measurements.</p>	<p>p. 14- "Objective 2: Create or revise assessment tools to measure the effectiveness of environmental literacy  Strategy 1: Identify existing metrics for environmental literacy in PreK-12 education and teacher preparation  Strategy 2: Create and use effective metrics for assessing environmental literacy in research efforts"</p>	<p>outlines strategies for measurement of env literacy in three categories: env attitudes and behavior, env knowledge and skills, and access to quality outdoor learning; EOCs and other testing is reported annually</p>

North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon
0	4	0	4
Not yet begun writing	Goal V (pg. 15) discusses some methods for assessing or measuring environmental literacy, including traditional assessments using curriculum crosswalk areas, journals/projects, and participation counts-- appendix details agencies and specific resources to contribute to assessing EL	No mention of a k-12 formal or informal EL assessment plan or counts of participation	Ch.5: Assessment of environmental literacy addresses all the areas; "NELA..This reliable and valid instrument could be adapted for use in Oregon" (p.31)

Pennsylvania	Rhode Island	South Carolina	South Dakota
2	2	0	2
<p>"students will be tested through the mandated Science &amp; Technology &amp; Engineering standard as well as the Environment and Ecology PA System of School Assessment (PSSA) test and the Biology Keystone exam. ", but is not tied directly to environmental literacy key areas but to Environment and Ecology standards</p>	<p>Concerned with assessment changes based on planned adoption of CCSS, and possible adoption of NGSS. Describes some of the goals for assessment of environmental literacy, including "Investigate the possibility of implementing a separate environmental literacy assessment similar to the national recently-piloted middle school assessment funded by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and the National Science Foundation (McBeth, Hungerford, Marcinkowski, Volk, &amp; Meyers, 2008)." but does not mention specifics in reporting or participation counts in other EE or EL programming</p>	<p>ELP in writing phase</p>	<p>pg. 15 gives some examples of areas where assessment work can be done, including traditional and counts of student participation/portfolios. Includes plan to survey student knowledge and attitude, as well as examine positive action. Without crosswalk, assessment plan is limited. No mention of reporting of measurements.</p>

<b>Tennessee</b>	<b>Texas</b>	<b>Utah</b>	<b>Vermont</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<p>outlines strategies for measurement of env literacy; EOCs and other testing is reported annually by LEAs</p>	<p>Goal V (p.12) "develop systems fr the evaluation of the overall Texas Natural Resource/Environmental Education plan; including assessment of effective strategies and programs for ongoing improvement"</p>	<p>ELP in writing phase</p>	<p>No assessment plan is described</p>

Virginia	Washington	West Virginia	Wisconsin
0	2	0	4
ELP in writing stage	Describes using science state standard areas that are aligned with ESE standards for reporting, and teacher formative assessments. No mention of reporting time frames or count of informal EE participation. "It may be advantageous to work with other states to develop validated and common (national) comprehensive assessment resources that states could use to determine students' environmental and sustainability literacy and inform instructional practices." (p. 24-- does not mention any previously created EL assessments)	Writing stage of ELP	pg. 22-23 discuss assessment plan for traditional assessments, participation counts, etc. Also outline reporting measurements as described by Wisconsin Act 299. WI ELP mentions the possible use of the "National Environmental Literacy Assessment, 29 completed in 2008,"

**Wyoming**

**0**

Writing stage of ELP

<b>Rubic: Political Status</b>		<b>Alabama</b>	<b>Alaska</b>
<b>Score</b>	<b>Definition</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>
0	No political progress	No documented political action in plan or SEEO website	Appendix E- Alaska State Statute "Sec. 14.30.380. Environmental education." (passed in 1991, not specific to ELP but may be used as leverage for development and implementation)
1	In talks with legislature		
2	Political progress documented		
3	By-Laws in place specific to ELP		
4	Statutory Requirements (including Executive Orders, Laws, and State Statutes) in place specific to ELP		

<b>Arizona</b>	<b>Arkansas</b>	<b>California</b>	<b>Colorado</b>
<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>
No ELP	ELP in writing phase	Strategy 4- highlights state laws and policies where changes will be focused (p.30), no documented action	"The Colorado Kids Outdoors Grant Program Act (HB10-1131), authorized the creation of the ELP" p. 6

<b>Connecticut</b>	<b>DC</b>	<b>Delaware</b>	<b>Florida</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<p>"On June 2, 2012 Governor Dannel Malloy signed a proclamation in support of Connecticut's Environmental Literacy Plan advancing the steps to promoting environmental literacy for a healthier and sustainable Connecticut" (CT Dept of Energy and Env website)</p>	<p>"unanimous passage of the Healthy Schools Act of 2010"... "calls for an environmental literacy plan for the District" and Chesapeake Bay Executive Order 13508 (issued on May 12, 2009) Citizen Stewardship mandate</p>	<p>ELP in writing phase</p>	<p>No documented political support</p>

<b>Georgia</b>	<b>Hawaii</b>	<b>Idaho</b>	<b>Illinois</b>
<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>
ELP in writing phase	HELP mentions several times working to build support for legislation that would assist in funding and implementing the plan, no progress is documented in plan or website	IDEEA does not appear to have any documented talks/progress in terms of promoting, supporting or implementing their ELP.	"Governor Pat Quinn signed Executive Order 10-7 on April 14, 2010, supporting the adoption of the Environmental Literacy for Illinois strategic plan"

<b>Indiana</b>	<b>Iowa</b>	<b>Kansas</b>	<b>Kentucky</b>
<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>
No mention or documentation of political progress	No documented political progress	"Executive Order issued by Governor Kathleen Sebelius which establishes the Kansas Coalition for Children in Nature"... "calls for the creation of an Environmental Literacy Plan for Kansas"	"In KRS 157.915, KEEC is charged with several goals, including developing an environmental education master plan, titled Land, Legacy and Learning (1999, 2004, 2009). Kentucky is one of the few states in the nation that maintains a comprehensive state environmental education plan."- does not explicit support an environmental literacy plan but does show higher level of political

<b>Louisiana</b>	<b>Maine</b>	<b>Maryland</b>	<b>Massachusetts</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>
<p>"Presentations were made to the Louisiana House of Representatives' Natural Resources and Environment Committee in 2010 and 2011 emphasizing the need for a plan and informing the members about the current status of plan development" (P. 5)</p>	<p>No documented political action in plan or SEEO website</p>	<p>environmental literacy graduation requirement to COMAR 13A.03.02: Graduation Requirements for Public High Schools in Maryland, but no political progress specific to ELP</p>	<p>ELP in writing phase</p>

<b>Michigan</b>	<b>Minnesota</b>	<b>Mississippi</b>	<b>Missouri</b>
<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
No evidence of political action on state level	ELP in writing phase	ELP in writing phase	No documented political progress

<b>Montana</b>	<b>Nebraska</b>	<b>Nevada</b>	<b>New Hampshire</b>
<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Not yet begun writing	Presents idea to obtain funding through state legislature for EE Coordinator position in DOE, no evidence of success	No evidence of political action on state level	NH does not appear to have any documented legislative talks/progress in terms of promoting, supporting or implementing their ELP. NH ELP has support of Commissioner of ED and NH DOE.

<b>New Jersey</b>	<b>New Mexico</b>	<b>New York</b>	<b>North Carolina</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>
<p>New Jersey has the "New Jersey Environmental Education Act (N.J.S.A. 18A:6-91.1 et seq.);" which date back to 1996, but helps establish the need for and legislative support for environmental education in the state</p>	<p>NM ELP notes the importance of pursuing supporting legislation in the state, but there is no evidence of documented political progress with ELP</p>	<p>"Working with state legislators (Kavanagh and Bradley) to introduce NYS Environmental Education legislation"ELC report 2009-2010</p>	<p>Statute creates Office of Environmental Education to support ELP development and implementation</p>

<b>North Dakota</b>	<b>Ohio</b>	<b>Oklahoma</b>	<b>Oregon</b>
<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>
Not yet begun writing	No indication of political progress with ELP	No evidence of political progress with Master Plan or in developing an ELP	House Bill 2544 signed into law to create ELP

<b>Pennsylvania</b>	<b>Rhode Island</b>	<b>South Carolina</b>	<b>South Dakota</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<p>2008- law created PA Center for Environmental Education, 2011- center was defunded and disbanded, no progress documented specific to ELP</p>	<p>"RIIEEA developed a proposed Executive Order to establish a Children in Nature", to collaborate with other EL efforts (and healthy living) in the state. No evidence the legislation passed in 2010 or after Coalition</p>	<p>ELP in writing phase</p>	<p>No evidence of political progress in relation to ELP development, adoption or implementation</p>

<b>Tennessee</b>	<b>Texas</b>	<b>Utah</b>	<b>Vermont</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>
<p>Gubernatorial support of TN 2020 (see plan status for additional notes on TN 2020), ELP strategic plan</p>	<p>Political support for 2010 Texas Children in Nature Strategic Plan which uses TELP for formal/informal education</p>	<p>ELP in writing phase</p>	<p>pg. 24 contains "Action Steps: Policy Makers &amp; Government Organization" but no evidence of political progress of Roadmap</p>

<b>Virginia</b>	<b>Washington</b>	<b>West Virginia</b>	<b>Wisconsin</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>
<p>Writing stage of ELP; however- "Executive Order NUMBER FORTY TWO (2015) ESTABLISHING THE VIRGINIA ENVIRONMENTAL LITERACY CHALLENGE"</p>	<p>"Pursuant to RCW 28A.230.020 instruction about conservation, natural resources, and the environment shall be provided at all grade levels in an interdisciplinary manner through science, the social studies, the humanities, and other appropriate areas with an emphasis on solving the problems of human adaptation to the environment." Washington State Legislature, passed in 1990s- not explicit to ELP but can be used for</p>	<p>ELP in writing stage, no evidence of political progress related to ELP development</p>	<p>2009- "Governor Jim Doyle signs a letter with sixteen other governors supporting the national NCLI Act." pg. 47. No other evidence of political progress with ELP</p>

**Wyoming**

**0**

ELP in writing stage, no evidence of political progress related to ELP development