



**COMMUNITY
GARDEN
NETWORK**

GROW SDG AND CORNWALL

Evaluation Report 2017

March 16, 2018

Prepared by
Philip Groff, Ph.D.
Sustain Ontario

With Support from:

**Social Development Council
of Cornwall & area**
"building stronger communities"



**Conseil de développement social
de Cornwall et de la région**
"renforcer les communautés"

Ontario
Trillium
Foundation



Fondation
Trillium
de l'Ontario

An agency of the Government of Ontario.
Un organisme du gouvernement de l'Ontario.

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	1
Introduction and Background	2
Scope and Methodology	3
Results	4
Document Review	4
CGN Member Interviews	5
Micro-Grant Recipient Interviews	8
Discussion and Recommendations	10
Assessment of the Project Goals	10
Connecting and empowering residents to work together	10
Enhancing existing efforts	10
Optimizing limited resources	11
Celebrating the community garden programs in the region	11
Recommendations	11
APPENDICES	13
APPENDIX A - CGN Member Interview Questions	13
APPENDIX B - CGN Micro-Grant Recipient Interview Questions	14
APPENDIX C - Brief Summary/Results of Incredible Edibles QUESTIONNAIRE	15
APPENDIX D - Seedy Saturday 2017 Door Prize Survey Results	16
APPENDIX E - “Where Does Your Garden Grow” Maps	18

Introduction and Background

In 2016, an application was made by the Social Development Council of Cornwall and Area to the Ontario Trillium Foundation, for a Seed Grant. The project description from that application was “Delivering a project at the idea or conceptual stage with a \$39,800 grant over 11 months to hire a part-time garden network coordinator to formalize a Community Garden Network Initiative. Building Inclusive and engaged communities together, this initiative is helping diverse groups work together to improve community life, and has an impact on the lives of 520 people in the community.” According to the project brief:

The purpose of our project is formalize a Community Garden Network for Cornwall and Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry Counties (SDG) as a means of connecting and empower residents to work together, enhancing existing efforts, optimize our limited resources, and celebrating the community garden programs in our region. In an area struggling with poverty and food insecurity, we consider these four objectives central to building a more resilient, inclusive, and solution focused community.

Designed as an inclusive community initiative, this project will invite and encourage membership from a wide range of stakeholders including community health workers, municipal staff, business owners, farmers, horticultural society members, senior citizens, women and new mothers, children and youth participating in school after-school garden programs, aboriginals working with traditional food and planting, faith-based group members, food bank gardeners, francophones and other language communities, new Canadians, grass-roots organizations, and non-affiliated residents. Leadership will be shared; however, the project objectives will be facilitated by a garden network coordinator.

The grant application was successful, and the Community Garden Network (CGN) operated from February 22, 2017 through February 21, 2018 in collaboration with local NGO, All Things Food. Kat Rendek of All Things Food, was seconded as the part-time CGN coordinator. As noted above, there were four key goals of this initiative:

1. Connecting and empowering residents to work together;
2. Enhancing existing efforts;
3. Optimizing limited resources; and
4. Celebrating the community garden programs in region.

In February 2017, All Things Food contacted Sustain Ontario about assisting with this evaluation, and a formal contract was signed between the Social Development Council of Cornwall and Area and Sustain Ontario, to formalize this relationship. The executive director of Sustain Ontario, Dr. Philip Groff, a credentialed evaluator with the Canadian Evaluation Society, undertook this contract.

Scope and Methodology

Given the pilot nature of the CGN initiative, and the tight timeframes for the evaluation, a modest scope of evaluation was decided upon. A case-study approach would be undertaken by Dr. Groff making use of three principal sources of data: a review of the primary and secondary documentation of this project, as well as two sets of key informant interviews, conducted by Dr. Groff in late February and Early March of 2018.

Primary documents for the project were reviewed. These included, the initial application for a seed grant made to the Ontario Trillium Foundation in September 2016 by the Social Development Council of Cornwall and Area (SD98099), the financial workbook submitted as a budget with this application, as well as records of actual expenses listed against the budget, the list of Community Garden Network members, the agenda and minutes of all CGN meetings, the final email to the CGN dated February 17, 2018, and the copies of evaluation results from the Incredible Edibles, and Seedy Saturday events. Secondary documentation reviewed included the CGN Project Brief and a document entitled Additional Notes and Reflections prepared by CGN Project Coordinator Kat Rendeck as part of the briefing for this evaluation.

Semi-Structured Key Informant Interviews were conducted by telephone with fourteen (14) of the twenty-five (25) listed members of the Community Gardening Network. Invitations were distributed by e-mailed to all listed members, and interviews scheduled with those that responded. This must, therefore be considered a convenience sample with all the usual caveats attending self-selection of respondents. However, it should be noted that during the qualitative analysis of the responses we did reach saturation. The interview questions can be found in Appendix A. Responses were analyzed from notes taken by the evaluator during the interviews, which were not recorded. Analysis was mixed methods, primarily qualitative in nature.

Semi-Structured Key Informant Interviews were conducted by telephone with ten (10) of the eleven (11) recipient of micro-grants from the CGN. These ten represented the recipients of fifteen (15) of the sixteen (16) grants distributed during this past year. This can thus be taken to be a representative sample of the population. It should be noted that during the qualitative analysis of the responses we did reach saturation. The interview questions can be found in the Appendix B. Responses were analyzed from notes taken by the evaluator during the interviews, which were not recorded. Analysis was mixed methods, primarily qualitative in nature.

Results

Document Review

The application to the Ontario Trillium Foundation was reviewed for indication of the primary intended outcomes of the CGN project. A list of proposed activities and anticipated deliverables was found, but in the end, it was determined that a more meaningful framework for this case study could be found in the four goals outlined in the project brief, namely:

1. Connecting and empowering residents to work together;
2. Enhancing existing efforts;
3. Optimizing limited resources; and
4. Celebrating the community garden programs in region.

Accordingly the CGN member interviews were constructed around these goals, and the overall structure of this discussion and recommendations section of this report will likewise follow this framework.

A review of the Financial Workbook for this project, with approved OTF budget set against actual expenditures was undertaken. The documentation suggests that the project coordinator was exercising proper fiduciary diligence and that the project funds were all used appropriately, and in line with the stated budget. In addition to the overall budget v. actuals report, the evaluator was also presented with documentation tracking in-kind contributions, volunteer hours, and a detailed list of “equipment” purchased, in this case the recipients of an innovative micro-granting initiative that was part of the CGN plans. A necessary caveat to this review was that it should by no means be taken to constitute a financial audit, nor should the opinions of this evaluator be taken as equivalent to those of an accountant. No attempt was made to test or validate the expense claims against receipts, bank reconciliations, etc.

A review of the list of the 25 members, the agendas and minutes of the three meetings of the Community Garden Network revealed a number of interesting points. First, the overall makeup of the the CGN was quite diverse, this must be tempered somewhat by the fact that both the minutes, as well as the interview with members indicate that not all those nominally part of the CGN were regular or active members. Some attended only the foundational or some later meeting, and some attended no meetings at all, maintaining contact through a variety of channels. In the end, only 15 of the CGN members attended at least one in-person meeting. This could be seen as detrimental to the functioning of the network, but in reality is endemic to broad-based community mobilization efforts, particularly in their first year(s) of operation. The network coordinator made effort to accommodate the differing availability of network members by scheduling meetings at different times of day, and in one case running the same meeting twice, for two different sets of participants, once in the daytime and once in the evening. Additionally, all but two of the CGN members were regularly responsive to email contact by the

coordinator, and additionally, 22 members requested and/or participated in small group meetings or call facilitated by the network coordinator.

While the evaluation reports of the two events, Incredible Edibles and Seedy Saturday were reviewed, their results were sufficiently specific to those events to not bear repeating in this document. It should be noted that documentation from both these events suggest that they were well attended, and well received by the community members who attended. Specific results from the evaluation of those events will be referenced as appropriate, in the remainder of this document. The full results of the Incredible Edibles Questionnaire can be found in Appendix C, and the tabulated results of the Seedy Saturday survey can be found in Appendix D.

Finally, one unique evaluation document received from the organizers of the Incredible Edibles event were images of maps (one city, one regional) that were displayed at the event, on which community members were encouraged to indicate the location of community gardens with a red sticky dot. The intention is for this map to be maintained in subsequent years, with different coloured dots used at each years event. This allows for a low-tech approach to geo-locating gardening efforts, and tracking their growth and spread across years. While this tool will really only become useful as multiple years of information are overlain on the map, the two images are provided in Appendix E, as a benchmark.

CGN Member Interviews

The fourteen (14) interviewees represented a diverse cross-section of CGN membership. There were those involved directly in community gardening projects ranging from community centres, health care facilities, church lands and community housing. There were also members not directly involved in provision of community gardens from local business owners, to not for profit management and staff, to simply concerned citizens with an interest in local affairs. Degree of involvement in the CGN ranged from those who attended every meeting, through those who kept involved via emails and other communications, to those who may have been involved in founding the network and had little contact since.

When asked what the main impact of the community garden network was over the past year, twelve (12) respondents emphasized a positive impact, one (1) respondent gave a neutral impact, and one (1) respondent declared their lack of awareness of the impact, if any. Positive impacts stressed the importance of community building and networking; knowledge translation and sharing; fostering awareness of in the community; building on existing capacity - particularly through support of ongoing activities such as Incredible Edibles, and Seedy Saturday; and empowerment of newer projects to make good decisions. The neutral response suggested that the CGN itself didn't have a lot of impact due to focus on process rather than outcomes, though it should be stressed that this respondent was one that had only limited contact with the CGN after it was founded. Finally, the respondent who said that they didn't know what impact the CGN had, still noted that the idea of community gardening is definitely spreading through the area, and that the CGN had had some involvement with new garden initiatives.

When asked if the community garden network had been a useful project in the region, eleven (11) respondents said yes, and one (1) said maybe not. Of those answering in the affirmative the most commonly used word was “absolutely” with reasons being given ranging from the importance of specific contacts made; the importance of the issues of food security and food literacy; individual skills built or knowledge acquired, with most giving examples related to their personal benefit, and a few the benefit to the community. The individual who said maybe not, argued that a greater emphasis should be placed on establishing new gardens, and that that could be easily accomplished by a dedicated team of volunteers, in an afternoon or so, per garden. It should be noted, that contra this point, one individual noted that the greatest benefit of the network was facilitating their decision not to plant a garden at this time, as they lacked sufficient resources to ensure it’s longer-term sustainability, and reasoned that it was better to not start such a project before they were ready, than to start and have it fail.

When asked which of the four stated goals of the CGN had been accomplished best, the vast majority (12) chose *Connecting and Empowering Residents*, while one (1) person each selected *Optimizing Limited Resources*, and *Enhancing Existing Efforts*. Interestingly, no-one chose *Celebrating the Community Garden Programs in the Region*. While the majority was clear, it should be noted that a small subset of that twelve (12) also suggested an affinity for one of the other goals, as a “close second” to *Connecting and Empowering Residents* and these tended to suggest *Optimizing Limited Resources*. When asked for examples, the twelve respondents mentioned such factors as the diversity of speakers and participants throughout the region, and the ability to make necessary connections for the sharing of knowledge and resources.

When asked which of the four goals was least well accomplished, fifty percent (7) of the respondents chose *Celebrating the Community Garden Programs in the Region*, while three (3) chose *Enhancing Existing Efforts*, and two (2) chose *Optimizing Limited Resources*. Two declined to choose, giving alternative responses: “I think at a certain level, all this has happened. We were doing some of it before, but the CGN was to get more people on the same page for sustainability,” and “I don’t know. We had come up with some ideas for the city to become involved but not sure we celebrated too much. Community work is slow work. It takes time to convince politicians of value.” It should also be noted that one of the seven (7) who chose *Celebrating the Community Garden Programs in the Region* said that it was potentially a toss up between that choice and *Connecting and Empowering Residents*, because: “Celebrating the community gardens was probably least well done, but while the connecting between the community gardens happened but it didn’t really have much impact on empowering others to work together.” When asked to elaborate or give examples, it was suggested that many efforts had not come to fruition after one year and thus celebration would have been premature, that much of the effort of the CGN was Cornwall-centric, that there has been too little awareness raised in the general populace, and that it was never clear that celebration was an intended goal of the project. One clear statement in relation to the choice of *Enhancing Existing Efforts* was:

“The effort to carry on these programs and expand on them, needs to come from more than anyone network can provide. It’s dependent on the residents, gardeners,

community members in general. While the CGN did what they could, the onus remains on the individual programs to sustain themselves. In many cases, individual gardeners were unable or unwilling to self-regulate or provide self-governance. The CGN built some dependence on the network, which hampered self-sustainability somewhat.”

When asked which of the four goals they would have liked to have seen more emphasis on, or would like to see more emphasis on in the future, the results were much more mixed. Two (2) respondents chose *Connecting and Empowering Residents*, three (3) chose *Enhancing Existing Efforts*, five (5) chose *Optimizing Limited Resources*, and four (4) chose *Celebrating the Community Garden Programs in the Region*. It should be noted that one each of those choosing the last two goals, stressed the intimate connection between their chosen goal, and the first one, saying “Number one and three are very connected. Number three is probably the highest priority. It’s where we have the best potential effect.” and “Celebrating leading to Connecting,” respectively. When asked to elaborate on their choices, various responses stressed such issues as the large size of the region making connections and equitable representation difficult, the need to focus on sustainability, different issues in rural and urban areas (funds and space respectively), and lack of political will at the municipal level requiring greater engagement, “Municipal government doesn’t really see the value and importance of this. Need to find a way to better connect with municipal decision makers, so that they would choose to fund / put some effort behind this. Perhaps a group of municipalities could hire a coordinator to continue this work. It’s still somewhat fringe in the community.” Despite these concerns, many also chose this opportunity to again focus on what had been accomplished, such as the good start on getting folks connected, the important networking and information sharing that had taken place, and the spin off benefits, such as the Kinsmen Farmers’ Market connection. Other respondents took this opportunity to offer concrete suggestions, such as more micro-granting perhaps tied to outcomes in the future, improved communication of existing assets in the region such as a swap site, and further promotion of free or low cost resources in the region that could be sourced centrally and then shared such as a compost or seed sharing network. Finally, several respondents stressed the importance of coordination for ongoing sustainability, the need for members to take greater ownership, “It’s up to us to step up and do this,” and the fact that there in clearly existing demand.

When asked if, based on their experience, they would recommend others in the region join the CGN, the vast majority (13) said yes, while only one (1) said no. It should be noted that the responses likely reflected a diversity of understanding about what joining might entail. For example the individual who said “no”, clarified that they meant, “Not in my immediate area unless they need information. As a resource it’s amazing. But going to meetings for folks from [my] county doesn’t make sense.” Similarly, among those who said yes, many clarified that different levels of engagement were appropriate for those with different needs. For example, “I think anybody who is assigned to develop gardens would do well to be on the network. However, there’s a limited number of laymen we can take on,” or “It has a limited capacity. But for those with an interest in gardening this is the sort of thing that could really help build capacity--particularly for smaller projects.” The largest group of positive responders

underscored the value of increased involvement, the introduction of new blood and the increase in awareness as all being crucial for long-term sustainability.

The final, open-ended, question asked was whether there was anything else they would like to share with the organizers of the CGN? While some (3) said no, perhaps daunted by the open-ended nature of the question, the majority chose to express their gratitude for the project, and their hope that it would continue in some form or another, going forward. Some offered concrete suggestions for what that might look like, such as “Focus more on results than process,” “Figure out who your target market is,” “I’d like to see some linkages to cooking and other food literacy programs. For example, teaching folks all the things you can do with a bushel of apples before you end up composting anything,” and “I really want to stress the value of the data collection piece through the micro-grant process. It was extremely valuable and easy to do.” Many expressed their hopes that the community gardening movement would continue to grow in the region, as they felt it represented an important change, “Love that we’re changing mentality, and social norms. Gardens in front of fire station and city hall don’t just have to be pretty, they can be functional,” or “SDG and Cornwall are not known for their collaborative work, like this, she helped us get started.” The she, referred to in the previous quotation was Kat Rendek, the coordinator of the Community Garden Network, who was individually singled out for thanks and praise by a number of respondents. Finally, there was general agreement that the time was right for redoubling of efforts, “It’s trendy now, but the faster we can get gardens up and going, the better. The rest will follow.”

Micro-Grant Recipient Interviews

Interviews were conducted with ten (10) of the eleven (11) recipient of micro-grants from the CGN. These ten represented the recipients of fifteen (15) of the sixteen (16) grants distributed during this past year. Most individual respondents were from organizations receiving one of the grants, while two had received two, and one had received four. All but one grant were for \$200, with the exception being \$136.90, which was one of the grants received by the organization that received four. Grants were intended to fund a wide range of activities from village beautification, skill building workshops, community awareness events, children’s activities as community events, to specific garden improvements such as repairing the roof for a garden shed, or building raised beds and procuring mulch, manure and seeds.

When asked if receiving the micro-grant(s) allowed them to accomplish anything they otherwise wouldn’t have, all but one recipient stressed the importance of receiving the grants. The one that responded negatively suggested that the lateness of the application process, post prime gardening season, and the subsequent lateness of receiving funds (not yet received at the time of this interview) precluded as much benefit as possible. Others noted that while the activities funded may have occurred even without the grants, the receipt of the grants allowed them to do more, and have greater impact with limited resources than would have been otherwise possible, for example, “It will allow us to have fresh herbs in the soup kitchen throughout the summer. We use herbs every day. Not having to buy fresh herbs will help tremendously with the budget.”

Some recipients noted additional, unintended benefits of this program, for example, “The money itself was a springboard for community voluntarism. After announcing grant, other things started to happen. Someone offered a tiller to help. A local hardware proprietor offered lumber and materials for building the raised beds, and helping with the labour.”

When asked if there was any way the micro-grant program could have helped you better accomplish what you wanted, a third of the respondents said there was not, as the application process was very clear and easy to follow, and the grants were very flexible in terms of allowable use. Others indicated that additional money would always help, as there are always projects in mind or on the go that could make good use of this support. It’s noteworthy that at least one participant who responded this way, nonetheless, suggested that, “The amount that was available to us was substantial and sufficient for our needs.” One respondent noted that the process would have been improved by taking place earlier in the year, and with increased publicity, and increased opportunity by the CGN to help shape the grants.

When asked if the Community Garden Network micro-grant program was a useful project to launch in your region, the vast majority of those that responded ($\frac{7}{8}$) was positive. The most commonly used word was “absolutely.” One of those who responded positively did note that they had been expecting more. Another indicated that in addition to the grant, they would like to hear more about who else received them, as a way of further promoting community garden efforts to the public. Finally, the sole negative response says that they never heard anything further about these grants for a long time after the initial meeting where they were announced.

The participants were next asked, “If the CGN were to run the micro-grant program again in the future, is there anything they should do differently?” Three (3) commented that the process this year was good, with the grants very easy to apply for. The other five (5) respondents to this question made concrete suggestions for future projects, including increased promotion and a greater lead time (4), increased amounts of money, perhaps contingent upon demonstrating success with an initial small investment (1), and more targeted grants based on an initial environmental scan of community needs (1). One recipient included all three of these points, quite eloquently, “Perhaps for us, we would have liked a greater heads up to enable time to really assess what we might have asked for. Of course, the amount available has more impact than the time available. Once we knew the potential size of the grant we knew immediate what we’d use it for.”

When asked if they would apply again if a micro-grant program were to be run in future, all but one said yes. The single negative response came from an individual who feels cut-off from the community garden network, and thus likely ineligible for future funding. Even among the positive responses, however, several suggested the need to evaluate how well the funding had been used this year. As no funds had been disbursed yet at the time of the writing of this report, such an assessment is beyond the scope of this current evaluation.

Finally, participants were asked an open-ended question, to share anything else they wished with the organizers of the Community Garden Network, in reference to the micro-grant program.

Five respondents wanted to stress their gratitude for this program, and the assistance this funding provided, for example “It’s important that the organizers realize just how much these small grants help in small communities,” and “Emphasize the creativity of this approach--a local grant for local people.” Other responses made suggestions about the program including: the need to focus efforts more specifically on meeting the expanding demand for plots of land, the need to continue developing rapport between members of the CGN and the community, to share reports on what’s been accomplished with the funds, and in general to better promote the work of the CGN, “I wasn’t aware of the SDG CGN. Heard of the grant through the grapevine. Would love someone (e.g. All Things Food) to follow up with us, and maybe give a presentation.” One respondent indicated the need for improved communication throughout the process, “A whole growing season later, there had been no communications? Grants only go out in October, long after garden season. We hear nothing about our application until last week. It feels like nothing carried through.” Two individuals referenced Kat Rendek, coordinator of the CGN by name, in their responses, “Presentation by Kat Rendak was really tight in April last year,” and “Kat was fantastic, her flexibility in hours was really helpful.”

Discussion and Recommendations

Assessment of the Project Goals

As noted above, the overall structure for this case-study was based on the four stated goals from the Project Brief, of the Ontario Trillium Foundation Seed Grant proposal.

Connecting and empowering residents to work together

- The membership of the CGN was diverse and at least nominally representative of the region, and the range of potential stakeholders.
- Nearly everyone interviewed agreed that this was what was done best by the CGN over the past year.
- Notwithstanding the above, many also commented that this should be either directly or indirectly an area of increased focus for future activity. This was attributed to scale and diversity in the region, as well as diversity in the types of stakeholders.
- It was also acknowledged that it is difficult to get a large group together, and to accommodate diverse needs, and thus any future efforts must also recognize that there will be differing levels of involvement and that this should be seen as a feature not a bug.

Enhancing existing efforts

- Document review indicates that the CGN and in particular the coordinator, was involved in various local, pre-existing events such as Seedy Saturday and Incredible Edibles.

- Interviews indicated that the CGN was supportive of new and existing community garden sites, through networking and information sharing activities, particularly in small groups.
- Despite these efforts, many identified the need for increased attention to this priority, while acknowledging that a lot was accomplished in one year of operation.
- The micro-grant initiative was hailed by all recipients as an important support for ongoing efforts.

Optimizing limited resources

- This was not identified by any of the interviewees as being done either particularly well or particularly poorly. Perhaps this is because it is so implicit in the community work in question. One recipient commented that optimizing limited resources is practically the definition of community gardening.
- On the other hand, the fact that so much was accomplished in just one year with very modest investment from the Ontario Trillium Foundation, plus the in kind contributions of partners, indicates that this goal was baked into the very DNA of the project. The fact that it remained largely invisible to the key stakeholders is perhaps the best evidence that such stewardship was well in hand.
- Again, as noted above, the micro-grant initiative was well received and demonstrated the potential impact for community mobilization of even very modest sums.

Celebrating the community garden programs in the region

- This was almost universally identified as the goal that was least well achieved. However, it must be noted that many who did so also acknowledged that they were unaware that this was a goal of the project.
- Several of the involvements of the CGN and the project coordinator in local events could be seen as important first steps to this goal. In particular the mapping conducted at the Incredible Edibles event (see Appendix E) could be the start of a way to acknowledge and thus celebrate the growth of gardening throughout the region.
- Finally, while there is evidence of growth in several of the local events, held in 2017 over previous years, it was nonetheless identified by several key informant in response to several different questions, that one area of potential shortfalling was in public relations, and awareness raising of the CGN, and the community garden movement in the region. Again, this was partly attributed by respondents to the vast geographic size, and diverse nature of the communities in the catchment area.

Recommendations

- The work of the CGN is just getting started. Every effort should be made to ensure that the momentum generated over the past year is not lost.
- A complex, community based initiative like the CGN requires staff time to coordinate all the diverse sets of volunteers and other stakeholders. The Social Development Council

of Cornwall and Area, potentially in concert with All Things Food, should make hiring of a network coordinator a priority for this year's fund development efforts.

- Government relations efforts should be directed to increase awareness of community gardening as an answer to local challenges in food security and food literacy. Advocacy efforts are needed to encourage cross-municipal, region-wide support of CGN efforts--perhaps including funding or seconding the coordinator staff position.
- The Micro-grant process was very successful at supporting small local efforts with very modest resources. An effort should be made to ensure that this project can be undertaken again in 2018, with the following refinements--an earlier intake period to allow impacts in the 2018 growing season, greater publicity of the opportunity (both prior to intake and in celebration of impacts), and finally for the future, a tiered process should be considered where projects or organizations that have made good use of small micro-grants could become eligible for larger grants.
- The garden maps (see Appendix E) should be maintained year over year, to chart the growth and spread of the community gardening movement across the region. It should also be used as a planning tool for prioritizing areas for increased attention within the region. While the tactile, paper map is a very good item to have on hand at events, it is crucial that this data be preserved in a more durable, and ultimately usable manner--for example, translated into Google Maps or other readily available tools. This might make a good summer student, or geography student intern, project.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A - CGN Member Interview Questions

Interviewee:

Date and Time:

1. Please describe your involvement or connection with the Community Garden Network.
2. What would you say was the main impact of the Community Garden Network over the past year?
3. Would you say that the Community Garden Network was a useful project to launch in your region? Why or why not?
4. The CGN Project had four goals:
 - a. Connecting and empowering residents to work together;
 - b. Enhancing existing efforts;
 - c. Optimizing limited resources; and
 - d. Celebrating the community garden programs in the region.

Given that. Which of these four do you think the network accomplished best?

Can you please elaborate or give an example?

5. Given the four stated goals (repeat as necessary):
Which of these four do you think the network accomplished least well?

Can you please elaborate or give an example?

6. Which of the four stated goals [repeat if necessary] do you wish more attention had been paid to or would you like to see more attention paid to in future?

Do you have any specific recommendations in mind?

7. Given your experience would you recommend others in your region become involved with the Community Garden Network? Why or why not?
8. Is there anything else you would like to share with the organizers of the Community Garden Network?

APPENDIX B - CGN Micro-Grant Recipient Interview Questions

Interviewee:

Date and Time:

1. Please describe describe the nature of the Micro Grant you received from the Community Garden Network.
2. Is there anything that receiving this micro-grant allowed you to accomplish that you would have otherwise been unable to accomplish this year?
3. Is there anyway the micro-grant program could have helped you better accomplish what you wanted?
4. Would you say that the Community Garden Network micro-grant program was a useful project to launch in your region? Why or why not?
5. If the CGN were to run the micro-grant program again in the future, is there anything they should do differently? Do you have any specific recommendations in mind?
6. If the CGN were to run the micro-grant program again, would you apply again? Why or why not?
7. Is there anything else you would like to share with the organizers of the Community Garden Network about the Micro Grant Program?

APPENDIX C - Brief Summary/Results of Incredible Edibles QUESTIONNAIRE

compiled by Lorna McKendry, 8 June 2017

Total number of folks who took a minute to answer 5 quick questions:

110	Cornwall	
<u>30</u>	out of towners	
140		

Number of 1st time attendees **80/140**

2nd	"	"	30
3rd or 4th	"	"	23
5th	"	"	7

Garden size:	pots	40/130
	small	47
	medium	30
	large	13

Beginners	Intermediate	Experienced
57	32	45/134

Years gardening:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	15	20	25	30	35	40	50	60	70	80
24	16	14	10	12	4	3	1	1	13	7	11	1	4	1	10	3	1		1/137

APPENDIX D - Seedy Saturday 2017 Door Prize Survey Results

	Was this your first Seedy Saturday event?	Were you satisfied with the selection of exhibitors ?	What exhibitors would you like to see next year?	Did you attend a workshop ?	What workshops would you like to see next year?	Did your children enjoy the activities?	Comments
Yes	120	134	Honey from the glen	27	storing harvest	45	Great job!
No	14		flowers	105	food workshop	2	Loved the owl and bird seed craft
Multiple			Greta's honey	2	how to get rid of japanese beetles		craft very much!
N/A			all of them!		gardening	87	Thank you excellent!
			community market, kozroots, aboriginal table - all good	no, room too small	soil enhancement		very lovely, friendly, and happy event!
			bats	"gardenin g for dummies"	heirloom gardening		Needs more signage in counties - would put up at sign at Glengarry cheese factory
			flow hive	multiple, small plot	more native		
			Green's Creek, Honey from the glen	urban	american's		
			City of Cornwall	gardens	container gardens		
			Bird Feeder		edible ornamentals		
			the same as this year - I found them friendly and knowledgeable		composting		
			garden tools		canning/harvesting/ preserving		
			soap		organics		
			maple vendors		how to get birds		
			same		sprout seedlings		
			more organic vendors x3		bird feeders		
			all the same, very good		square foot gardens		
			food vendors		starting seeds		
			fruit trees x2		indoorsx3		
			green creek farm		I would like to see the schedule online in advance		
			free exchange		bee workshop		
			seedlings?		fermentation		
			Marlin's Orchards		workshop		
			honey		sprouting		
			same! they were great		pruning		
			missed against the grain		garden Box Building		
			composting information		bees		
			composting, more		micro greens		
			heirloom seeds		native america		
			Plants for sale		seeds		
			sprouts/sprouting equip.		old time gardening		
			hopefully more		ways		
			teas from garden, tasting		composting		
					gardening in small		

		against the grain bee keepers something with soil more from Fred old time gardening tips/books seeds and more seeds! more more flowers/shrubs Pitt Street Garden more composting, more recipes same, but more herbs and teas seedlings more honey small plot urban gardens		spaces vegetable gardens x2		
--	--	--	--	-----------------------------------	--	--

APPENDIX E - “Where Does Your Garden Grow” Maps

