

# Novice Hunter Program Summary Report

## 2013-2017 Hunter Recruitment and Retention Pilot Program

### Introduction

The Novice Hunter Program (NHP) began in 2013 as an effort to recruit and retain new hunters in the Northeast Region of Colorado. NHP was encouraged by the Wildlife Commission and designed by a team of Colorado Parks and Wildlife (CPW) staff with help from local chapters of Pheasants Forever. The focus was on small game hunting, primarily pheasant, which is relatively inexpensive and simple to get started, has abundant public property to hunt, and teaches skills that can carry to hunting other species.

The target audience of NHP were youth and adults 12 years or older that have completed their Hunter Education within 3 years prior to class. Students were recruited through targeted e-mails to recent hunter education graduates and promoted through the Hunter Outreach webpage in late spring and early summer each year. NHP events in June and July provided comprehensive seminar training on pheasant biology, habitat, regulations, ethics, tactics, and information about where to hunt. The seminar was followed up with a wing-shooting clinic (trap) and a field clinic that covered field safety, moving and communicating as a hunting group, and simulated hunting scenarios.

Students that completed the NHP seminar, wing-shooting clinic, and field clinic received an NHP student ID card and vehicle hang tag. These would allow them to hunt several NHP Walk-in-Access properties in Phillips, Sedgwick, Logan, and Yuma counties. In addition, staff and volunteers offered multiple mentored hunts to students that wanted additional help throughout the pheasant hunting season, mid November through January 31.

### Results

This pilot program was evaluated through two efforts. All students were sent a post-season program evaluation and staff tracked license buying trends throughout the five year pilot program.

### General Information

Over the 5 year program, 767 students completed NHP (Table 1) and about one-quarter (27%) were female (Table 2). About 40% of program participants were between 12 and 18 years old (Table 3). Adult age ranges were further broken down into 10 year increments. About 40% of adult participants were between the ages of 30-39 (21%) and 40-49 (18%). Many of these individuals were parents who completed Hunter Education with their children and NHP was the next step in learning to hunt as a family.

**Table 1. Number of NHP Students Each Year**

Year	# of Students
2013	113
2014	153
2015	176
2016	205
2017	120
<b>Total</b>	<b>767</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>153</b>

The large interest in the 23-50 year olds demonstrates a desire among adults to learn and take advantage of recruitment and retention programs.

**Table 2. Male and Female NHP Students Each Year**

Year	Gender	Count	%	Gender	Count	%
2013	Female	32	28	Male	81	72
2014	Female	47	31	Male	106	69
2015	Female	47	27	Male	129	73
2016	Female	49	24	Male	156	76
2017	Female	30	25	Male	90	75
<b>Total (average %)</b>		<b>205</b>	<b>(27%)</b>		<b>562</b>	<b>(73%)</b>

**Table 3. Number and percent of NHP students by age grouping. Data includes all five years.**

Age	Count	%
18 and under	310	40
Adults 19+	457	60
19-29	96	13
30-39	161	21
40-49	139	18
50+	61	8

### License Buying Patterns

The NHP program tracked all license-purchasing behavior beginning in 2011 for every student. This was done to estimate trends in hunter retention. Looking at the entire group by year, there is an increasing pattern of license purchases in the years prior to class, peaking out in the years the students took NHP, followed by a drop in license purchases. The number of licenses purchased in years after the class are much higher than the years purchased prior to class, though lower than the year they completed NHP.

Table 4. The number of Small Game and Combo licenses purchased for each class year. Note the gray boxes indicate the year the students took the NHP class.

Class Year	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	Ave # of licenses in years prior to NHP	Ave # of licenses each year after NHP	% of students that buy license in class year
2013	4	28	<u>97</u>	61	52	43	43	16	49.8	85.8
2014	10	17	53	<u>124</u>	72	54	55	27	60.3	81.0
2015	4	6	28	63	<u>149</u>	85	77	25	81	84.7
2016	0	0	10	25	64	<u>168</u>	108	33	108	82.0
2017	0	0	0	7	12	46	<u>98</u>	22	NA	81.7
										Average: 83%

Throughout the 5 year effort, approximately 83% of students actually purchased a small game license for the season right after they completed the NHP class (Table 4). However, 17% of the students did not take advantage of the Novice Hunter Program incentives by not purchasing a license the season after they completed NHP. The NHP classes were held in the summer prior to that year's pheasant hunting season. Purchasing a small game hunting license was not a requirement to participate in the classes. Students that went on to participate in a mentored hunt were required to purchase a small game license as required by state hunting regulations.

Tracking all licenses purchased offered the opportunity to look into other types of hunting and angling license patterns. Table 5 indicates the number of big game licenses purchased each year organized by the year they took the NHP class. Most of the classes showed an increasing trend in license purchasing behavior throughout the monitoring period. There appears to be a jump in big game licenses purchased the year these students took the NHP class and in the following years. It is unknown if their participation in NHP influenced this increase in big game hunting.

Table 5. The number of Big Game licenses purchased for each class year. Note the gray boxes indicate the year the students took the NHP class.

Class Year	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	Ave # of licenses each year after NHP	Trend
2013	8	26	<u>48</u>	71	67	64	72	68.5	+20.5
2014	10	15	40	<u>102</u>	94	90	86	90	-12
2015		2	12	42	<u>83</u>	95	103	99	+16
2016	1	1	7	12	53	<u>116</u>	150	150	+34
2017				1	11	38	<u>91</u>	NA	NA

In an effort to gauge retention of hunters after NHP over a longer time span, we looked at the student license data from the first 2 years of classes of this program- 2013 and 2014 (236 total students). We calculated the average number of hunting licenses they purchased each year since completing NHP. This data was broken down into 4 categories based on the average number of hunting licenses they purchased after they completed NHP. The findings are:

- Approximately one-quarter (24%) of the students purchased an average of two or more licenses every year since they took the class. One might describe this group of hunters as “heavily retained.”
- Almost 40% are averaging 1-2 licenses per year. These hunters have demonstrated an interest and continued participation in hunting, though limited.
- Students that purchased less than 1 license on average per year since their NHP class were 37% of the total. They have showed an interest in hunting and have at least made an effort to try it. However, their continued participation in hunting is questionable.
- And 11% of the students have not purchased any licenses since taking this class and not regarded as “recruited hunters”.

License Buying Pattern- Comparison with Random Hunter Education Group

In addition to monitoring the recruitment and retention patterns of NHP students, staff also tracked license purchasing behavior of a random sample of 500 Hunter Education students who did not participate in the NHP. We did this to determine whether participating in the NHP influenced license purchasing behavior. Two criteria were used to select the 500 students. First, they had to have passed a Hunter Education course and second, they needed to be between the ages of 10 - 65. Data used in this comparison spanned the same time frame as NHP (i.e., 2013-2017).

Hunter Ed student data was pulled from the Event Manager Program used to register students. Students that matched the above criteria were assigned a unique identification number. A random number table generated 500 numbers through a Microsoft Excel feature within the range of numbers that fit available Hunter Ed student data. The students whose Hunter Ed identification number matched the random generated table were used for this comparison. The same license purchase data was collected for the Hunter Ed sample as was collected for NHP participants.

The percentage of youth to adults was nearly identical between the two datasets (Table 6a). There were some differences in the adult age groupings, particularly in the 19-29 year old category (9% difference).

It is also important to note that when dealing with data over multiple years, students that completed Hunter Ed or NHP in

**Table 6a. Percent of Hunter Ed and NHP by age categories. Data is from 2013-2017.**

Age	HE sample	NHP
< 19	41	40
Adults 19+	59	60
19-29	22	13
30-39	18	21
40-49	12	18
50+	7	8

**Table 6b. Percent of total sample of Hunter Ed and NHP by year they completed class.**

Age	HE sample	NHP
2013	20	15
2014	25	20
2015	21	23
2016	19	27
2017	15	16

the earlier years of this five year sample size would have more years to purchase licenses than the students that completed Hunter Ed or NHP in 2016 or 2017. This data set is a quick snapshot of the entire sample size within the 5 year study period.

Table 7 provides the average number of big game, small game (daily, annual, and combo licenses), turkey, and fishing licenses, as well as the number of state and federal waterfowl stamps of the Hunter Education sample and the Novice Hunter students. To obtain this average, the total number of licenses purchased in each category were summed and then divided by the total number of students. For each license category, there was a positive change in the number of licenses purchased by NHP students over the random Hunter Education group.

The last column of Table 7 illustrates expected additional licenses purchased for every 100 students that go through NHP. For every 100 students that attend NHP, we would expect an additional 293 licenses or waterfowl stamps purchased over a 5 year period, than just taking Hunter Education alone.

**Table 7. Comparison of NHP program participants' license purchasing behavior with 500 non-program participants that completed Hunter Ed within the 2013-2017 time period.**

	<u>Hunter Ed-Avg. Licenses/Student</u>	<u>NHP- Avg. Licenses/Student</u>	<u># of Avg. License/Student Change</u>	<u>Per 100 Students</u>
Big Game	1.26	2.02	0.76	76
Small or Combo	0.79	2.08	1.29	129
Turkey	0.09	0.33	0.24	24
Fishing	1.4	1.55	0.15	15
Stamps (state and fed)	0.34	0.83	0.49	49
<b>Total</b>	<b>3.88</b>	<b>6.81</b>	<b>2.93</b>	<b>293</b>

Comparing the average cost of licenses spent by the Hunter Education students and NHP program participants shows that for every 100 students who completed the NHP, yields an additional \$5,354 spent across a 5 year period (Table 8). This is a 1.6-fold increase over non-NHP/Hunter Education students.

**Table 8. The average cost of licenses purchased by random 500 Hunter Education students compared with the NHP class in years 2013-2017, the change in licenses between Hunter Education and NHP, and the cost of licenses expected applying a 100 student factor.**

	<u>Hunter Ed-Ave. Licenses/Student</u>	<u>NHP- Ave. Licenses/Student</u>	<u># of Ave. License/Student Change</u>	<u>Increase Per 100 Students</u>
Big Game	\$39.56	\$57.34	\$17.78	\$1,778.00
Small or Combo	\$17.92	\$44.30	\$26.38	\$2,638.00
Turkey	\$1.71	\$6.51	\$4.80	\$480.00
Fishing	\$23.68	\$23.77	\$0.09	\$9.00
Stamps (state and fed)	\$3.23	\$7.72	\$4.49	\$449.00



Big Game	1548	2.02	833	2.00	715	2.04	0.045	4.53
Small Game or Combo	1594	2.08	782	1.88	812	2.32	0.445	44.47
Turkey	256	0.33	141	0.34	115	0.33	-0.010	-0.96
Fishing	1190	1.55	691	1.66	499	1.43	-0.231	-23.14
Waterfowl Stamps	637	0.83	327	0.78	310	0.89	0.102	10.15
<b>Total</b>	<b>5225</b>	<b>6.81</b>	<b>2774</b>	<b>6.65</b>	<b>2451</b>	<b>7.00</b>	<b>0.351</b>	<b>35.06</b>

Table 12 provides the cost of licenses for the same categories as Table 11. Small game licenses showed a similar increase in hunters that participated in a mentored hunt over those that did not participate in a mentored hunt.

Data from Tables 11 and 12 do not show overwhelming increases in license buying patterns (retention) from those that participated in a mentored hunt over those that did not. Factoring in the 17% that never bought a small game license the year they took NHP (and did not go on a mentored hunt), the licenses purchased and costs of licenses were likely higher or comparable between the mentored hunters and non-mentored hunters. Based on personal interaction between hunt mentors and NHP students on a mentored hunt, they felt the mentored hunts were a very important factor in their movement from interest to retained hunter. However, some students arrive to NHP with a personality that just requires the basic training and opportunity and will progress on their own or with mentors already in place. Still other hunters did not find the time or interest to sign up for a mentored hunt or go out with friends or family.

Table 12. Cost of licenses and average cost of licenses per student for all NHP students, students that did not participate on mentored hunt, and students that participated on mentored hunt. 2013-1017 license data.

	All Students		Students that did not Participate in Mentored Hunt		Students that did participate in Mentored Hunt		Difference=Mentored Hunt Ave. License-No Mentored Hunt Ave. License.	
	# Licenses-2013+	Ave. Licenses /Student	# Licenses-2013+	Ave. Licenses /Student	# Licenses-2013+	Ave. Licenses /Student	Difference	100 student Factor
<b>Big Game</b>	\$43,977.25	\$57.34	\$24,125.75	\$57.86	\$19,851.50	\$56.72	-\$1.14	-\$113.69
<b>Small Game/Combo</b>	\$33,981.25	\$44.30	\$17,255.50	\$41.38	\$16,725.75	\$47.79	\$6.41	\$640.78
<b>Turkey</b>	\$4,991.00	\$6.51	\$2,751.00	\$6.60	\$2,240.00	\$6.40	-\$0.20	-\$19.71
<b>Fishing</b>	\$18,231.00	\$23.77	\$10,474.00	\$25.12	\$7,757.00	\$22.16	-\$2.95	-\$295.46
<b>Waterfowl Stamps</b>	\$5,925.00	\$7.72	\$3,065.00	\$7.35	\$2,860.00	\$8.17	\$0.82	\$82.13
<b>Total</b>	\$107,105.50	\$139.64	\$57,671.25	\$138.30	\$49,434.25	\$141.24	\$2.94	\$294.04

Mentored hunts will likely be a valuable component to a segment of interested hunters to move them to identify as hunters. Outreach efforts of a more basic level that provide learning opportunities without the heavy input of NHP will be enough other segments of new hunters.

#### Post NHP Survey Data

Every NHP student was sent a survey after the pheasant season ended the year they completed NHP. The response rate across the pilot study is about 35% (Table 13). The majority of questions were multiple choice focused on satisfaction or importance of NHP components. The survey also

included 2 questions soliciting their comments. The first question asked for suggestions on how to improve the program. The second asked for any additional comments. These responses are saved in a spreadsheet format in the NE Region’s Hunting and Angling files. Most of the feedback was positive. Many of the repeated suggestions and comments asked for NHP for big game, waterfowl, and turkey and the ability to hunt NHP WIA for multiple years. Some comments indicated a desire to hunt pheasant closer to the Front Range. These responses were organized into broad categories and are discussed below.

Appendix 1 summarizes the bulk of the post survey data, listed for each year’s class. Totals and averages for the pilot years are provided with a quick comment on each question’s data. The survey was designed to assess satisfaction and the relative importance of key components of the Novice Hunter Program. These components included: classroom seminar, field scenario, wing-shoot training, NHP Walk In Access properties, mentored hunts, and mentor/instructors. Satisfaction was high across all of the components of NHP. The questions related to the importance of each component ranked high as well.

*Table 13. Summary of Post-Season Evaluation Responses*

	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	Total	Average
# of Students	113	153	176	205	120	<b>767</b>	
# of Post Survey Responses	90	41	54	48	32	<b>265</b>	
% Responded	80%	27%	31%	23%	27%		34.6%

The sample size through this post-evaluation was low and there are responses that do not match the data available through tracking license purchases. There appears to be a bias in respondents that attended a mentored hunt. For instance, 86% of the total students that responded to the evaluation indicated they participated in a mentored hunt, however, our records indicate only 35% actually participated (Appendix A, question 6). We have not followed up with further evaluations, but feel the students that took full advantage of the NHP program, including the mentored hunts, were more willing to take the time to respond to the evaluation request.

A quick summary of the evaluation is listed below, however more detail is found in Appendix A.

Question 2 of the Post-Season Evaluation asked how satisfied they were with the overall Novice Hunter Program. 97.5% were “Very” (84.5%) or “Somewhat Satisfied” with the program. 2 responded they were Very Unsatisfied (.8%)

Questions 3 and 4 asked their level of satisfaction with multiple elements of NHP. A quick summary of their responses are the following:

- 3a- Classroom- 97% (79% very, 18% somewhat)
- 3b- Field Clinics- 96% (83% very, 14% somewhat)
- 3c- Wingshoot- 87% (73% very, 14% somewhat)
- 4- Instructors and Mentors- 97% (92% very, 5% somewhat)

Question 5 asked for suggestion on how to improve NHP. The responses were grouped into similar comments and summed below.

- Wouldn’t change 55
- More hunts 35
- More time developing shooting skills 12
- Location 8
- Extend Novice access 7
- More Resources, maps, land 4

- Field Dressing 3
- Develop a community with other novice hunters 3
- Hunter group size smaller (more leaders) 2
- More punctual class time 2

Question 6 asked if they participated in a mentored hunt. 68% responded they did. However, only 45% of the participants actually went on a mentored pheasant or dove hunt. This high number may suggest a bias in responses we received.

Question 7 asked if they went on a mentored hunt, how important was the mentored hunt. Only 198 answered this question, compared with the 244 that responded to question 6. From question 6, 166 indicated they went on a hunt. There were 21 “not sure” replies, and 3 “neither”. No one responded that the mentored hunts were unimportant. 76% thought they were very important. 12% responded the mentored hunts were somewhat important.

Question 8 asked if NHP prepared them to hunt pheasants. 56% responded they were very prepared and 40% were somewhat prepared.

Question 9 asked if the NHP participants if they would have hunted pheasants that season if they had not taken NHP. Only 13% responded “yes,” while 72% responded “no.” 15% were not sure. Question 10 asked participants how important the elements were to the NHP Program. Based on the percentages that responded “very” or “somewhat important,” the are list in order of importance:

- Classroom- 97% (70% very, 27% somewhat)
- NHP Walk In Access- 93% (81% very, 12% somewhat)
- Field Clinics- 93% (75% very, 18% somewhat)
- Wingshoot- 85% (73% very, 12% somewhat)
- Mentored Hunts- 82% (75% very, 7% somewhat)

Questions 10-17 were inconsistent throughout the five years and provide value concerning each year’s classes. The responses are recorded in the NE Region Hunting and Angling files.

Question 18 asked for any additional comments. The responses were grouped and summed below.

**Additional Comments**

Loved it/ Great Program	107
Expand Program	29
More Resources, maps, land, time	16
More shooting opportunities	6
Location/ time (issues)	6
More interaction with mentors or Pheasants Forever	4
Better communication	4
Not enough time for mentored hunt	4
Develop a community with other novice hunters	2

Discussion

The Novice Hunter Program was designed to help new hunters overcome common hurdles to entering the hunting community (recruitment) and staying involved (retention) over time. Key components of this program include knowledge about pheasant behavior, habitat identification, regulations, access to equipment, and places to hunt. For those participants that took advantage of



mentored hunts, they had the additional time with an experienced hunter in the field. Findings from the first five years of the program indicate high-levels of overall satisfaction by students, quality materials and instructors, and an increase in hunter retention among participants.

NHP shows value for recruitment and retention, however, it relies heavily on multiple factors. From our interaction with students in class, as well as the multitude of e-mailed questions on when the NHP Walk-In Access properties would be published, we suspect the NHP Walk-In Access properties are a major attraction for people to sign up for this program. Even though the NE Region of Colorado has plenty of quality public walk-in access properties, the NHP WIA provides a comfortable place to hunt with little public pressure. NHP also requires specific equipment to run the program. The NE Region uses a wingshooting trailer with 3-4 traps and provides all the ammunition, clays, and loaner shotguns needed to participate. This program requires a core group of staff and volunteers to support it. A group of 25-30 students will attend a 3-4 hour seminar and then go out into the field for about 4 hours. Support for the field requires 4-5 range instructors and 4-5 field instructors. Mentored hunts rely on staff and several trained volunteers. Coordination of dates, location, staff and volunteers requires a great deal of invested time to be successful.

The basic structure of a Novice Hunter Program can be repeated for other hunting opportunities; however, there will be some notable differences. NHP targeting waterfowl would likely draw great interest, but the added cost of decoys and waders, limited public places to hunt waterfowl, and additional waterfowl identification skills might result in lower retention numbers. Turkey hunting would also gather high interest; however, finding reserved lands for students to hunt would be problematic and likely limit the number of students the program can host. Big game hunting would draw many hunters, but limited licenses and lack of reserved land for students to access for a year would be a major challenge. Applying NHP concepts to these hunting outreach programs would have to be modified to individual program goals and objectives. Thinking outside the box, maybe partnerships with non-profit organizations would help meet goals and alleviate concerns with access to land, equipment, and mentors.

The Novice Hunter Program is a solid outreach effort. I would recommend changing a few minor elements. The program can be run more efficient if we combine 2 classes in a day, or separate the classroom portion from the field portion on different dates. This would reduce the number of days to coordinate space, staff, and volunteers, but still target similar numbers. Another element that needs work is how we market or advertise to our target audience. Greater interaction with regional hunter education instructors may increase our outreach. There is great potential in direct e-mails to recent hunter education graduates as our targeted audience, however the mechanism to accomplish this is challenging.

I recommend continuing program evaluations through participant feedback and license purchases. Recent changes to the CPW licensing system will require a new process to gather data. As the old process used to gather license data was very time consuming, it is possible the new system can provide similar data through an easier process. There would be an added benefit to apply a similar evaluation to additional outreach programs.

## Appendix 1

	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	Total	Average
# of Students	113	153	176	205	120	<b>767</b>	
# of Post Survey Responses	90	41	54	48	32	<b>265</b>	
% Responded	80%	27%	31%	23%	27%		34.6%

								Comments
1: Participated as:	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	Total	Average	2013 data- Youth and Adult were not split out. Student data tracked by staff does not match these post evaluation responses.
Student Youth		12	9	7	5	<b>33</b>	18.9%	
Student Adult		21	32	30	14	<b>97</b>	55.4%	
Student Parent	72	6	3	8	7	<b>24</b>	13.7%	
Non Student	18	2	10	3	6	<b>21</b>	12.0%	
						<b>Total:</b>	<b>175</b>	

2: Satisfaction with NHP	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	Total	Average	Combine "Very" and "Somewhat"	Comments
Very Satisfied	58	25	45	45	29	<b>202</b>	84.5%	97.5%	High level of satisfaction with overall NHP program.
Somewhat Satisfied	8	11	6	3	3	<b>31</b>	13.0%		
Neither	0	1	2	0	0	<b>3</b>	1.3%		
Somewhat Unsatisfied	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>	0.0%	0.8%	
Very Unsatisfied	0	1	1	0	0	<b>2</b>	0.8%		
Not Sure	1	0	0	0	0	<b>1</b>	0.4%		
						<b>Total:</b>	<b>239</b>		

3a: Classroom	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	Total	Average	Combine "Very" and "Somewhat"	High level of satisfaction with classroom portion of NHP
Very Satisfied	47	28	43	44	27	<b>189</b>	78.8%	97.1%	
Somewhat Satisfied	20	8	9	3	4	<b>44</b>	18.3%		
Neither	1	1	1	1	1	<b>5</b>	2.1%		
Somewhat Unsatisfied	0	0	1	0	0	<b>1</b>	0.4%	0.8%	
Very Unsatisfied	0	1	0	0	0	<b>1</b>	0.4%		
Not Sure	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>	0.0%		
						<b>Total:</b>	<b>240</b>		
3b: Field Simulations	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	Total	Average	Combine "Very" and "Somewhat"	High level of satisfaction with Field Scenarios
Very Satisfied	58	29	42	43	26	<b>198</b>	82.5%	96.3%	
Somewhat Satisfied	9	5	9	5	5	<b>33</b>	13.8%		
Neither	1	2	2	0	1	<b>6</b>	2.5%		
Somewhat Unsatisfied	0	1	0	0	0	<b>1</b>	0.4%	0.8%	
Very Unsatisfied	0	1	0	0	0	<b>1</b>	0.4%		



Very Unimportant	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	unimportant!
Not Sure	1	0	7	11	2	21	10.6%	
						<b>Total:</b>	<b>198</b>	

8: NHP Prepared me to Hunt Pheasants	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	Total	Average	Combine "Very" and "Somewhat"	Great numbers. The few somewhat unprepared might have never gone out to hunt or attended a mentored hunt.
Very Prepared	30	19	35	29	21	134	56.1%	96.2%	
Somewhat Prepared	36	16	16	17	11	96	40.2%		
Neither	1	2	0	0	0	3	1.3%	0.8%	
Somewhat Unprepared	1	0	1	0	0	2	0.8%		
Very Unprepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%		
Not Sure	0	0	2	2	0	4	1.7%		
						<b>Total:</b>	<b>239</b>		

  

9: Would I have hunted pheasants this year if not taken NHP	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	Total	Average	Combine "Very" and "Somewhat"	Pretty strong reasoning for NHP type classes
Yes	13	4	5	5	4	31	13.0%		
No	46	29	42	31	23	171	71.5%		
Not Sure	9	4	7	12	5	37	15.5%		
						<b>Total:</b>	<b>239</b>		

10a: Importance-Classroom	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	Total	Average	Combine "Very" and "Somewhat"	Note that the "Very Important" is the lowest for Classroom. Maybe that indicates a need to reduce the time in classroom and transition concepts to field?
Very Important		26	36	35	22	119	69.6%	96.5%	
Somewhat Important		10	15	12	9	46	26.9%		
Neither		1	3	0	0	4	2.3%	1.2%	
Somewhat Unimportant		0	0	0	0	0	0.0%		
Very Unimportant		0	0	1	1	2	1.2%		
Not Sure		0	0	0	0	0	0.0%		
						<b>Total:</b>	<b>171</b>		

  

10b: Importance-Field Clinics	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	Total	Average	Combine "Very" and "Somewhat"
Very Important		29	38	38	23	128	74.9%	93.0%
Somewhat Important		6	12	8	5	31	18.1%	
Neither		2	4	1	3	10	5.8%	1.2%
Somewhat Unimportant		0	0	1	0	1	0.6%	
Very Unimportant		0	0	0	1	1	0.6%	
Not Sure		0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	

					Total:	171			
10c: Importance- Wingshoot	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	Total	Average	Combine "Very" and "Somewhat"	The higher number of "Not Sure" or "Neither" is interesting. Some students had spent time trap shooting prior to class. Our basic intro may have been too simple for their level or they did not feel they improved in the time available.
Very Important		26	40	39	22	127	73.4%	85.5%	
Somewhat Important		7	6	3	5	21	12.1%		
Neither		2	4	2	2	10	5.8%		
Somewhat Unimportant		0	0	1	0	1	0.6%	1.7%	
Very Unimportant		0	1	0	1	2	1.2%		
Not Sure		1	3	3	5	12	6.9%		
					Total:	173			
10d: Importance- Mentored Hunts	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	Total	Average	Combine "Very" and "Somewhat"	Pretty low combined importance. Likely an indicator of who from survey actually went on a mentored hunt.
Very Important		27	42	35	24	128	75.3%	82.4%	
Somewhat Important		5	5	1	1	12	7.1%		
Neither		1	3	3	2	9	5.3%		
Somewhat Unimportant		0	0	1	0	1	0.6%	1.2%	
Very Unimportant		0	0	0	1	1	0.6%		
Not Sure		3	4	8	4	19	11.2%		
					Total:	170			
10e: Importance- NHP WIA	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	Total	Average	Combine "Very" and "Somewhat"	Highest ranking of importance, both grouped and "very." This question applies to students that hunted, regardless whether they attended a mentored hunt. Some students never even bought a hunting license.
Very Important		28	43	40	27	138	81.2%	93.5%	
Somewhat Important		6	7	5	3	21	12.4%		
Neither		0	2	1	0	3	1.8%		
Somewhat Unimportant		0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.6%	
Very Unimportant		0	0	0	1	1	0.6%		
Not Sure		2	2	2	1	7	4.1%		
					Total:	170			