



Making a difference...together

Efficient Outdoor Water Use Educational Workshops Evaluation Report



Prepared by CRD Environmental Sustainability Department
Environmental Partnerships Division
Demand Management Program

November 2011

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Efficient Outdoor Water Use Educational Workshops were implemented in 1999, with the goal of providing the Capital Regional District (CRD) residential participants knowledge to enable them to make water conserving changes in their outdoor water use activities and encourage use of efficient irrigation technologies. For the irrigation industry professionals, the Irrigation Industry Association of BC (IIABC) courses offer an opportunity for the industry to learn or reinforce techniques that contribute positively to conserving the resource that is their livelihood and assisting their customers to reduce water use.

There are currently eight Efficient Outdoor Water Use Educational Workshops offered, consisting of four residential (Native Plant Gardening, Efficient Micro/drip Irrigation Systems, All Efficient Irrigation Systems and Irrigation Controller Scheduling) and five Professional Irrigation Certification courses (Certified Irrigation Technician Program Level 1 and 2, Certified Irrigation Scheduler, Fundamentals of Design and the Certified Landscape Irrigation Auditor Program).

The evaluation framework for the project utilized a two-phased approach. The first approach examined participants' satisfaction with the workshops using data collected from CRD End of Workshop questionnaires. The second approach using data collected from surveys, focused on the longer-term outcomes of the program, including two main areas of change 1) Learning: knowledge and skills and 2) Behavior: practices.

The evaluation focused on nine central questions:

End of Workshop

1. Are participants' expectations/reason for attending being met?
2. Are the instructors' knowledge, technical ability and/or presentation skills satisfactory?
3. Are the workshop logistics (time, materials, facilities, etc.) satisfactory?
4. How many sessions and participants have there been over the life of the workshops?

Outcomes

1. Are participants (both residential and Certified Irrigation Professionals) demonstrating changes in knowledge and skills in areas covered by the workshops?
2. Are participants demonstrating behavior change in their outdoor water and landscaping practices?
3. Is there evidence that workshop information is being spread to the wider community?
4. What marketing strategies have been most effective in promoting the workshops?
5. Which communities and dwelling types are most representative of residential participants?

EVALUATION FINDINGS

Evaluation findings are discussed in relation to these nine questions. Highlights of the findings follow in the Executive Summary, while a more detailed discussion can be found in the Evaluation Findings Section 3.

End of Workshop

1. *Are participants' expectations/reason for attending being met?*
The evaluation shows that all of the workshops are meeting participant expectations. Ratings of over 90% are consistently found when participants are asked if the workshop met their expectations and or their reason for attending.
2. *Are the instructors' knowledge, technical ability and/or presentation skills satisfactory?*
The workshop instructors' unfailingly receive high ratings for their technical and presentation abilities and subject knowledge.

3. *Are the workshop logistics (time, materials, facilities, etc.) satisfactory?*
Ratings for the program logistics continue to be high year after year with little or modest fall off in year to year ratings. This is readily reflected in repeated attendance for many of the workshops.
4. *How many sessions and participants have there been over the life of each workshop?*
Two hundred and twenty-four sessions have been delivered with 4,326 participants.

Outcomes

1. *Are participants (both residential and Certified Irrigation Professionals) demonstrating changes in knowledge and skills in areas covered by the workshops?*
This evaluation has also shown that long-term learning of new skills and knowledge is occurring. The evidence is in results such as the:
 - Native Plant Gardening workshop where 92% of respondents agreed that the workshop specifically influenced them to retain or plant native vegetation.
 - Certified Professional Irrigation course where 89% of respondents indicated they had learned a new technique or knowledge to help their end users reduce water use.
2. *Are participants demonstrating behavior change in their outdoor water and landscaping practices?*
Results from this evaluation clearly show that not only is new learning taking place but changes in actual practices are also occurring. Some examples of behaviour change:
 - 75% of respondents in the irrigation controller scheduling outcomes survey, when asked if they had changed their scheduling practices answered in the affirmative.
 - Almost (60%) of respondents answered that they had changed their existing system from information they received at the Efficient Irrigation Systems workshop.
 - 86% of respondents in the Certified Professional Irrigation outcomes survey indicated that they had applied a new technique to their work.
3. *Is there evidence that the workshop information is being spread to the wider community?*
There are clear indications that the information is being spread beyond the actual attendance numbers to the community which adds additional benefits to the workshops. The following are the percentages from respondents who indicated that they had shared what they learned in the workshop.
 - 88% of respondents from the Native Plant Gardening survey.
 - 65% of respondents from the Efficient Irrigation Systems survey.
 - 54% of respondents from the Irrigation Controller Scheduling survey.
4. *What marketing strategies have been most effective in promoting the workshops?*
One particular strategy yielded results: newspaper ads designed to advertise the workshops were mentioned by survey respondents (average of 65% across all workshops) as the way they had first learned about the program.
5. *Which communities and dwelling types are most representative of residential participants?*
Overall the CRD Efficient Outdoor Water Use Educational residential workshops are being used most frequently by residents from Saanich. Attendance from Saanich took top spot in all three workshops.

The majority (90%) of respondents from the Native Plant Gardening and the Efficient Irrigation Systems workshops and (82%) of the Irrigation Controller Scheduling workshop lives in a single, detached dwelling. The remainder lives in condominiums, townhouse or duplexes.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The report provides recommendations for the program moving forward in Section 5. In summary, they include:

- Improve the effectiveness of the End of Workshop evaluation questionnaire.
- Improve marketing of the course information.
- Provide follow-up and additional information about various topics on the CRD website.
- Add additional course topics to workshops.
- Expand irrigation systems and irrigation controller workshop sessions to additional locations.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	i
Table of Contents	iv
List of Tables	v
Section 1: Introduction.....	1
1.1 Background	1
1.2 Workshop Profiles	1
1.2.1 Native Plant Gardening	1
1.2.2 All Efficient Irrigation Systems	1
1.2.3 Efficient Micro/drip Irrigation Systems.....	2
1.2.4 Irrigation Controller Scheduling.....	2
1.2.5 Professional Irrigation Certification	2
1.3 Purpose of the Evaluation	3
Section 2: Evaluation Design	4
2.1 End of Workshop Evaluation.....	4
2.2 Outcomes Evaluation	4
2.3 Evaluation Questions	4
2.3.1 End of Workshop Evaluations.....	4
2.3.2 Outcomes.....	4
2.4 Methodology.....	5
2.4.1 End of Workshop Evaluations.....	5
2.4.2 Outcomes Evaluation	5
2.5 Limitations of the Evaluation	5
Section 3: Evaluation Findings	6
3.1 Part A1: End of Workshop Evaluation – Residential.....	6
3.2 Part A2: End of Workshop Evaluation – Professional Irrigation Certification	8
3.3 Part B: Outcomes – All Workshops.....	14
Section 4: Conclusions.....	26
Section 5: Recommendations	27
Appendix A: End of Workshop Questionnaires.....	28
Appendix B: Outcomes Surveys Questionnaire.....	36
Appendix C: Outcomes Surveys Additional Comments.....	52

LIST OF TABLES

Table Number	Description	Page
1	Usefulness in Meeting Attendance Goal (All Efficient Irrigation Systems / Efficient Micro/Drip).....	6
2	Usefulness in Meeting Attendance Goal (Irrigation Controller Scheduling)	6
3	Instructor's Knowledge (Native Plant Gardening)	7
4	Instructor's Technical Ability to Present Material (All Efficient Irrigation Systems / Efficient Micro-Drip).....	7
5	Instructor's Technical Ability to Present Material (Irrigation Controller Scheduling)	7
6	Workshop Organization (Native Plant Gardening)	7
7	Presentation Methods (Native Plant Gardening)	8
8	Appropriate Time Allotted for Workshops (All Efficient Irrigation Systems / Efficient Micro/Drip)	8
9	Instructor' Knowledge of Subject Matter (Certified Irrigation Technician CIT Level 1, 2007-2008)	8
10	Instructor's Ability to Encourage Questions (Certified Irrigation Technician CIT Level 1, 2007-2008)	9
11	Value of Day (Certified Irrigation Technician CIT Level 1, 2007-2008)	9
12	Presentation of Material (Certified Irrigation Technician CIT Level 1, 2007-2008)	9
13	Interest in Additional Programs (Certified Irrigation Technician CIT Level 1, 2007-2008)	9
14	Rating of Instructor's Abilities (Certified Irrigation Technician CIT Level 1, 2009)	10
15	Overall Rating of Workshop (Certified Irrigation Technician CIT Level 1, 2009)	10
16	Instructor Knowledge of the Subject (Certified Irrigation Technician CIT Level 2, 2007).....	10
17	Instructor Encouraged Questions (Certified Irrigation Technician CIT Level 2, 2007)	10
18	Value of Day (Certified Irrigation Technician CIT Level 2, 2007)	10
19	Presentation of Materials (Certified Irrigation Technician CIT Level 2, 2007).....	11
20	Interested in Future Programs (Certified Irrigation Technician CIT Level 2, 2007).....	11
21	Instructor's Abilities (Certified Irrigation Technician CIT Level 2, 2008-2009)	11
22	Overall Rating of Workshop (Certified Irrigation Technician CIT Level 2, 2008-2009)	12
23	Instructor's Knowledge of Subject Matter (Fundamentals of Irrigation Design, 2008)	12
24	Instructor Encouraged Questions (Fundamentals of Irrigation Design, 2008)	12
25	Value of Day (Fundamentals of Irrigation Design, 2008)	12
26	Presentation of Materials (Fundamentals of Irrigation Design, 2008)	13
27	Interested in Future Programs (Fundamentals of Irrigation Design, 2008)	13
28	Instructor Rating (Certified Irrigation Scheduler, 2009)	13
29	Rating of Workshop (Certified Irrigation Scheduler, 2009).....	13
30	Workshop Outputs	14
31	Workshop Specifically Influenced (Native Plant Gardening)	14
32	Workshop Provided Adequate Information (Native Plant Gardening).....	15
33	Identified Invasive Species (Native Plant Gardening)	15
34	Type of Irrigation System Installed (All Efficient Irrigation Systems / Efficient Micro/Drip)	15
35	Person Who Made Modifications (All Efficient Irrigation Systems / Efficient Micro/Drip)	15
36	Who Installed New System (All Efficient Irrigation Systems / Efficient Micro/Drip)	15
37	Who Installed Controller (Irrigation Controller Scheduling)	17
38	Workshop Information Help Change Landscaping Practices (Native Plant Gardening)	17
39	Type of Changes (Native Plant Gardening)	17
40	Amount of Native Plantings on Property (Native Plant Gardening).....	18
41	Removed Invasive Species (Native Plant Gardening)	18
42	Types of Modifications/Changes (All Efficient Irrigation Systems / Efficient Micro/Drip).....	18

43	Workshop Influenced Respondent to Take Actions (All Efficient Irrigation Systems / Efficient Micro/Drip).....	18
44	Changed Scheduling Practices (Irrigation Controller Scheduling)	19
45	Changed Other Watering Practices (Irrigation Controller Scheduling).....	19
46	What Watering Practices Changed (Irrigation Controller Scheduling)	19
47	New Techniques Used Since Workshop (Professional Irrigation Certification).....	19
48	What Information Shared (Native Plant Gardening).....	20
49	What Prompted You To Share (Native Plant Gardening).....	20
50	What Information Shared (All Efficient Irrigation Systems / Efficient Micro/Drip)	20
51	What Prompted You To Share (All Efficient Irrigation Systems / Efficient Micro/Drip).....	20
52	What Information Shared (Irrigation Controller Scheduling)	21
53	What Prompted You To Share (Irrigation Controller Scheduling)	21
54	Source of Information (Native Plant Gardening)	21
55	Source of Information (All Efficient Irrigation Systems / Efficient Micro/Drip).....	21
56	Source of Information (Irrigation Controller Scheduling)	21
57	Participant Municipality (Native Plant Gardening)	22
58	Participant Municipality (All Efficient Irrigation Systems / Efficient Micro/Drip)	22
59	Participant Municipality (Irrigation Controller Scheduling).....	23
60	Course Attended (Professional Irrigation Certification)	23
61	Reason for Attending (Professional Irrigation Certification)	23
62	Type of Technical Information Left Behind (Professional Irrigation Certification)	24
63	Supply CRD Information to End Users (Professional Irrigation Certification)	24
64	Type of Organization Where Currently Work (Professional Irrigation Certification).....	24
65	Number of Full Time Years Working in Irrigation (Professional Irrigation Certification).....	24
66	Age Group (Professional Irrigation Certification).....	25
67	Formal Education (Professional Irrigation Certification).....	25

SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND

Since early 1999, the Capital Regional District (CRD) has offered educational workshops on a variety of efficient outdoor water use conservation topics. These workshops are part of an overarching water conservation strategy whose ultimate goal is to assist the population of the Capital Regional District to improve knowledge and awareness and transform behaviour towards the environment by promoting sustainable water resources management that will meet the present and future water needs of people and the natural environment.

The workshops are based on the following objectives:

- To give residential participants knowledge to enable them to make water conserving changes in their outdoor water use activities and encourage use of efficient irrigation technologies.
- To give irrigation industry courses that offer an opportunity for the industry to learn or reinforce techniques that contribute positively to conserving the resource that is their livelihood and assisting their customers to reduce water use.

The concept for regularly scheduled workshops was based on early one time efforts in the late 1990's and early 2001. In 1999 the Water Services Department (now Integrated Water Services) hosted a workshop for irrigation industry professionals. Over 65 irrigation system designers, installers, operators and vendors attended the one-day session which was co-sponsored by the CRD and Irrigation Industry Association of BC (IIABC).

In 2001 the Water Services Department hosted an irrigation workshop for industry irrigation specialists, municipal representatives and government landscapers presenting the principals of efficient water use auditing of irrigation systems.

The success of these initial workshops and growing requests from residents and the irrigation industry lead to the development and expansion of a full roster of workshops.

1.2 WORKSHOP PROFILES

(All residential workshops are free of charge to participants.)

1.2.1 Native Plant Gardening

This three hour workshop implemented in 2001, is for residents who are interested in learning about drought – resistant native plants in the garden. The workshop defines the principles and reviews the benefits of water wise gardening, identifies native plants and teaches how and where to grow these plants. It also offers techniques for reducing or eliminating lawns, how to create special habitats and attract wildlife, how to recognize invasive species and includes a tour of the Swan Lake native plant garden. (CRD provided funding for these demonstration gardens).

1.2.2 All Efficient Irrigation Systems

This three hour workshop started in 1999, is for residents who presently have or are considering the purchase and installation of an irrigation system. The workshops are jointly sponsored by the CRD and the Irrigation Industry Association of BC. The course instructors (irrigation experts) explain the system components, discuss installation and provide scheduling and maintenance information.

The original workshop's focus was centred primarily on automatic irrigation systems with additional information about micro/drip systems. However, as interest for more information about micro/drip and

participants' requests has grown, a stand-alone micro/drip workshop was developed and is offered as a regularly sponsored workshop.

1.2.3 Efficient Micro/Drip Irrigation Systems

This three-hour workshop, started as a stand-alone in 2006, explains Micro/Drip system components, proper design and installation and provides scheduling and maintenance tips.

1.2.4 Irrigation Controller Scheduling

This workshop explores controller functions, water saving features, determining station run times, best water saving features, and how to water correctly. Irrigation experts demonstrate the benefits of these systems, explain how to schedule controllers, provide tips for self-maintenance and more. This workshop began in 2007.

1.2.5 Professional Irrigation Certification

Certified Irrigation Technician (CIT) Program Level 1 and 2

CIT Level 1: This one-day workshop is for irrigation specialists wishing to gain skills and certification in the installation and maintenance of irrigation systems. This course teaches the fundamentals of installing and maintaining an efficient irrigation system. IIABC Certified Technicians Level I exams are administered after the completion of the course to participants who qualify to write the exam.

CIT Level 2: This two-day course builds on the knowledge gained from the Level 1 course and adds additional training on the principles of hydraulics; backflow prevention fundamentals; irrigation system operational troubleshooting; electrical troubleshooting; controller troubleshooting; basic quoting and scheduling an irrigation system based on soils, precipitation and general plant type. Exams are administered after the completion of the course to participants who qualify to write the exam.

Note: The CIT Level 1 Certification is a pre-requisite to CIT Level 2 certification.

Certified Irrigation Scheduler (CIS)

This course teaches skills for field technicians to quickly be able to observe and assess an irrigation system's operation and set up an efficient irrigation watering schedule. It provides skills for Schedulers to use the best tools, technology and knowledge to produce a watering schedule in the simplest, most efficient manner to cost effectively improve irrigation systems water efficiency. IIABC exams are administered after the completion of the course to participants who qualify to write the exam. CIT Level 1 and CIT Level 2 are prerequisites to write the CIS exam.

Fundamentals of Design

This one day course covers the basics of turf irrigation design and application. Attendees learn about irrigation system equipment and components; system hydraulics and friction losses; sprinkler selection, spacing and layout; precipitation and developing a basic irrigation schedule. There is no exam for this course.

Certified Landscape Irrigation Auditor Program

Landscape irrigation auditing is the skill of managing and scheduling irrigation water wisely and efficiently. In this 1.5 day course, participants learn how to perform field tests on irrigation systems to determine the efficiency and how to combine plant water use and local weather data to calculate accurate water schedules for irrigation systems.

Candidates for certification must pass an exam; a minimum of one year irrigation verifiable related experience is required prior to applying to write the exam and submit an independently completed audit, certified by an Irrigation Association Auditor in good standing within one year of application for certification.

1.3 PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION

In the spring of 2009, the CRD Water Advisory committee (a public advisory committee to the Regional Water Supply Commission) requested that CRD Demand Management staff conduct an evaluation of program marketing and program effectiveness of existing CRD water conservation programs (including rebate programs and ICI) and deliver recommendations based on the results of the evaluations.

Although all CRD integrated conservation programs were to be evaluated, budgets and staff time made it necessary to choose one of demand management's current, active programs for examination.

Because all residential rebate programs were cancelled and reduction in outdoor water use still remains a priority for CRD, staff determined that an evaluation of CRD's efficient outdoor water use educational workshop series would be an appropriate and valuable place to begin.

The purpose of this evaluation was to determine if CRD's Efficient Outdoor Water Use Educational Workshops are changing participants' water conservation knowledge, skills and behaviour.

SECTION 2: EVALUATION DESIGN

A two-step evaluation framework was developed to assess CRD's Efficient Outdoor Water Use Educational Workshops.

Part A of the evaluation focused on the findings from data collected from CRD's End of Workshop questionnaires. The End of Workshop evaluation examined participants' satisfaction with the workshops and with program components. Forms were given to workshop attendees to submit immediately after each workshop. See Appendix A for copies of the End of Workshop Evaluation Questionnaires.

Part B of the evaluation using data collected from telephone surveys, focused on the longer-term outcomes of the program, including two main areas of change 1) Learning: knowledge and skills and 2) Behavior: practices. See Appendix B for copies of the Outcome Survey Questionnaires administered by the CRD.

2.1 END OF WORKSHOP EVALUATION

The End of Workshop evaluation is primarily used to examine participants' reaction to the training. In evaluating the workshop at this level, the focus is on the participants' perception about the course and its effectiveness. It also gathers data on the outputs of each workshop (Outputs measures are measures of volume in two categories: products delivered (e.g., numbers of workshop sessions held) and number of participants).

The information gathered from these questionnaires is important for the continuity of the course. Nevertheless, this information cannot indicate whether the workshop has met its objectives beyond ensuring participant satisfaction.

2.2 OUTCOMES EVALUATION

Outcomes evaluation is used to look at the impacts/benefits/changes to participants (as a result of the CRD workshop efforts) after their participation in the workshops. Telephone surveys were administered two or more years after participants attended the workshops. CRD hoped to find that specific water using changes have been achieved or are occurring as a result of participants' involvement with one or more of the efficient outdoor water use educational workshops.

The evaluation looks at two main areas of change 1) Learning: knowledge and skills and 2) Behavior: Practices.

2.3 EVALUATION QUESTIONS

2.3.1 End of Workshop Evaluations

1. Are participants' expectations/reasons for attending being met?
2. Are the instructor's knowledge, technical ability and/or presentation skills satisfactory?
3. Are the workshop logistics (time, materials, facilities, etc.) satisfactory?
4. How many sessions and participants have there been over the life of the workshops?

2.3.2 Outcome Survey Questionnaires

1. Are participants (both residential and Certified Irrigation Professionals) demonstrating knowledge/skills changes in the areas covered by the workshops?
2. Are participants demonstrating behavior change in their outdoor water and landscaping practices?
3. Is there evidence that workshop information is being spread to the wider community?
4. What marketing strategies have been most effective in promoting the workshops?
5. Which communities and dwelling types are most representative of participants?

2.4 METHODOLOGY

2.4.1 End of Workshop Evaluations

Over 2,300 completed End of Workshop questionnaires (Appendix A); both residential and professional were entered into a database for analysis. A review and analysis of these questionnaires was undertaken to measure participants' satisfaction with the course/instructor and to determine session numbers/participants of each workshop. Because each residential workshop has a different evaluation questionnaire, it was not possible to get exact comparative information to answer the evaluation questions. However, where possible, the results for questions with similar intent are shown in the body of this report.

The Certified Irrigation Professionals workshop questionnaires were designed by the IIABC. They also have different questionnaire formats. Because the professional irrigation courses are planned and evaluated by IIABC, it was not possible to answer this report's End of Workshop evaluation questions, therefore, the full analysis of each workshop is shown.

2.4.2 Outcomes

The outcomes were measured using a series of indicator questions in a survey format. The survey design consisted of telephone interviews with a random sample of 100 former participants from each workshop (Native Plantings, Irrigation Controller Scheduling, Efficient Micro/Drip and All Efficient Systems Irrigation). The Professional Irrigation Certification course only yielded 36 surveys.

Four separate surveys (Appendix B) were created which asked similar questions but were designed to capture specific workshop focused information. These surveys were designed to assess how well each workshop is achieving the designated outcomes through questions that reflect the key indicators.

All interviews, except the Professional Irrigation Certification, were conducted by CRD Demand Management summer students July through September of 2010. The Professional Irrigation Certification interviews were completed by full time CRD staff.

2.5 LIMITATIONS OF THE EVALUATION

Workshop designers should develop a comprehensive strategy for workshop delivery and evaluation as part of the process from the very beginning. Unfortunately, no evaluation plans were set before implementation of the current residential workshops which required the setting of objectives and outcomes before the evaluation could begin.

The end of workshop evaluation questionnaires were not originally designed to capture good evaluative information. The questionnaires were also different for each workshop in most aspects, and therefore, allowed for little ability to examine full process comparative questions making it difficult to get any real overall evaluative data.

The original survey sample called for 100 participants for each workshop. Unfortunately only 36 telephone surveys were completed for the Certified Irrigation Professionals due to:

- Phone number (Not in Service)
- Individual participant no longer employed with the business
- Business had dissolved
- Respondents attended more than one workshop

SECTION 3: EVALUATION FINDINGS

Section 3 presents the evaluation findings. Part A-1 shows data from the three residential End of Workshop questionnaires (information from the All Efficient Irrigation (A/E) Systems workshop and the Efficient Micro/Drip Irrigation (M/D) Systems is collected on the same questionnaire) and Part A-2 shows data from the End of Workshop Certified Irrigation Professionals questionnaires.

Part B shows results from the outcomes survey responses.

3.1 PART A1: END OF WORKSHOP – RESIDENTIAL

1. *Are participants' expectations/reasons for attending being met?*

Results from the four workshops clearly demonstrate that workshops are meeting the expectations of participants. All four residential workshops show high ratings for this question.

Native Plant Gardening

Across the eight years for which data is available, the average “Yes” response to expectations being met is 97%. Yes responses range from a low of 96% to a high of 99%.

All Efficient Irrigation Systems / Efficient Micro/Drip

On average, over the five-year period for which data is available, 94% of the All Efficient workshop participants and 96% of Micro/Drip workshop participants indicated the workshop to be very useful or useful in meeting their reason for attending. Table 1 shows the five-year results in detail.

	2006		2007		2008		2009		2010	
	A/E	M/D								
Very Useful	60%	70%	47%	79%	80%	85%	94%	79%	57%	100%
Useful	32%	27%	45%	7%	20%	13%	6%	18%	29%	0%
Somewhat Useful	8%	3%	8%	14%	0%	2%	0%	3%	14%	0%

Results for 2010 reflect only 50% of sessions delivered

Irrigation Controller Scheduling

On average, over the period for which data is available, a majority of participants (97%) indicated the workshop to be very useful or useful in meeting their attendance goal. Table 2 shows the four-year results in detail.

	2007	2008	2009	2010
	Very Useful	53%	74%	65%
Useful	39%	21%	30%	26%
Somewhat Useful	8%	5%	5%	3%

Results for 2010 reflect only 50% of sessions delivered

2. *Are the instructors' knowledge, technical ability and/or presentation skills satisfactory?*

Native Plant Gardening

The eight-year average rating for which data is available was 97% for excellent or very good for instructor's knowledge. As shown in Table 3, the lowest excellent/very good rating was 91% and the highest 96%.

Table 3: Instructor's Knowledge								
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Excellent	63%	75%	76%	75%	73%	78%	84%	73%
Very Good	34%	22%	22%	22%	23%	19%	14%	22%
Good	3%	3%	2%	3%	4%	3%	2%	5%

Results for 2010 reflect only 50% of sessions delivered

All Efficient Irrigation Systems / Efficient Micro/Drip

As shown in Table 4, participants consistently highly rated the instructor's ability. Over the five year period, for which data is available, the average rating for the All Efficient workshop was 93% for excellent/very good and 98% for the Micro/Drip workshop.

Table 4: Instructor's Technical Ability to Present Material										
	2006		2007		2008		2009		2010	
	A/E	M/D								
Excellent	64%	65%	54%	73%	72%	68%	71%	53%	63%	63%
Very Good	29%	33%	30%	27%	28%	28%	29%	47%	30%	35%
Good	7%	0%	16%	0%	0%	2%	0%	0%	7%	1%
Poor	0%	2%	0%	0%	0%	2%	0%	0%	0%	1%

Results for 2010 reflect only 50% of sessions delivered

Irrigation Controller Scheduling

Over the four year period for which data is available, the average excellent/very good rating was 95%. Table 5 shows results for all years.

Table 5: Instructor's Technical Ability to Present Material				
	2007	2008	2009	2010
Excellent	62%	62%	67%	61%
Very Good	30%	32%	30%	36%
Good	8%	6%	3%	3%

Results for 2010 reflect only 50% of sessions delivered

- Are the workshop logistics (time, materials, facilities, etc.) satisfactory?

Native Plant Gardening

Workshop Length Appropriate: The "Yes" response for the 8 years for which data is available averaged 97%, with a low of 93% and a high of 99%.

Time of Day Convenient: The "Yes" response for the 8 years for which data is available averaged 98%, with a low of 96% and a high of 99%.

Workshop and Handouts Information Appropriate: The "just right" category for workshop content was 97% and for the handout content 98%. Across the 8 years for which data is available, just right responses for workshop content ranged from a low of 93% to a high of 99% and just right responses for the handout content ranged from a low of 97% to a high of 99%.

Workshop Organization: the lowest excellent/very good rating was 92% and the highest 96%. Table 6 shows results for all years.

Table 6: Workshop Organization								
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Excellent	56%	59%	68%	58%	61%	64%	68%	59%
Very Good	37%	35%	28%	34%	32%	31%	28%	34%
Good	7%	6%	4%	8%	7%	4%	4%	7%
Poor	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%

Presentation methods: The 8 year average for which data is available, rating was 95% for excellent or very good. Table 7 illustrates results for all years.

Table 7: Presentation Methods								
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Excellent	58%	55%	66%	56%	61%	62%	71%	52%
Very Good	39%	39%	29%	41%	30%	32%	25%	41%
Good	3%	6%	5%	3%	9%	6%	4%	7%

Results for 2010 reflect only 50% of sessions delivered

All Efficient Irrigation Systems / Efficient Micro/Drip

Workshop Length Appropriate: As highlighted in Table 8, the majority of participants indicated the allotted time was appropriate. Over the five year period for which data is available, the average rating of appropriate was selected 86% of the time for A/E and 92% of the time for M/D.

Table 8: Appropriate Time Allotted for Workshops										
	2006		2007		2008		2009		2010	
	A/E	M/D	A/E	M/D	A/E	M/D	A/E	M/D	A/E	M/D
Too Much	4%	7%	0%	7%	3%	0%	0%	2.5%	0%	33%
Appropriate	80%	86%	90%	93%	94%	98%	94%	95%	100%	67%
Too Little	16%	7%	10%	0%	3%	2%	6%	2.5%	0%	0%

Results for 2010 reflect only 50% of sessions delivered

Facilities: Over the five year period for which data is available, the average rating of very good or good was selected 94% of the time for both the All Efficient and Efficient Micro/Drip Irrigation workshops.

3.2 PART A2: END OF WORKSHOP EVALUATION – PROFESSIONAL IRRIGATION CERTIFICATION

Because the professional irrigation certification courses are planned and evaluated by the IIABC, it was not possible to answer this report's entire End of Workshop evaluation questions, therefore, the full analysis of each workshop is shown.

Two different evaluation forms were used to assess the three CIT level 1 courses. Therefore it is possible to compare only the 2007 and 2008 course evaluations. Comparisons for 2007-2008 appear first followed by the 2009 course evaluation.

Note: Two additional Certified Irrigation Level 1 courses were been held in 2005 and 2006 but no evaluations exist for these courses.

Certified Irrigation Technician Level 1, 2007-2008

Participants were asked if the instructor had good knowledge of the subject matter. As shown in Table 9, the majority (97% in 2007 and 85% in 2008) strongly agreed.

Table 9: Instructor's Knowledge of Subject Matter		
Instructor had good knowledge of the subject matter.	2007	2008
Strongly Disagree	0%	5%
Moderately Disagree	0%	0%
Agree	0%	5%
Moderately Agree	3%	5%
Strongly Agree	97%	85%

The instructor was also rated highly for their ability to encourage questions from the group. As shown in Table 10, a majority (68% in 2007 and 55% in 2008) selecting strongly agree.

Table 10: Instructor's Ability To Encourage Questions		
Instructor encouraged questions from the group.	2007	2008
Strongly Disagree	0%	5%
Moderately Disagree	3%	0%
Agree	3%	15%
Moderately Agree	26%	25%
Strongly Agree	68%	55%

Participants were asked to indicate their level of agreement to the statement "the day was good value for the money." As summarized in Table 11, the majority of participants (81%) strongly agreed with this statement in 2007 and to a lesser degree (60%) in 2008.

Table 11: Value of Day		
The day was good value for the money.	2007	2008
Strongly Disagree	0%	10%
Moderately Disagree	0%	5%
Agree	6%	10%
Moderately Agree	13%	15%
Strongly Agree	81%	60%

Participants were asked to indicate their level of agreement to the statement "the material was presented in an organized and understandable fashion." As Table 12 shows, the majority of participants (71%) in 2007 and to a lesser degree (55%) in 2008 strongly agreed with the statement.

Table 12: Presentation of Material		
Material presented in an organized and understandable fashion.	2007	2008
Strongly Disagree	0%	5%
Moderately Disagree	0%	0%
Agree	0%	5%
Moderately Agree	29%	35%
Strongly Agree	71%	55%

Participants were asked to rate the facility. The majority of participants rated the venue on a scale of 1-10 (1 being poor and 10 being excellent) at 9.71 in 2007, and 8.53 in 2008.

Participants were asked to indicate their location preference for future workshops. In both years Vancouver Island was chosen as the participants preferred location 71% in 2007 and 74% in 2008.

Participants were asked to indicate their level of interest in attending future workshop sessions. As shown in Table 13, a majority (84% in 2007, and 63% in 2008) strongly agreed to an interest.

Table 13: Interest in Additional Programs		
Interested in future education programs offered by association.	2007	2008
Strongly Disagree	0%	5%
Moderately Disagree	0%	0%
Agree	0%	11%
Moderately Agree	16%	21%
Strongly Agree	84%	63%

Certified Irrigation Technician Level 1 Course - 2009

Thirty-three participants responded to this questionnaire, however response numbers varied by question. Most questions in Tables 14 and 15 were answered by 33 participants, however the asterisk ** indicates questions where only 32 participants responded.

Table 14: Rating of Instructor's Abilities			
Statement	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Disagree
The instructor had a good knowledge of the subject matter.	100%	0%	0%
The material was presented by the instructor in an organized and understandable way.	94%	6%	0%
The instructor effectively responded to questions.	100%	0%	0%
The instructor used relevant examples.	94%	6%	0%
The instructor solicited audience interaction.	91%	9%	0%
The instructor was able to hold my interest.	91%	9%	0%
Overall I found the instructor to be very effective. **	97%	3%	0%

Table 15: Overall Rating of Workshop			
Statement	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Disagree
The presentation pace was too fast. **	6%	38%	56%
The presentation pace was too slow. **	6%	9%	85%
The ideas and skills presented were useful. **	88%	12%	0%
The day was a good value for the money.	85%	15%	0%
Overall, I found the content to be very valuable.	91%	9%	0%
I would be interested in future education courses offered by the Association.	97%	3%	0%

Certified Irrigation Technician (CIT) Level 2 - 2007

Two different evaluation forms were also used to assess the three CIT Level 2 courses. Therefore it is possible to compare only the 2008 and 2009 course evaluations. Results from the 2007 evaluation appear first followed by the 2008-2009 comparisons.

Participants were asked if the instructor had good knowledge of the subject matter. As shown in Table 16, the majority (86%) strongly agreed.

Table 16: Instructor Knowledge of the Subject	
The instructor had good knowledge of the subject matter.	2007
Moderately Agree	14%
Strongly Agree	86%

The instructor was also rated highly for their ability to encourage questions from the group. As shown in Table 17, a majority (72%) selected strongly agree.

Table 17: Instructor Encouraged Questions	
The instructor encouraged questions.	2007
Moderately Disagree	14%
Moderately Agree	14%
Strongly Agree	72%

Participants were asked to indicate their level of agreement to the statement “the day was good value for the money.” As summarized in Table 18, the majority of participants (82%) strongly agreed with this statement.

Table 18: Value of Day	
The day was good value for the money.	2007
Agree	4%
Moderately Agree	14%
Strongly Agree	82%

Participants were asked to indicate their level of agreement to the statement “the material was presented in an organized and understandable fashion.” As illustrated in Table 19, the majority (57%) of participants strongly agreed.

Table 19: Presentation of Materials	
The material was presented in an organized and understandable fashion.	2007
Moderately Disagree	14%
Moderately Agree	14%
Strongly Agree	72%

In response to a question to rate the facility, the majority of participants rated the workshop venue at an 8.86 on a scale of 10 (with 1 being poor and 10 being excellent).

Participants were asked to indicate their location preference for future seminars. Vancouver Island was chosen as the participants preferred location (86%) in 2007.

Participants were asked to indicate their level of interest in attending future workshop sessions. As shown in Table 20, a majority (64%) of participants strongly agreed to an interest.

Table 20: Interested in Future Programs	
Interested in future workshops.	2007
Agree	14%
Moderately Agree	22%
Strongly Agree	64%

Certified Irrigation Technician (CIT) Level 2 – 2008 & 2009

Table 21: Instructor's Abilities						
Statement	2008			2009		
	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Disagree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Disagree
The instructor had a good knowledge of the subject matter.	100%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%
The material was presented by the instructor in an organized and understandable way.	100%	0%	0%	94%	6%	0%
The instructor effectively responded to questions. **	100%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%
The instructor used relevant examples.	93%	7%	0%	100%	0%	0%
The instructor solicited audience interaction.	86%	14%	0%	100%	0%	0%
The instructor was able to hold my interest.	93%	7%	0%	94%	6%	0%
Overall I found the instructor to be very effective.	100%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%

**** Two respondents did not fill in this question**

Table 22: Overall Rating of Workshop						
Statement	2008			2009		
	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Disagree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Disagree
The presentation pace was too fast.	7%	29%	64%	0%	24%	76%
The presentation pace was too slow. **	7%	14%	79%	0%	24%	76%
The ideas and skills presented were useful. **	100%	0%	0%	94%	6%	0%
The day was a good value for the money.	93%	7%	0%	100%	0%	0%
Overall, I found the content to be very valuable.	86%	14%	0%	88%	12%	0%
I would be interested in future education courses offered by the Association.	93%	7%	0%	94%	6%	0%

Fundamentals of Irrigation Design - 2008

Participants were asked if the instructor had good knowledge of the subject matter. As shown in Table 23, the majority (94%) strongly agreed.

Table 23: Instructor's Knowledge of Subject Matter	
The instructor had good knowledge of the subject matter.	2008
Strongly Disagree	3%
Moderately Agree	3%
Strongly Agree	94%

The instructor was also rated highly for their ability to encourage questions from the group. As shown in Table 24, a majority (87%) selected strongly agree.

Table 24: Instructor Encouraged Questions	
The instructor encouraged questions.	2008
Strongly Disagree	3%
Moderately Agree	10%
Strongly Agree	87%

Participants were asked to indicate their level of agreement to the statement "the day was good value for the money." As summarized in Table 25, the majority of participant's (89%) strongly agreed with this statement.

Table 25: Value of Day	
The day was good value for the money.	2008
Strongly Disagree	4%
Moderately Agree	7%
Strongly Agree	89%

Participants were asked to indicate their level of agreement to the statement "the material was presented in an organized and understandable fashion." As illustrated in Table 26, the majority (80%) of participants strongly agreed.

Table 26: Presentation of Materials	
The material was presented in an organized and understandable fashion.	2008
Strongly Disagree	3%
Moderately Agree	17%
Strongly Agree	80%

Participants were asked to rate the facility. The majority rated the workshop venue on a scale of 1-10 (1 being poor and 10 being excellent) at a 9/10.

Participants were asked to indicate their location preference for future workshops, Vancouver Island (86%) was chosen as the participants preferred location.

Participants were asked to indicate their level of interest in attending future workshop sessions. As shown in Table 27, a majority (89%) of participants strongly agreed to an interest.

Table 27: Interested in Future Programs	
Interested in future workshops.	2008
Strongly Disagree	4%
Moderately Agree	7%
Strongly Agree	89%

Certified Irrigation Scheduler (CIS) - 2009

Twenty-six people attended this course but only 18 actually responded to the instructor and course evaluation. In the instructor rating question 6* only 3 people out of the 18 responded. It is not known if the low response to question 6 is an input error or the actual number of respondents.

Table 28: Instructor Rating			
Statement	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Disagree
The instructor had a good knowledge of the subject matter.	100%	0%	0%
The material was presented in an organized an understandable way.	95%	5%	0%
The instructor effectively responded to questions.	100%	0%	0%
The instructor used relevant examples.	89%	11%	0%
The instructor solicited audience interaction.	95%	5%	0%
The instructor was able to hold my interest. *	33%	67%	0%
Overall I found the instructor to be very effective.	95%	5%	0%

Table 29: Rating of Workshop			
Statement	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Disagree
The presentation pace was too fast.	5%	0%	95%
The presentation pace was too slow.	11%	22%	67%
The ideas and skills presented were useful.	95%	5%	0%
The day was a good value for the money.	83%	17%	0%
Overall, I found the content to be very valuable.	89%	11%	0%
Interested in future education courses offered by the Association.	95%	5%	0%

4. How many sessions and participants have there been over the life of the workshops?

Table 30 shows the session and participant numbers for individual workshops for which we have separated participant and session data. Additional All Efficient Irrigation Systems and Irrigation Controller Scheduling Workshops were held from 1999 to 2004; however session and participant numbers were not separated in original data. The total number for these joint sessions is 26 and the total number of participants for these combined sessions is 1,100. These numbers have been added to session and participant numbers in Table 30 to determine the total number of sessions and participants.

The total number of sessions for all workshops since 1999 is 224 and the total number of participants is 4,326.

Table 30: Workshop Outputs																				
Workshop	Number of Sessions Delivered										Number of Participants									
	Years	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Native Plantings	3	21	10	16	19	18	18	19	19	8	45	209	165	296	247	210	300	365	252	112
Irrigation Systems			-	-	-	10	4	5	5	2					-	228	82	94	92	11
Irrigation Controller			-	-	-	-	3	3	2	2					-	-	63	69	42	38
Technician Level 1			-	-	1	1	1	1	1	-					39	29	31	23	33	-
Technician Level 2			-	-	-	-	1	1	1	-					-	-	26	15	22	-
Design			-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-					-	-	-	30	-	-
Scheduler			-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1					-	-	-	-	-	24
Landscape Auditor			-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-					-	34	-	-	-	-

Note: Irrigation systems workshops are divided between All Efficient and Micro/Drip. Numbers in the Table represent total combined sessions/participants. It is interesting to note that attendance for the M/D in 2007 and 2008 was higher than for the A/E.

Note: Session and attendance numbers for 2010 represent only 50% of sessions delivered.

3.3 PART B: OUTCOMES – ALL WORKSHOPS

These results included data collected from telephone surveys, focusing on the longer-term outcomes of the program, including two main areas of change 1) Learning: knowledge and skills and 2) Behavior: practices.

1. Are participants (both residential and Certified Irrigation Professionals) demonstrating changes in knowledge/skills in the areas covered by the workshops?

This series of questions are used to discover if new skills and knowledge were learned from the workshops and is this information being retained.

Native Plant Gardening

Did the workshop specifically influence the respondent to retain or plant native vegetation? As Table 31 shows 89% of respondents indicated that the workshop did specifically influence them.

Table 31: Workshop Specifically Influenced	
Yes	89%
No	7%
DK/DR	4%

Did the workshop provide adequate information to help the respondent use native plantings on their property? As Table 32 indicates 89% indicated that the workshop provided adequate information to help the respondent use native plantings.

Table 32: Workshop Provided Adequate Information	
Yes	89%
No	8%
DK/DR	3%

Have respondents identified invasive species on their property? As Table 33 shows, an 85% majority indicated “Yes” while only 15% said “No”.

Table 33: Identified Invasive Species	
Yes	85%
No	15%

All Efficient Irrigation Systems / Efficient Micro/Drip

Over 12% of respondents indicated that they had taken both the all efficient irrigation systems workshop and the efficient micro/drip irrigation system workshop.

Almost 60% of respondents answered that they had changed their existing system based upon information they received at the workshop, while 39% said they had not; 3% were unable to remember.

Respondents were asked if information in the workshop helped them to decide who would make the modifications. Fifty percent (50%) indicated that information did help them while 40% said it did not and 10% didn't remember.

Respondents were asked if the information provided in each of the workshops helped them hire and work with a contractor. The Yes/No response was identical at 50% each.

Fifty-two percent (52%) of respondents indicated that they installed a system after taking the workshop. Respondents were asked to indicate what type or types of systems were installed. As Table 34 shows, the majority of those who installed a system chose Micro/drip.

Table 34: Type of Irrigation System Installed	
Micro/Drip	51%
In-ground	16%
Both	31%
DK/DR	2%

Table 35 illustrates results from a question that asked who made modifications to their systems. Respondent answers would seem to indicate that information supplied in the workshops is comprehensive enough for people to confidently undertake their own modifications.

Table 35: Person Who Made Modifications	
Yourself	67%
Contractor	12%
Both	12%
DK/DR	9%

Table 36 illustrates results from the question that asked who installed the new system. Although a majority (63%) of respondents indicated that they installed their own systems, over one-third indicated that they used a contractor. It is interesting to note the differences and similarities between the response to this question and to the information in Table 35. Over three times as many respondents used a contractor to install their system as respondents did to modify their systems (37% vs. 12%), but almost the same percent of respondents installed their own system as modified their systems (63% vs. 67%).

Table 36: Who Installed a New System	
Yourself	63%
Contractor	37%

When asked if information supplied in the workshop changed their watering habits, a 66% majority of respondents answered “Yes”, while 32% said “No” and 3% didn’t remember. Workshop information encourages participants to use only irrigation contractors who are certified by the IIABC for irrigation work. Survey respondents who indicated they had an irrigation system on their property before attending the workshop but changed the system after the workshop and used a contractor to do so, were asked if the contractor they hired was certified by the IIABC. The Yes/No response was identical at 25% each.

When the same question was asked of respondents who did not have a system but installed one after the workshop, using a contractor, a 73% majority answered “Yes” to the contractor they hired was certified by the IIABC. (Only 5 people responded to this question.)

When asked if the workshop influenced their decision on what type of system to install the majority (72%) of respondents answered “Yes”.

When asked if information in the workshop helped them to decide on who would install the system (contractor, yourself or both), only 42% of respondents answered “Yes”, while 52% said “No” and 6% did not remember.

68% of respondents answered “Yes”, 27% said “No” and 5% did not remember when asked if the information provided in the workshop helped them hire and work with a contractor.

Irrigation Controller Scheduling

A majority (81%) of respondents indicated they had a controller on their system before they came to the workshop while (19%) said “No”. The question was designed to uncover if respondents were influenced to purchase a new controller based on the information they learned at the workshop. While some people indicated that they had an old controller very few (7) purchased a new one. The majority (87%) said “No” while (10%) said “Yes” and (3%) did not remember.

When asked if a controller was installed after the workshop, a (69%) majority of respondents said “Yes” with (31%) answering “No”. Only 16 people responded to this question.

Respondents were asked who installed their new irrigation controller. The majority (72%) of respondents who had a new controller installed used a contractor, while (14%) installed themselves and (14%) did not remember or did not know.

Respondents were asked if the information provided in the workshop helped them hire and work with a contractor. Only five respondents answered this question with the Yes/No response identical at 40% each and don’t remember/don’t know at 20%.

Only 4 respondents gave a response to the question “was the contractor they hired to install the controller certified by the Irrigation Association of B.C”. The “Yes” and “don’t remember” answers were identical at 50% each.

The following questions were asked only of those people who indicated that they did not have a system installed before attending the workshop.

When asked if the workshop influenced the type of irrigation controller that was purchased, the majority (55%) of respondents indicated “No”, with (18%) saying “Yes” and (27%) of respondents who did not remember or know.

When asked if information in the workshop helped them to decide who would install the controller, the majority (82%) of respondents indicated “No”, with responses for “Yes” and don’t remember both a 9% each. Only 11 people responded to this question.

Table 37 illustrates results from Question 6 of who installed the new system. The majority (64%) of respondents indicated they used a contractor to install their controller, while (27%) indicated personally installing and (9%) did not remember or know.

Table 37: Who Installed Controller	
Yourself	27%
Contractor	64%
DK/DR	9%

The majority (57%) of respondents answered “No” when asked if the information provided in the workshop helped them hire and work with a contractor, while (43%) said “Yes”.

When asked if the contractor they hired was certified by the Irrigation Association of BC, the majority (43%) of respondents answered “Yes”, while (14%) said “No” and (43%) did not remember.

Certified Irrigation Professionals

When asked if they had learned a new technique or knowledge that would help the end user reduce water 89% responded “Yes”, while only 11% said “No”.

2. Are participants demonstrating behavior change in their outdoor water and landscaping practices?

While it is important to understand if new knowledge and skills are being acquired from the workshops, it is equally important to ascertain if these skills are translating into actions. A series of questions were asked of respondents to ascertain if concrete efficiency practices were being applied.

Native Plant Gardening

Did information supplied in the workshop change their landscaping practices? As Table 38 shows, 73% of survey respondents indicated that the information they received in the workshop helped them change their practices while 25% said “No” and 2% didn’t remember.

Table 38: Workshop Information Help Change Landscaping Practices	
Yes	73%
No	25%
DK/DR	2%

Respondents were asked to describe the type of changes they have made to their landscaping practices. This was an open focused question; therefore responses have been reviewed and grouped under similar categories. Table 39 shows the types of changes made by respondents.

Table 39: Type of Changes	
Type	Frequency of Responses
Lawn care	10%
Planted native/drought tolerant species	61%
Water less	18%
General	11%

Respondents were asked to indicate how much of their property now contained native plantings. This was an open focused question and responses have been reviewed and grouped under similar categories. Table 40 shows the frequency of response for various percentages.

Table 40: Amount of Native Plantings on Property	
Percentage	Frequency of Responses
< 25%	43%
25-49%	27%
50-74%	3.5%
75-100%	17%
None	6%
Unknown	3.5%

It is important to discover if people can not only recognize invasive species but also act to remove them. Respondents were asked if they had removed the identified invasive species on their property. As shown in Table 41, 88% of those who previously indicated (Table 33) they had identified invasive species had removed them.

Table 41: Removed Invasive Species	
Yes	88%
No	9%
DK/DR	3%

All Efficient Irrigation Systems / Efficient Micro/Drip

Respondents were asked to indicate what changes or modifications were made to their irrigation systems. This was an open-focused question; therefore responses were reviewed and grouped into similar categories. Table 42 shows the categories and percentages for each.

Table 42: Types of Modifications/Changes	
Type	Frequency of Response
Modified In-ground or Changed to M/D	52%
Changed heads	16%
Controller Adjusted /New/ Scheduling	22%
Removed completely	5%
Repaired	5%

Respondents who answered in the affirmative in the previous question were asked to indicate if the workshop specifically influenced them to take any actions from a listed set of actions. Table 43 shows these results. The largest percentage (19%) indicated adjusting watering scheduling based on conditions.

Table 43: Workshop Influenced Respondent to Take Actions	
Action	Frequency of Response
Adjust your watering scheduling based on conditions	19%
Install a rain shut-off device	7%
Group your plantings according to watering requirements	13%
Plant native plantings	13%
Install an irrigation controller	8%
Assess the health/depth of your soil	8%
Install a rain gauge	12%
Conduct regular monthly reviews of your irrigation system	9%
Convert a portion or all of an existing in-ground system to micro-drip	4%
Other	7%
DR/DK	0%

Irrigation Controller Scheduling

Respondents were asked if they changed scheduling practices based on information from the workshop. As shown in Table 44, the majority (75%) of respondents answered “Yes” while (25%) said “No”.

Table 44: Changed Scheduling Practices	
Yes	75%
No	25%

Question 19 asked respondents if the information from the workshop persuaded them to change other watering practices. As shown in Table 45 the majority (65%) said “Yes” while (31%) answered “No” and (4%) did not remember.

Table 45: Changed Other Watering Practices	
Yes	65%
No	31%
DK/DR	4%

Respondents were asked to indicate which specific watering practices they had changed. This was an open focused question so responses were reviewed and grouped under similar categories.

Table 46: What Watering Practices Changed	
Changed Practice	Frequency of Responses
Use less/stopped watering	16%
Water more efficiently (timing, time of day, length, etc.)	64%
Installed/changed equipment	14%
Other	6%

Certified Professional Irrigation

When asked if they had applied a new technique/techniques to their work the majority (86%) answered “Yes”, five respondents (14%) indicated they had not applied the new techniques to their work.

A follow-up question asked for the specific techniques/knowledge they have applied since taking the workshop. While only 32 of the potential 36 respondents answered this question, multi-choice responses were allowed. The new techniques are evenly spread among all of the categories which suggest that behaviour change is wide spread.

Table 47: New Techniques Used Since Workshop	
Technique/Information	Frequency of Response
New Scheduling Techniques	20%
Sprinkler spacing	18%
Application rates	20%
Separate zones	17%
Maintenance improvements	19%
Other	6%

3. *Is there evidence that the workshop information is being spread to the wider community?*

Native Plant Gardening

Respondents were asked if they shared the information with others. The majority (88%) of respondents indicated that they had shared what they learned in the workshop with others. This information reflects that the information is being spread beyond the actual attendance numbers to the community which adds additional benefits to the workshops.

This question asked the respondents who answered yes in the preceding question to provide information on what they shared. This was an open focused question, so responses have been reviewed and grouped under similar categories. Table 48 shows the types of shared information.

Table 48: What Information Shared	
Information Shared	Frequency of Responses
Details of Workshop/Handouts	44%
Plant Identification/Planting tips	39%
Watering/Irrigation tips	8%
General tips/techniques	5%
Identifying/removing invasive plants	4%

As a follow-up question, respondents were asked to tell the interviewer what prompted them to share the information.

Table 49: What Prompted You To Share	
Reason	Frequency of Responses
Valuable and important information	23%
Interest from neighbours & friends	52%
General conversation	15%
Asked specifically about it from others	10%

All Efficient Irrigation Systems / Efficient Micro/Drip

Respondents were asked if they shared any of the information from the workshop with others. Almost two-thirds (65%) indicated “Yes”.

Respondents who replied they had shared information with others in the preceding question were asked to provide answers about what information they shared. This was an open focused question so responses were reviewed and grouped under similar categories. Table 50 shows the types of shared information.

Table 50: What Information Shared	
Information Shared	Frequency of Responses
Information on installing a system	14%
Workshops/Handouts/Tips learned	36%
Conservation techniques	29%
General system components, controllers, scheduling	21%

Respondents were asked to explain why they decided to share the information.

Table 51: What Prompted You To Share	
Reason	Frequency of Response
Valuable and important information	32%
Conservation	35%
Questions from family & friends	27%
Interest from others	6%

Irrigation Controller Scheduling

Respondents were asked if they shared any of the information from the workshop with others. The majority (54%) answered “Yes” while (44%) said “No” and (2%) did not remember.

Respondents who replied they had shared information with others in the preceding question were asked to provide answers about what information they shared. This was an open focused question so responses were reviewed and grouped under similar categories.

Table 52: What Information Was Shared	
Information Shared	Frequency of Responses
Details of the workshop/handouts	31%
Scheduling/timing	16%
Watering time, plant needs, etc.	41%
General information	12%

Respondents were asked to explain why they decided to share the information.

Table 53: What Prompted You to Share	
Reason	Frequency of Responses
General conversation	48%
Questions from neighbors/family	10%
Education and awareness building	29%
For customers	13%

4. *What marketing strategies have been most effective in promoting the workshops?*

Marketing strategies to promote CRD workshops remained consistent between 2003 and 2010 (available data). Although percentages varied across the three workshops, Tables 54, 55 and 56 show that the newspaper was rated as the number one source. The CRD website as a source ranks very low for all workshops. The ability to recall the source of information after a length of time suggests the strategy of using newspapers as the primary marketing tool is effective.

Native Plant Gardening

Table 54: Source of Information	
Newspaper	70%
Friends/Family	8%
Word of Mouth	1%
CRD	3%
Presentation	2%
Other	10%
DK/DR	6%

All Efficient Irrigation Systems / Efficient Micro/Drip

Table 55: Source of Information	
Newspaper	59%
Friends/Family	4%
CRD Website	2%
Presentation	3%
Other	9%
DK/DR	23%

Irrigation Controller Scheduling

Table 56: Source of Information	
Newspaper	64%
Friends/Family	5%
CRD Website	7%
Presentation	3%
Other	5%
DK/DR	16%

5. Which communities and dwelling types are most representative of participants?

The CRD Efficient Outdoor Water Use Educational Workshops are being used most frequently by residents from Saanich. As can be seen in Tables 57, 58 and 59, Saanich took top spot in all three workshops.

Native Plant Gardening

Table 57: Participant Municipality	
Municipality	Frequency
Central Saanich	1%
Colwood	3%
Esquimalt	5%
Juan de Fuca Electoral Area	1%
Langford	5%
Metchosin	6%
North Saanich	5%
Oak Bay	8%
Saanich	34%
Sidney	2%
Sooke	6%
Victoria	20%
View Royal	2%
Other: Malahat, Highlands	2%

All Efficient Irrigation Systems / Efficient Micro/Drip

Table 58: Participant Municipality	
Municipality	Frequency
Central Saanich	8%
Colwood	3%
Esquimalt	2%
Juan de Fuca Electoral Area	0%
Langford	5%
Metchosin	2%
North Saanich	9%
Oak Bay	7%
Saanich	43%
Sidney	4%
Sooke	7%
Victoria	8%
View Royal	1%
Other: Highlands	1%

Irrigation Controller Scheduling

Table 59: Participant Municipality	
Municipality	Frequency
Central Saanich	11%
Colwood	5%
Esquimalt	3%
Juan de Fuca Electoral Area	0%
Langford	4%
Metchosin	1%
North Saanich	6%
Oak Bay	8%
Saanich	43%
Sidney	6%
Sooke	1%
Victoria	11%
View Royal	1%
Other: Highlands	0%

The majority (90%) of respondents from the Native Plant Gardening, the All Efficient Irrigation Systems / Efficient Micro/Drip Irrigation Systems workshops and (82%) of the Irrigation Controller Scheduling workshop lives in a single, detached home. The remainder lives in a condominium, townhouse or duplex.

Professional Irrigation Certification

Participants were asked to indicate which course they had attended. As shown in Table 60 the majority (92%) of respondents said the Certified Irrigation Technician (CIT) Level 1 course, followed in second place by the CIT Level 2 course.

Table 60: Course Attended	
Reason	Frequency of Response
CIT Level 1	92%
CIT Level 2	61%
Landscape Auditor	28%
Irrigation Scheduler	17%
Fundamentals of Design	25%

Note: 69% of respondents attended more than one course

Question 2 asked respondents to choose from a list of reasons as to their primary reason for attending the course. The majority (42%) of respondents indicated education, followed by job requirement (36%).

Table 61: Reason For Attending	
Reason	Frequency of Response
Job Requirement	36%
New to Industry	3%
Education	42%
To improve industry standards	19%
To fulfill Municipal, City Specifiers request for bidding	0%
Clients are asking for Certification	0%
Other	0%

When asked if they left any technical information for their end users, 58% said “No” and 42% indicated “Yes”.

A follow up question asked respondents to indicate what specific technical information was left behind chosen from a given list. While only 14 of the potential 36 respondents answered this question, multi-choice responses were able to choose more than one response resulting in 50 total responses. As shown in Table 62 the most frequent response (26%) about information left behind was controller manuals, followed in second place by product literature. Website literature, CRD literature and other were (12%) each.

Table 62: Type of Technical Information Left Behind	
Technique/Information	Frequency of Response
Product literature	22%
Controller manuals	26%
Contract information	16%
Website information	12%
CRD literature	12%
Other	12%

Respondents were asked if they were aware that CRD had outdoor information available for end users. Thirty-five of the potential 36 respondents answered this question. Of the respondents (77%) indicated “Yes” while 23% said “No”.

A follow-up question asked respondents if they not only know about CRD information but actually supply this information to their end users. As Table 63 illustrates the majority (43%) of respondents indicated they did not supply CRD information, while (25%) said “Yes” and (32%) tell end users that the information is available.

Table 63: Supply CRD Information to End Users	
Yes	25%
No	43%
Tells available	32%

Note: Several respondents indicated that they worked for a municipality or had their own information

Respondents were asked to select which one, from a given list of organization types, most closely describes the organization they currently work for. Table 64 illustrates that the majority of respondents currently work at an irrigation contracting firm (28%), followed in second place at a City/Town or Municipality (22%).

Table 64: Type of Organization Where Currently Work	
City/Town	22%
School District	3%
Irrigation Contracting	28%
Landscape Contracting	8%
University	11%
Parks	0%
Equipment Supplier	17%
Other	11%

Respondents were asked to indicate the number of years they had been working full time in the irrigation profession. Table 65 shows the results of this question.

Table 65: Number of Full Time Years Working in Irrigation	
Years	Frequency of Response
1 or less	3%
2-3	0%
4-7	28%
8-10	30%
11-15	5%
16-20	17%
More than 20	17%

Table 66 shows respondents' responses to their age group.

Table 66: Age Group	
Age	Frequency of Response
Under 25	2%
25-35	17%
36-49	42%
50-64	39%
65 and over	0%
Refused	0%

Table 67 shows respondents' responses to their level of education.

Table 67: Formal Education	
Education Level	Frequency of Response
Grade School	0%
Some high school	0%
Graduated high school	19%
Some college/university	42%
Graduated college/university	36%
Refused	3%

SECTION 4: CONCLUSIONS

In the 11 years since the Efficient Outdoor Water Use Educational Workshops have been offered, they have assisted the CRD to establish credibility and take important steps toward realizing the mandate of CRD Demand Management.

This evaluation has shown that all of the workshops are meeting participant expectations. Ratings of over 90% are consistently found when participants are asked if the workshop met their expectations.

The workshop instructors' unfailingly receive high ratings for their technical and presentation abilities and subject knowledge.

The program attributes continue year after year with little or modest fall off in year to year ratings. This is readily reflected in repeated attendance for many of the workshops.

This evaluation has also shown that long-term learning of new skills and knowledge is occurring. The evidence is in results such as the Native Plant Gardening workshop where 92% of respondents agreed that the workshop specifically influenced them to retain or plant native vegetation. The Professional Irrigation Certification course where 89% of respondents indicated they had learned a new technique or knowledge to help their end users reduce water use.

Results from this evaluation clearly show that not only is new learning taking place but changes in actual practices are also occurring. As an example, 75% of respondents in the irrigation controller scheduling outcomes survey, when asked if they had changed their scheduling practices answered in the affirmative.

Despite the success of these workshops there is an inherent weakness in the uneven representation for all communities of the CRD. Smaller attendance numbers may be accounted for from some communities that have a predominantly farming base, however, there is considerable opportunity for improving the reach to all areas of the CRD.

This evaluation has found the Efficient Outdoor Water Use Educational Workshops to be a strong and popular resource for the CRD. The workshops have played a major role in positively positioning the CRD. They have also encouraged considerable progress toward changing residents' outdoor water use behaviour and demonstrating the learning and adaption of new water saving techniques from professional irrigation personnel.

SECTION 5: RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Improve the effectiveness of the End of Workshop evaluation questionnaire.

Redesigning the End of Workshop evaluations; using a single questionnaire administered at the end of the workshop that incorporates a “retrospective pre-test”. Using this preferred approach, participants are asked to rate their knowledge, skill, attitude, or behavior from two perspectives: after the educational event and before the event. Use the same evaluation for all workshops directly under the control of the CRD.

2. Improve marketing of the course information.

While there is a strong recognition to newspaper advertising, other media choices have not been fully explored. It would be advisable to find out how people would like to receive information about upcoming workshops. The CRD website in particular should be used more frequently.

3. Provide follow-up and additional information about various topics on the CRD website.

The website should be used not only for promoting attendance at the workshops but also as a reinforcement of the information learned in the workshops and as a potential long-term evaluation tool. This would require a re-designing of the water conservation portion of the web site and regular updating of the site.

4. Add additional course topics to workshops.

CRD should build on the success of current workshops and devise strategies to increase the topics of workshops. Suggestions for additional courses could include drought tolerant gardening, edible landscaping, companion planting and additional micro/drip sessions.

5. Expand irrigation systems and irrigation controller workshop sessions to additional locations.

Attendance for irrigation and irrigation workshops is concentrated in a few communities and underrepresented from communities which have high outdoor water use. Conducting pilot sessions in these high water using areas might encourage better attendance from these areas.

APPENDIX A

END OF WORKSHOP QUESTIONNAIRES

- Native Plant Gardening Evaluation
- Irrigation Controllers Scheduling Workshop Evaluation
- Irrigation Workshop Evaluation (All Efficient and Micro/Drip)
- Professional Irrigation Course Evaluation

NATIVE PLANT GARDENING EVALUATION

Thank you for your interest in our workshop. Please take a moment to fill out this evaluation and leave it with us so we may improve our program services.

1. Workshop Date: _____

2. Did this workshop meet your expectations?

Yes Partially No

If no, what changes or improvements could be made?

3. Was the amount of information given:

Workshop Content: just right too much too little

Hand-out Materials: just right too much too little

4. Was the length of the workshop appropriate?

Yes Partially No

If no, what would you suggest?

5. Was the time of the workshop convenient?

Yes Partially No

If no, what would you suggest?

6. Please rate the following:

Instructor's knowledge

Poor Good Very Good Excellent

Presentation methods

Poor Good Very Good Excellent

Workshop organization

Poor Good Very Good Excellent

Room set-up/facilities

Poor Good Very Good Excellent

7. Are there other workshop topics or other aspects of this topic you would like to see in the future?

8. How did you hear about the workshop?

Thank you!

IRRIGATION CONTROLLERS SCHEDULING WORKSHOP EVALUATION

Workshop Date: _____

- 1) Briefly explain your goal for this session (or the reason you attended this workshop).

- 2) How useful was the workshop in meeting your goal?

Very Useful Useful Somewhat Useful Not Useful

- 3) Please indicate which type of irrigation controller you currently have.

Do not currently have an irrigation controller

- 4) Briefly describe how you currently schedule your irrigation.

- 5) Did you find the technical information given in this workshop: (Tick all that apply)

Easily understood

Not easily understood

Too much information

Too little information

Other (Please specify) _____

- 6) Do you feel the workshop information will help you schedule your system in a more water efficient way?

Yes Partially No

7) Please rate the instructor's technical ability to present the material in an organized and informative fashion.

Excellent Very Good Good Fair Poor

8) Would you recommend this workshop to others?

Yes No Maybe

9) Which municipality do you live in? _____

General Comments:

IRRIGATION WORKSHOP EVALUATION

Workshop Date: _____

- 1) Briefly explain your goal for this session (or the reason you attended this workshop).

- 2) How useful was the workshop in meeting your goal?

Very Useful Useful Somewhat Useful Not Useful

- 3) In your opinion was the time allotted for this workshop:

just right too much too little

- 4) Please rate the facilities where the workshop was held.

Very Good Good Fair Poor

- 5) Did you find the CRD information given at the beginning of this workshop: (Tick all that apply)

Useful

Not Useful

Too Long

Too Short

Interesting

Not of Interest

Other (Please specify) _____

6) Did you find the technical (irrigation system) information given in this workshop: (Tick all that apply)

- Easily understood
- Not easily understood
- Too much information
- Too little information
- Other (Please specify) _____

7) Please rate the technical instructor's ability to present the material in an organized and informative fashion.

- Excellent Very Good Good Fair Poor

8) What suggestions do you have for improving the content of this workshop?

9) Would you recommend this workshop to others?

- Yes No Maybe

10) Do you plan on installing your own irrigation system?

- Yes No Maybe

11) What other topics would you like to see CRD offer in future workshops?

General Comments:

PROFESSIONAL IRRIGATION COURSE EVALUATION

Course Title:			
Date:		Time:	Location:
Name of Instructor:			

Please check whether you Agree, Somewhat Agree or Disagree with the following questions.

INSTRUCTOR RATING		AGREE	SOMEWHAT AGREE	DISAGREE
1.	The instructor had a good knowledge of the subject matter.			
2.	The material was presented by the instructor in an organized and understandable way.			
3.	The instructor effectively responded to questions.			
4.	The instructor used relevant examples.			
5.	The instructor solicited audience interaction.			
6.	The instructor was able to hold my interest.			
7.	Overall, I found the instructor to be very effective.			

OVERVIEW OF WORKSHOP		AGREE	SOMEWHAT AGREE	DISAGREE
1.	The presentation pace was too fast.			
2.	The presentation pace was too slow.			
3.	The ideas and skills presented were useful.			
4.	The day was a good value for the money.			
5.	Overall, I found the content to be very valuable.			
6.	I would be interested in future education Courses offered by the association.			

Any Additional Comments:

APPENDIX B

OUTCOME SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRES

- Native Plant Gardening Effectiveness Survey
- Irrigation Controller Scheduling Effectiveness Survey
- Irrigation Effectiveness Survey (All Efficient and Micro/Drip)
- Professional Irrigation Effectiveness Survey

NATIVE PLANT GARDENING EFFECTIVENESS SURVEY

INTERVIEWER: Before each phone call record telephone number being called.

Telephone Number called: _____

Call back needed Person to Ask for: _____

Date(s) to Call: _____

Time(s) to Call: _____

INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT FOR THE INTERVIEWER

Hello my name is _____. I am calling on behalf of the Capital Regional District Environmental Partnerships (formerly CRD Water Services). We are contacting people who have participated in a Native Plant Workshop sponsored by the CRD. We are asking for your assistance in evaluating the effectiveness of these workshops in promoting the use of native plantings. The survey will take about 10 minutes, and all of your responses are confidential.

May I first confirm that you are the person who attended the Native Plant Workshop?

- A. Yes – Original Attendee (PROCEED TO B)
- If respondent says No, ask for the name of the person who attended and if you might speak with him/her. If the correct person comes to the phone repeat introductory statement and PROCEED TO B.
 - If the correct person is not available ask when would be a convenient time that you might call back to talk with him/her? (IMMEDIATELY FILL IN CALL BACK INFORMATION ABOVE.) Thank person for call back information. Disconnect.
- B. Do you still reside at the same address as when you attended the workshop?
- Yes (PROCEED TO Q.1) No (PROCEED TO C)
- C. Have you applied the knowledge you gained at the workshop to your new property?
- Yes (PROCEED TO Q.1)
- No - Because the survey contains specific questions about native plantings on your current property, I will not be able to continue with the survey. Thank you for your time. Disconnect

If the original attendee says **he/she does not wish to complete the survey even at another time**, thank them for their time and close the conversation.

- Question 1) What was your primary reason for attending the Native Plant Workshop?
(INTERVIEWER RECORD VERBATIM; HIGHLIGHT FIRST RESPONSE; CONTINUE TO Q. 2)
- Question 2) Did information supplied in the workshop change your landscaping practices?
 Yes (CONTINUE TO Q. 3)
 No (GO TO Q. 4)
 Don't remember/DK (DO NOT READ – GO TO Q.4)
- Question 3) What landscaping practices did you change? Please be as specific as possible.
(DO NOT PROMPT; RECORD VERBATIM) (E.g. removed invasive plantings, reduced pesticide use, removed lawn, etc.) (CONTINUE TO Q.4)
- Question 4) Did the workshop specifically influence you to retain or plant native vegetation on your property? (CONTINUE TO Q. 5)
 Yes
 No
 Don't remember/DK (DO NOT READ)
- Question 5) Did the workshop provide adequate information to help you use native plantings on your property? (CONTINUE TO Q.6)
 Yes
 No
 Don't remember/DK (DO NOT READ)
- Question 6) Approximately how much native vegetation is currently on your property?
(Interviewer: A variety of measurements may be given to this question such as a percentage or flower beds; record all) (CONTINUE TO Q.7)
- Question 7) Have you identified any invasive species on your property?
 Yes (CONTINUE TO Q. 8)
 No (GO TO Q. 9)
 Don't remember/DK (DO NOT READ) (GO TO Q. 9)
- Question 8) Have you remove the identified invasive species on your property? (CONTINUE TO Q.9)
 Yes
 No
 Don't remember/DK (DO NOT READ)
- Question 9) Do you compost? (CONTINUE TO Q.10)
 Yes
 No
 Don't remember/DK (DO NOT READ)

Question 10) Did you share any of the information you learned in the workshop with others?
 Yes (CONTINUE TO Q. 11)
 No (GO TO Q.13)
 Don't remember/DK (DO NOT READ – GO TO Q.13)

Question 11) What information from the workshop did you share? (RECORD VERBATIM TO Q.12)

Question 12) What prompted you to share the information? (RECORD VERBATIM; TO Q. 13)

Question 13) How did you hear about the Native Plant Workshop? (DO NOT PROMPT; TICK ALL RESPONSES; CONTINUE TO Q. 14)

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> CRD Web site | <input type="checkbox"/> Friends or family |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Newspaper | <input type="checkbox"/> Word of Mouth |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Radio | <input type="checkbox"/> Public presentation/event |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Don't remember/DK (DO NOT READ) | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____ |

Question 14) Which municipality do you live in? (TICK RESPONSE; CONTINUE TO Q.15)

- Central Saanich
- Colwood
- Esquimalt
- Juan de Fuca Electoral area
- Langford
- Metchosin
- North Saanich
- Oak Bay
- Saanich
- Sidney
- Sooke
- Victoria
- View Royal
- Other (Specify) _____
- Refused (DO NOT READ)

Question 15) What type of dwelling do you live in?

- Single family detached
- Duplex
- Condominium
- Town House
- Other (Specify) _____
- Refused (DO NOT READ)

INTERVIEWER: Thank them for their time and co-operation. Ask if they have any additional comments.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

IRRIGATION CONTROLLER SCHEDULING EFFECTIVENESS SURVEY

INTERVIEWER: Before each phone call record telephone number being called.

Telephone Number called: _____

Call back needed Person to Ask for: _____

Date(s) to Call: _____

Time(s) to Call: _____

INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT FOR THE INTERVIEWER

Hello my name is _____. I am calling on behalf of the Capital Regional District Environmental Partnerships (formerly CRD Water Services). We are contacting people who participated in the Irrigation Controller Workshop sponsored by the CRD. We are asking for your assistance in evaluating the effectiveness of this workshop in promoting efficient water use. The survey will take about 15 minutes, and all of your responses are confidential.

May I first confirm that you are the person who attended the Irrigation Controller Workshop?

A. Yes – Original Attendee (PROCEED TO B)

- If respondent says No, ask for the name of the person who attended and if you might speak with him/her. If the correct person comes to the phone repeat introductory statement and PROCEED TO B.
- If the correct person is not available ask when would be a convenient time that you might call back to talk with him/her? (IMMEDIATELY FILL IN CALL BACK INFORMATION ABOVE.) Thank person for call back information and close.

B. Do you still reside at the same address as when you attended the workshop?

Yes (PROCEED TO Q.1)

No - Because the survey contains specific questions about the operation of the controller on the property you lived at before attending the workshop, I will not be able to continue with the survey. Thank you for your time. Disconnect.

If the original attendee says **he/she does not wish to complete the survey even at another time**, thank them for their time and close the conversation.

SECTION A: REASON FOR WORKSHOP ATTENDANCE

Question 1) What was your primary reason for attending the irrigation controller workshop? (RECORD VERBATIM; HIGHLIGHT FIRST RESPONSE; CONTINUE TO Q.2)

Question 2) How did you hear about the irrigation controller workshop? (DO NOT PROMPT; TICK ALL RESPONSES; CONTINUE TO Q. 3)

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> CRD Web site | <input type="checkbox"/> Friends or family |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Newspaper | <input type="checkbox"/> Word of Mouth |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Radio | <input type="checkbox"/> Public presentation/event |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Don't remember/DK (DO NOT READ) | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____ |

SECTION B: PRE-WORKSHOP IRRIGATION CONTROLLER

Question 3) Did you have a controller on your system before attending the workshop?

- Yes (CONTINUE TO Q. 4)
- No (GO TO Q.10)

Question 4) What type of controller did you have? (RECORD TYPE OR DK; CONTINUE TO Q. 5)

- Type: _____
- Don't Remember/DK (DO NOT READ)

Question 5) Did you purchase a new controller based on the information learned at the workshop?

- Yes (CONTINUE TO Q. 6)
- No (GO TO Q.18)
- Don't Remember/DK (DO NOT READ; GO TO Q.18)

Question 6) Who installed your new irrigation controller? Was it: (Read Choices; Tick Response)

- Yourself (GO TO Q. 18)
- A Contractor (CONTINUE TO Q. 7)
- Both (CONTINUE TO Q. 7)
- Other (specify) _____ (GO TO Q.18)
- Don't Remember/DK (DO NOT READ; GO TO Q.18)

Question 7) Did the information provided in the workshop help you in hiring and working with a contractor?

- Yes (GO TO Q. 9)
- No (CONTINUE TO Q. 8)
- Don't Remember/DK (DO NOT READ; GO TO Q. 9)

Question 8) What other information would have been helpful to you in hiring and working with a contractor? (RECORD VERBATIM; CONTINUE TO Q.9)

Question 9) Was the contractor you hired certified by the Irrigation Association of British Columbia? (GO TO Q.18)

- Yes
- No
- Don't Remember/DK (DO NOT READ)

SECTION C: SYSTEM AFTER WORKSHOP

- Question 10) Was an irrigation controller installed after attending the workshop?
- Yes (CONTINUE TO Q.11)
 - No (GO TO Q.19)
- Question 11) What type of controller was installed? (RECORD TYPE OR DK; CONTINUE TO Q.12)
- Type _____
 - Don't Remember/DK (DO NOT READ)
- Question 12) Did information in the workshop influence your decision on what type of controller you installed? (CONTINUE TO Q.13)
- Yes
 - No
 - Don't Remember/DK (DO NOT READ)
- Question 13) Did information in the workshop help you to decide who would install your system? (CONTINUE TO Q. 14)
- Yes
 - No
 - Don't Remember/DK (DO NOT READ)
- Question 14) Who installed your new controller? Was it: (READ CHOICES; TICK RESPONSE)
- Yourself (CONTINUE TO Q.18)
 - Contractor (CONTINUE TO Q.15)
 - Both (CONTINUE TO Q.15)
 - Don't Remember/DK (DO NOT READ; GO TO Q.18)
- Question 15) Did the information in the workshop help you in hiring and working with a contractor?
- Yes (GO TO Q. 17)
 - No (CONTINUE TO Q. 16)
 - Don't Remember/DK (DO NOT READ; GO TO Q. 17)
- Question 16) What other information would have been helpful to you in hiring and working with a contractor? (RECORD VERBATIM; CONTINUE TO Q17)
- Question 17) Was the contractor you hired certified by the Irrigation Association of British Columbia? (CONTINUE to Q. 18)
- Yes
 - No
 - Don't Remember/DK (DO NOT READ)

SECTION D: IRRIGATION PRACTICES

Question 18) Did you change your scheduling practices based on information from the workshop?
(CONTINUE TO Q.19)

- Yes
- No
- Don't Remember/DK

Question 19) Did information supplied in the workshop persuade you to change other watering practices?

- Yes (CONTINUE TO Q.20)
- No (GO TO Q. 21)
- Don't Remember/DK (DO NOT READ; GO TO Q. 21)

Question 20) What watering practices did you change? (DO NOT PROMPT; RECORD; CONTINUE TO 21)

Question 21) Did you share any of the information you learned in the workshop with others?

- Yes (CONTINUE TO Q. 22)
- No (GO TO Q.24)
- Don't Remember/DK (DO NOT READ; GO TO Q. 24)

Question 22) What information from the workshop did you share? (RECORD VERBATIM; CONTINUE TO Q.23)

Question 23) What prompted you to share the information? (RECORD VERBATIM; CONTINUE Q. 24)
SECTION E – DEMOGRAPHICS

Question 24) Which municipality do you live in? (CONTINUE TO Q. 25)

- Central Saanich
- Colwood
- Esquimalt
- Juan de Fuca Electoral area
- Langford
- Metchosin
- North Saanich
- Oak Bay
- Saanich
- Sidney
- Sooke
- Victoria
- View Royal
- Other (Specify) _____
- Refused (DO NOT READ)

Question 25) What type of dwelling do you live in?

- Single family detached
- Duplex
- Condominium
- Town House
- Other (Specify) _____
- Refused (DO NOT READ)

INTERVIEWER: Thank them for their time and co-operation. Ask if they have any additional comments.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

IRRIGATION EFFECTIVENESS SURVEY

INTERVIEWER: Before each phone call record telephone number being called.

Telephone Number called: _____

Call back needed Person to Ask for: _____
Date(s) to Call: _____
Time(s) to Call: _____

INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT FOR THE INTERVIEWER

Hello my name is _____. I am calling on behalf of the Capital Regional District Environmental Partnerships (formerly CRD Water Services). We are contacting people who participated in the Irrigation Workshop sponsored by the CRD. We are asking for your assistance in evaluating the effectiveness of this workshop in promoting efficient water use. The survey will take about 15 minutes, and all of your responses are confidential.

May I first confirm that you are the person who attended the Irrigation Workshop?

- A. Yes – Original Attendee (PROCEED TO B)
- If respondent says No, ask for the name of the person who attended and if you might speak with him/her. If the correct person comes to the phone repeat introductory statement and PROCEED TO B.
- If the correct person is not available ask when would be a convenient time that you might call back to talk with him/her? (IMMEDIATELY FILL IN CALL BACK INFORMATION ABOVE.) Thank person for call back information and close.
- B. Do you still reside at the same address as when you attended the workshop?
- Yes (PROCEED TO Q.1)
- No - Because the survey contains specific questions about irrigation systems on the property you lived at before attending the workshop, I will not be able to continue with the survey. Thank you for your time. Disconnect.

If the original attendee says **he/she does not wish to complete the survey even at another time**, thank them for their time and close the conversation.

SECTION A: REASON FOR WORKSHOP ATTENDANCE

- Question 1) Which workshop(s) did you attend? (READ CHOICES; TICK RESPONSE; TO Q.2)
- All efficient In-ground system only (large pop-up sprinklers-lawns)
- Micro/drip system only
- Both workshops
- Don't Remember/DK (DO NOT READ)

Question 2) What was your primary reason for attending the workshop(s)? (RECORD VERBATIM; HIGHLIGHT FIRST RESPONSE; CONTINUE TO Q.3)

Question 3) How did you hear about the irrigation workshop(s)? (DO NOT PROMPT; TICK ALL RESPONSES; CONTINUE TO Q. 4)

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> CRD Web site | <input type="checkbox"/> Friends or family |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Newspaper | <input type="checkbox"/> Word of Mouth |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Radio | <input type="checkbox"/> Public presentation/event |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Don't remember/DK (DO NOT READ) | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____ |

SECTION B: PRE-WORKSHOP IRRIGATION SYSTEM(S)

Question 4) Did you have an irrigation system on your property before attending the workshop?

- Yes (CONTINUE TO Q. 5)
- No (MOVE TO Q.13)

Question 5) What type of irrigation system did you have? (READ CHOICES; TICK ALL RESPONSES)

- In-ground system only (CONTINUE TO Q. 6)
- Micro/drip system only (CONTINUE TO Q.6)
- Both types of systems (CONTINUE TO Q.6)
- Other (Please specify) _____ (CONTINUE TO Q.6)
- Don't Remember/DK (DO NOT READ; GO TO Q.21)

Question 6) Was your existing irrigation system changed or modified from information you received at the workshop?

- Yes (CONTINUE TO Q. 7)
- No (MOVE TO Q.21)
- Don't Remember/DK (DO NOT READ; MOVE TO Q.21)

Question 7) What changes or modifications were made? (RECORD VERBATIM; TO Q.8)

Question 8) Did information in the workshop help you to decide who would make your modifications?

- Yes (CONTINUE TO Q.10)
- No (CONTINUE TO Q.10)
- Don't Remember/DK (DO NOT READ; GO TO Q. 21)

Question 9) Who made the changes/modifications? (READ CHOICES; TICK RESPONSE)

- Yourself (CONTINUE TO Q. 21)
- A Contractor (CONTINUE TO Q. 10)
- Both (CONTINUE TO Q. 10)
- Other (specify) _____ (CONTINUE TO Q. 21)
- Don't Remember/DK (DO NOT READ; GO TO Q.21)

Question 10) Did the information provided in the workshop help you in hiring and working with a contractor?

- Yes (CONTINUE TO Q. 12)
- No (CONTINUE TO Q. 11)
- Don't Remember/DK (DO NOT READ; GO TO Q. 21)

Question 11) What other information would have been helpful to you in hiring and working with a contractor? (RECORD VERBATIM; CONTINUE TO Q.12)

Question 12) Was the contractor you hired certified by the Irrigation Association of British Columbia? (CONTINUE to Q. 21)

- Yes
- No
- Don't Remember/DK (DO NOT READ)

SECTION C: SYSTEM AFTER WORKSHOP

Question 13) Was an irrigation system installed after attending the workshop?

- Yes (CONTINUE TO Q.14)
- No (GO TO Q.21)

Question 14) What type or types of irrigation system(s) was installed? (READ CHOICES; TICK ALL RESPONSES; CONTINUE TO Q. 15)

- In-ground system only
- Micro/drip system only
- Both types of systems

Question 15) Did information in the workshop influence your decision on what type of system you Installed? (CONTINUE TO Q.16)

- Yes
- No
- Don't Remember/DK (DO NOT READ)

Question 16) Did information in the workshop help you to decide who would install your system? (CONTINUE TO Q.17)

- Yes
- No
- Don't Remember/DK (DO NOT READ)

Question 17) Who installed your new irrigation system? (READ CHOICES; TICK RESPONSE)

- Yourself (CONTINUE TO Q.21)
- Contractor (CONTINUE TO Q.18)
- Both (CONTINUE TO Q.18)
- Don't Remember/DK (DO NOT READ; GO TO Q. 21)

Question 18) Did the information provided in the workshop help you in hiring and working with a contractor?

- Yes (GO TO Q.20)
- No (CONTINUE TO Q.19)
- Don't Remember/DK (DO NOT READ; GO TO Q. 20)

Question 19) What other information would have been helpful to you in hiring and working with a contractor? (RECORD VERBATIM; CONTINUE TO Q.21)

Question 20) Was the contractor you hired certified by the Irrigation Association of British Columbia? (Continue to Q. 21)

- Yes
- No
- Don't Remember/DK (DO NOT READ)

SECTION D: IRRIGATION PRACTICES

Question 21) What is your irrigation system watering? (READ CHOICES; TICK RESPONSES; CONTINUE TO 22)

- Lawn
- Trees
- Shrubs
- Flower beds
- Vegetable garden
- Other (Specify) _____

Question 22) Did information supplied in the workshop change your watering practices?

- Yes (CONTINUE TO Q. 23)
- No (GO TO Q. 24)
- Don't Remember/DK (DO NOT READ; GO TO Q. 24)

Question 23) Did the workshop specifically influence you to do any of the following? (READ CHOICES; TICK ALL RESPONDENT HAS DONE; CONTINUE TO Q. 24)

- Adjust your water scheduling based on conditions
- Install a rain shut-off device
- Group your plantings according to watering requirements
- Plant native plantings
- Install an irrigation controller
- Assess the health/depth of your soil
- Install a rain gauge
- Conduct regular monthly reviews of your irrigation system
- Convert a portion of or all of an existing in-ground system to micro/drip
- Other (Specify) _____
- Don't Remember/DK (DO NOT READ)

Question 24) Did you share any of the information you learned in the workshop with others?

- Yes (CONTINUE TO Q. 25)
- No (GO TO Q.27)
- Don't Remember/DK (DO NOT READ; GO TO Q.27)

Question 25) What information from the workshop did you share? (RECORD VERBATIM; CONTINUE TO Q. 26)

Question 26) What prompted you to share the information? (RECORD VERBATIM; TO Q. 27)

SECTION E: DEMOGRAPHICS

Question 27) Which municipality do you live in? (CONTINUE TO Q. 28)

- Central Saanich
- Colwood
- Esquimalt
- Juan de Fuca Electoral area
- Langford
- Metchosin
- North Saanich
- Oak Bay
- Saanich
- Sidney
- Sooke
- Victoria
- View Royal
- Other (Specify) _____
- Refused (DO NOT READ)

Question 28) What type of dwelling do you live in?

- Single family detached
- Duplex
- Condominium
- Town House
- Other (Specify) _____
- Refused (DO NOT READ)

INTERVIEWER: Thank them for their time and co-operation. Ask if they have any additional comments.

PROFESSIONAL IRRIGATION EFFECTIVENESS SURVEY

I INTERVIEWER: Before each phone call record telephone number being called.

Telephone Number called: _____

Call back needed Person to Ask for: _____

Date(s) to Call: _____

Time(s) to Call: _____

INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT FOR THE INTERVIEWER

Hello my name is _____. I am calling on behalf of the Capital Regional District Environmental Partnerships (formerly CRD Water Services). We are contacting people who participated in the Certified Irrigation Course sponsored by the CRD. We are asking for your assistance in evaluating the effectiveness of this workshop in promoting efficient water use. The survey will take about 15 minutes, and all of your responses are confidential.

May I first confirm that you are the person who attended a Certified Irrigation course?

A. Yes – Original Attendee (PROCEED TO Q. 1)

➤ If respondent says No, ask for the name of the person who attended and if you might speak with him/her. If the correct person comes to the phone repeat introductory statement and (PROCEED TO Q. 1)

➤ If the correct person is not available ask when would be a convenient time that you might call back to talk with him/her? (IMMEDIATELY FILL IN CALL BACK INFORMATION ABOVE.) Thank person for call back information and close.

If the original attendee says **he/she does not wish to complete the survey even at another time**, thank them for their time and close the conversation.

Question 1) I am going to read a list of the Certified Irrigation Courses that the CRD has sponsored. Will you please indicate which course (s) you attended? (READ LIST; TICK ALL RESPONSES; CONTINUE TO Q.2)

- Certified Irrigation Technician -Level1
- Certified Irrigation Technician- Level 2
- Certified Landscape Irrigation Auditor
- Certified Irrigation Scheduler
- Fundamentals of Design
- Don't Remember/DK (DO NOT READ)

Question 2) I am now going to read a list of reasons you may have had for attending the course (s). Will you please indicate which one was your primary reason for attending the course(s)? (READ LIST; RECORD FIRST RESPONSE ONLY; CONTINUE TO Q.3)

- Job Requirement
- New to industry
- Education
- To improve industry standards
- To fulfill Municipal, City, Specifiers request for bidding jobs
- Clients are asking for certification
- Other (Please specify) _____
- Don't Remember/DK (DO NOT READ)

Question 3) Did you learn a new technique or knowledge from the course(s) (for installation, scheduling or maintenance) that would help the end user reduce water use?

- Yes (CONTINUE TO Q. 4)
- No (SKIP TO Q. 6)

Question 4) Have you applied this new technique or knowledge to your work since taking the course?

- Yes (SKIP to Q. 6)
- No (CONTINUE TO Q.5)

Question 5) Would you please tell me why you have not applied this new technique or knowledge? (DO NOT PROMPT; RECORD RESPONSE VERBATIM; SKIP TO Q. 7)

Question 6) I am now going to read a list of techniques/knowledge you may have applied since taking the course. Will you please indicate which of them, if any, you have used? (READ CHOICES; TICK ALL RESPONSES; CONTINUE TO Q.7)

- New scheduling techniques
- Sprinkler spacing
- Application rates
- Separate zone
- Maintenance improvements
- Other (Please specify) _____
- None
- Don't Remember/DK (DO NOT READ)

- Question 7) Do you leave any technical information behind for the end user?
- Yes (CONTINUE TO Q. 8)
 - No (SKIP TO Q. 9)
- Question 8) I am going to read a list of possible information you may have left behind. Will you please indicate all that apply? (READ ALL CHOICES; TICK ALL RESPONSES; CONTINUE TO Q.9)
- Product literature
 - Controller manuals
 - Contract information
 - Website information
 - CRD literature
 - Other (Please specify) _____
 - Don't Remember/DK (DO NOT READ)
- Question 9) Are you aware that the CRD has outdoor watering saving information available for end users?
- Yes (CONTINUE TO Q. 10)
 - No (SKIP TO Q. 11)
- Question 10) Do you supply this information to end users? (DO NOT READ; TICK RESPONSE; CONTINUE TO Q. 11)
- Yes
 - No
 - Tell end user it is available
 - Don't Remember/DK (DO NOT READ)
- Question 11) I am now going to read a list of types of organizations. Will you please tell me which one most closely describes the organization you currently work for? (READ CHOICES; TICK ONE RESPONSE ONLY)
- City/Town/Municipality
 - School District
 - Irrigation contracting firm
 - Landscape contracting firm
 - University
 - Parks
 - Irrigation Equipment Supplier
 - Other (Please specify) _____
- Question 12) Approximately how many years have you been working full time in irrigation design and installation? (DO NOT READ LIST)
- 1 or less
 - 2-3
 - 4-7
 - 8-10
 - 11-15
 - 16-20
 - More than 20

Question 13) Into which of the following groups does your age fall? (READ LIST)

- Under 25
- 25-35
- 36-49
- 50-64
- 65 and over
- Refused (DO NOT READ)

Question 14) Which of the following best describes the amount of formal education you had the opportunity to complete? (READ LIST)

- Grade school
- Some high school
- Graduated high school
- Some college/university
- Graduated college/university
- Refused (DO NOT READ)

INTERVIEWER: Thank them for their time and co-operation. Ask if they have any additional comments.

APPENDIX C

OUTCOMES SURVEYS ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

- Native Plant Gardens
- Efficient Irrigation Systems
- Irrigation Controller Scheduling

NATIVE PLANT GARDENS

- Very good idea for getting people who just moved here - should be kept up!
- Happy with women who did tours, got nodding onion seed
- Well done, interesting, although already have established garden - if were to start a new garden would plant native
- Excellent, very knowledgeable instructor
- Fantastic, hope continue in future
- Quite well done
- Instructor very good, better than just reading info
- Very good, would go again
- Really enjoyed, people very knowledgeable, thought was good timing to allow to plant what going to do in spring
- Presenters very knowledgeable, a lot of info to absorb, appreciate handouts and seeds
- Very effective and worthwhile
- Really good
- Very interesting, enjoyed plants
- Quite helpful with watering info alongside with native species
- Great to have one that is more advanced
- Very important to bring people back to their surroundings
- Excellent, should continue, if there's every a new/adapted leading edge education opportunities please tell public
- Beginner course & an initial step to creating a native plant garden; loved time outside getting hands-on experience; need info on w/c; workshop expanded
- knowledge as a gardener
- Enjoyed where it was located & how we could walk around; should have follow-up on website so people can ask questions or verify information once
- Great, very informative
- Thoroughly enjoyed it; thought it was very informative
- Informative, enjoyable, knowledgeable
- Very informative
- Informative, good walk around to see plants, although not all were "up" because season
- Very good, a lot to learn, Pat very knowledgeable
- Good
- Would have liked to see samples so could identify better or photographs; gave package of seeds, felt that something more immediate would have provided more incentive
- All speakers were great, very informed
- Great program, shared info with others & encourage others to take
- She was really good; would have liked to put it to practice but local nurseries don't necessarily have local native plants & due to habits she hasn't planted native species
- Really informative; lots of good info; would be interested in it again
- Since workshop 80% of plantings have been native; resources good; presenter really great; should be more advanced class for gardeners who are already fairly aware
- Recommend to anyone, enjoyed both w/c speech by Deborah & thought Pat very enthusiastic & knowledgeable; overall great workshop
- Thought good info but would like to have more specific info that would help her with her yard
- Lots of info; lawn go brown this summer; use gauge
- Went twice, found it very interesting; wanted to learn more about water conservation & drought tolerant species
- Very good
- Excellent - there should be more opportunities like it
- Useful & enjoyed very much
- Very worthwhile

- Enjoyed it; lots of information - too much?
- Found workshop very, very helpful; lady before (Deborah) spoke very well about w/c; well done
- Great idea
- Enjoyable, lots of info, presenter very well informed
- Well worth it
- Appreciated it & how it was developed for community
- Thought it was great; appreciated it being offered
- Excellent - really enjoyed it
- Thought teacher good presenter & very knowledgeable; would take more classes along those lines
- Great - lots of info
- Should continue, very worthwhile; impressed
- Thought very good intro; would like additional/more advanced course for people who would like to take it to the next level
- Very nice to teach people how to beautify garden w/ n/p; n/p can be aesthetic tool & are meant to be here
- Thought Pat was great in teaching healthy gardening practices; hope district never stops workshop
- Great workshop - day of fun; very informative
- Very informative & good - I've had changes as result
- Really excellent
- Found it interesting; thought very good starting point but did further research when applying to own property
- Pat incredibly good
- Slides/identification slides were great; went in March so hard to identify plants outside that weren't in bloom; great course; learned a lot
- Thought interesting & well presented
- Thought really good; like walking in garden & asking questions
- Very informative; liked it
- Very good people/location; lots of info
- Like it; very long, extensive
- Very pleased with it
- Really enjoyed it; would go again
- Great workshop & instructor; very effective/inspiring presentation about water by CRD (Deborah)
- Enjoyed it - liked Carol

EFFICIENT IRRIGATION SYSTEMS

- Good workshop
- Very good
- Liked it; well presented; good info
- Really good; told others
- Good job; well-done intro
- Very comprehensive; great job by speaker
- Well organized; good speaker; excellent; great that CRD puts on workshops
- Really well thought out and done; covered a lot; no negative comments
- Not much reference to vegetable garden irrigation
- Excellent that it was provided as free, especially as results won't be seen for long time
- Helpful but info bit too mathematical/scientific (charts/calculations) but overall useful
- Wonderful seminar; nice that it's free; tons of info; would recommend to others
- Very good
- Very good; could have been longer; would have liked more visual presentation
- Good workshop; would recommend to anyone
- Really happy with course; would like to come back for micro-drip
- Very impressed by presenter, very patient & good for answering questions
- Decided not to have garden at all
- Wonderful course; very information; would recommend
- Great workshop, organized, informative, helpful
- Wasn't very effective; not interested in any other workshops
- Workshop was very helpful
- Really good, thorough
- Very information; lots of knowledge to gain
- Great workshop; very informative, well put together
- Very beneficial
- Good; Deborah was very effective, enjoyed her speech
- Good
- Very instructive & worthwhile
- Great
- Good idea
- About to install micro-drip
- Very useful
- Great workshop
- Seemed to be geared towards promoting that particular contractor and their business
- Very mindful of water, economic & water efficiency; helpful; should do lots of them
- Worthwhile; also like info on website
- Informative/worthwhile; info was very technical, wanted more how to be most efficient rather than putting in full system
- Should happen every year; suggest starting in winter when people starting to plan
- Wonderful
- Best thing ever did; instructor came out and gave advice free-of-charge
- Enjoyed it
- Useful; have moved since but still own home; will be attending workshops again when putting in new system
- Micro-drip didn't work as good as it should & had to change head; price was right; good info
- Suggestions were quite expensive for general homeowner; too complicated of a project to commit to
- Given complexity of systems where is line between contractor vs. do-it-yourself; would have liked to know what someone capable of doing themselves & building on that, & then be clear about what can't be done

- Instructor was outstanding; micro-drip resulted in discontinued use and now never
- Very good
- Good; will attend again when getting system installed
- Enjoyed it
- It was good; more detail (technical) than needed
- It was good thing; presenter very knowledgeable; manual very helpful
- Keep it up
- Good workshop; lots of good info
- Keep workshops going
- Too long ago to remember
- It was great; connect with great resources
- Very worthwhile; everyone should take
- Good overview
- Very good
- Valuable
- Good workshop; liked samples
- Keep up good work; nice that CRD has workshops available; would like to attend others
- Well presented
- Haven't installed yet but plan to; found workshop very informative
- Will get system when have money
- Very pleased
- It was fine
- Really good; lots of info; worked well with my garden plans
- Great workshop; helped me conserve water
- Workshop good idea, really helpful; acted on knowledge learned; cut down on watering
- Be careful with sharing info about m/d because they can be plugged sometimes quite easily therefore, CRD Water promote filters and maintenance of m/d systems
- Very useful for people who don't know how to use system; had just moved in and didn't understand existing irrigation controller
- Too prolonged; didn't help with where to go to buy, how to arrange for specialist; theoretical knowledge only; not enough info
- Would like one about fixing/modifying; where to go for parts, how to fix not included in workshop
- More free workshops available for public
- Liked that it was free; info useful
- Quite useful; like CRD workshops
- Good workshop; gave confidence to install system
- Would like to take more workshops
- Was great
- Extremely good
- Without workshop wouldn't have known where to start; still refer to handout material
- Really helpful workshop; instructor was excellent
- Good for what it was but didn't seem to be what was looking for
- Thank you - good idea to take course
- Very useful; enjoyed it & learned a lot
- Little too complicated for people who know nothing about irrigation; more scenario questions/answers; more hands-on would be helpful
- Keep it up
- Very thorough; can't remember it that well; terrific
- Helpful; thought m/d (even bought system) but never installed as though planting drought resistant was better idea
- Well done; recommend to others
- Very good; presenter very well informed; appreciated list of certified professionals
- Answered important questions

- Thoroughly enjoyed it
- Good idea; hope more people attend them in future
- Bought book
- Great workshop
- Very useful
- Karen was great
- Should be required for everyone
- Came away feeling like learned a lot; presenter was very good & informed
- Could have gotten more info on types of heads (short watering 2-3')
- Great; highly recommend
- Totally satisfied with workshop
- Workshop geared towards promoting one particular company which is not appropriate; thought/questioned why promoting one private co & its irrigation sales
- Nice to have someone guide through procedure
- Very good & informative; hand water everything
- Quite helpful; well presented; help to know getting an irrigation system may be good idea in future
- Great; very informative
- Keep it up
- Guy was good; got all stuff from their company
- Very interesting & happy with workshop
- Good
- Quite interesting
- Very worthwhile, helpful, thorough; liked binder; didn't work for our situation
- Workshop didn't cover native plants, soil
- Disappointed because didn't design irrigation/flowers all along property; not being watered properly; just hand water now
- Would recommend continuing workshops; extremely useful & valuable; glad to have taken it before dealing with contractor; presenters very knowledgeable & helpful
- Educating people very important, CRD doing great job; good job teaching about w/c; perhaps little section on water chemistry for those on weirs like where to get analysis done
- Great
- Very well done; lots of info; people from industry good
- Look forward to next year - will come with my wife next time
- Very useful, helpful; CRD should continue funding
- Enjoyed workshops
- On a farm/well and didn't find workshop applicable to situation
- Workshop reason installed m/d; Karen absolutely incredible; additional benefit weed control
- Quite interesting
- Very good
- Want to take again
- Good & informative
- Excellent
- Interesting and informative
- Very appreciative of workshop; going again, next need to know how to maintain system
- Thanks CRD; took tour of water supply & loved it
- Good workshop, really interesting
- Excellent; haven't yet installed but will
- Very enjoyable
- Have system but not working - decided not to fix as letting lawn go golden
- Well presented; speaker knowledgeable; info helpful; venue excellent
- Was long
- Had single meter turned into dual meter; great, enjoyed workshop; thought was weird to call a year after the fact.

- Good info; didn't feel like could do myself will take course at Camosun
- Husband who took workshop passed away 2 years ago
- Very good, would like to happen again

IRRIGATION CONTROLLER SCHEDULING

- Didn't make sense to me because didn't already have system; should have specified that course was catered to those already having system; will take again now that installed system
- Really learned a lot
- Very worthwhile and enjoyable
- Really enjoyed it
- Thought it was very informative
- Good idea for people to conserve; a bit complicated
- Need to advertise more - mass mailing to Stratas
- Thought it was good that information available to public
- Instructor was extremely knowledgeable and interested in making a difference for watering practices
- Anybody who has sprinkler system should go to workshop
- Good general info
- Manual useful; work for home depot, saw systems for sale, took interest
- Good for a complicated subject
- Well handled; didn't tell how to water specific areas; advertisement unclear
- Helpful; things to think about; would attend again before upgrading system
- Appreciate it; useful
- Very useful; glad I came
- Workshop better if been able to install system; couldn't do anything with info given
- Good idea
- Very helpful/interesting; long time ago; positive experience
- Enjoyed it; would go again
- Very well planned out; good info; took away lots - how timer worked, potential for adjustment; enjoyed it
- Useful workshop; appreciated it
- Very helpful with system; glad went; would recommend to others
- Excellent workshop; very satisfactory
- Don't stop workshops; so important for education; speaker very approachable, easy to understand, good at responding to questions;
- Focused on audience, clear and customer driven
- Informative; worth attending
- Did learn a few things; pamphlets helped
- Karen was very knowledgeable; presented in easy-to-understand, fun style; seems to really enjoy her work
- Interesting & informative; recommend it; great course
- Controller workshop extremely effective; lots of knowledge gained; also get information on other parts of system; very please & supportive of program
- Very pleased with presentation; presenter's knowledgeable, helpful
- Magnet given is handy to see watering times
- Appreciate it; confirmed what already knew and learned something new; liked handouts, especially watering gauge
- After workshop liked it so much went to in-ground irrigation workshop & loved it; looking forward to going to all efficient irrigation workshop
- Very useful; recommend others to go
- Good training; nice gathering
- Enjoyed workshop; like learning; affected habits; people were outstanding; didn't like to see it end
- Very good; interesting; kept our interest; good speaker; made us pay attention and listen
- Quite good; learned something
- Excellent
- Quite happy, works well

- It was good
- Thought it would be helpful, maybe using less water because of the inch a week (but they water less than that)
- Excellent presenters; enjoyed public questions, good handout
- Thought workshop great, should keep it going; use rain gauges, very helpful; well worth time & would suggest to others, especially people who are unfamiliar with systems
- Good value
- Pleased it was available
- Good but more specifics about certain controllers
- Really useful
- Good workshop
- Was useful; good starting point; too far back to remember
- Great
- Found it very informative; asked a lot of questions; like to see in the future
- Good, probably do another one
- Good workshop, very helpful; thought maybe more geared towards water conservation than how to actually use controller
- Positive
- Good
- Keep it up; put ads in water bills
- Got a lot out of it; would go again
- Interesting - glad went
- Many contractors that were at workshop asked questions of installation which was not helpful to us since we already had installed; would of liked to see more homeowner maintenance focus
- Got a lot out of it
- Well done; needed info
- Excellent workshop; should advertise it covers beginner to expert levels; also attended NPW and is going to sign up for Designer;
- Pat & Karen were excellent

PROFESSIONAL IRRIGATION CERTIFICATION

- Great Course, liked that the CRD sponsored the courses- made the boss more likely to send off his employees.
- Be nice to see more drip and micro in the industry
- So many people in the industry ; lots of problems and mistakes; think courses very important to help regulate the industry – has 9 employees all take courses
- Of all courses I have taken the one that affected the most efficient water use is the auditor course.
- Tests are not appropriate for the courses. Courses have improved over the years.
- Highly recommend, thought courses were great; always something new to learn
- A lot of information; very interesting course
- Please offer workshops in the fall and winter. Having the workshops running in the slow winter months will increase enrolment