

Science Panel Review of Social Indicators of Human Wellbeing
Reviewer: Lee Cerveny

First... wonderful! I love the report. Great use of graphics/diagrams. It reads well. Very accessible. I want to keep this on file as a model for how reports like this should be written. Congratulations – really great work.

Chapter 2.

1. P. 13-14. You spend a couple of paragraphs talking about why your model is different from NCCOS. I found this interesting, but if you wanted to cut down on the length, I would put this in an appendix. My sense is that most people reading this won't mind that it's different and won't be super-curious about why it's different. It's fine to leave in the narrative, but I think it could be in the appendix also.
2. Why did you change the words? You talk about how in the NCCOS, they called it components and in the WSG, it's called 'indicators' ... and various other changes. I found myself wondering why you changed the words. It's not clearly stated the reason/rationale for the change. Was there a conceptual difference? Merely a preference? I found myself wanting to know more. Was the NCCOS terminology flawed in some way????? Tell me a bit more! (Again, this could be in the appendix.)
3. Fig. 3. I like this figure because it really shows the three categories in the model. And, I would like to see some explanation for what is meant by domain, indicator, and measure. These are very straightforward words, but they are used differently in various contexts. You said yourself above, that the word 'indicators' had different meaning in your study v. the NCCOS study. I would like to see here on page 13 3 simple definitions/descriptions (one sentence will do) about what is a domain, what is an indicator, and what is a measure. This could accompany the diagram fig. 3.
4. P. 17-34. I loved all of the domains and the diagrams that accompanied them. I really like the diagram on the cover of the report, which is also fig. 1. I would have liked to have seen that diagram again on p. 17 and a short (one sentence) description of all of the domains to get a big-picture overview. That would have prevented me from wanting to jump ahead, thinking, "Hey, what about... Economic security. Oh, it's already there. Phew."
5. How come the yellow hexagon says "Planning and Management" on the cover and in Fig 1, but is called "Governance" on page 27?
6. Do you have a new hexagon for population dynamics? I wasn't sure why it wasn't included in the figure/model. I realize that demographics is kind of an aggregation of many things, but I think it could be more straightforward just to give the domain its own symbol. Probably it's too late to do this, but it would be my preference, for simplicity.
7. Are there some domains that are missing that were not included (for good reasons, like lack of measurable data....) I wonder if it would be helpful somewhere (in the intro?) to list or depict the universe of all possible 'human

dimensions' domains and then highlight (color) the ones that you used, due to the availability of data, the relevance/importance, and appropriateness of scale. (At least I'm assuming that's why these were picked.) Others not included might be: spiritual, cultural identity, etc.... At least, it might be helpful to mention a couple of examples or show a diagram with all possible HD domains listed, so that the reader knows that these were considered, but not used because they didn't match criteria. Just a thought.

8. Other random/odd things I wrote down:
 - a. p. 30 algae blooms impairing shellfish harvest? Where would that go?
 - b. P. 28 Tsunami? Is that under flood? Storm?
 - c. P. 26. What about fraternal organizations (VFW) and secret societies (i.e. Masons) Can those be considered non-sectarian social gathering places?
9. Finally, at the end of chapter 2 (p. 34) I found myself wanting to see a summary list of all of the domains, indicators, and measures in a giant table. That's just me, maybe. I like to see the big-picture.

Chapter 3.

1. I love the maps. Some graphs are accompanied by these nice maps and some are not. Is there any reason why the maps dropped off? Also, while I like the maps, there is a lot of space devoted to the state of WA, which is all one color. I found myself wanting to blow up the Pacific coastal counties to see them better and wanting to see less of the state of WA. I don't know how you could do that graphically and it's most likely too late, but just wanted to share that minor observation.
2. Sometimes the percentages go above 100% and I'm not always sure why. Examples: Nutrition Assistance, Educational Enrollment.
3. Page 76-77. I found these graphs hard to read and compare. The bars are small and narrow and there is too much information. I think this information is better conveyed in a table, where one can compare over time and across categories. I found myself using my finger and trying to draw a line in the air to compare ... or moving the papers around to hold them side-by-side. Another problem was that the scales on the axis were not identical. For 2000, the axis high point is 25%, compared to 30% for the other years. To truly compare them (visually) the axis label on the high point would need to be the same.
4. Page 81. This age distribution graph also was hard to read. My suggestion would be to use a stacked bar chart that totaled 100% and then compare across the 4 counties and the state of WA.
5. Finally, I was looking for a summary of what was learned collectively by studying the indicators within the various domains. While this may not be the goal of this report, I felt like there was a story there that could be told using these data. In some measures, the coastal counties are doing well. In other ways, not so much. Some counties (Jefferson) are doing better, generally

speaking, than others (Pacific). And, some things seem to be getting better over time, while other measure are declining. I thought it might be nice at the end of the chapter to have some bullet points that highlight critical trends. Again, this might not be the goal of the report, but I found myself trying to put the story together from all these data. What did you learn?

Chapter 4 and 5 looked fine – again well written, clear, approachable. Great job!