Wetland Perspectives, a 2-week teacher workshop held in July 1995, aimed to increase teacher understanding of some aquatic habitats of Wisconsin through Western scientific and Native American cultural perspectives. Workshop objectives included giving participants a more complete understanding of Wisconsin's wetlands, an opportunity to learn about Native American culture and issues related to classroom presentation of cultural perspectives on the environment, an understanding of the values of natural areas and how these values are related to cultural paradigms, and materials and contacts to help integrate environmental education into specific teaching disciplines. The workshop combined practical hands-on activities, field trips, panel discussions, and lectures to allow educators to learn about the ecology, hydrology, and cultural significance of these aquatic habitats. The 2-week workshop included a week at Lac Courte Oreilles Reservation near Hayward, Wisconsin, and a week at Madison, Wisconsin, where participants met with representatives of environmental education organizations and worked with computer programs related to their educational interests. Although the workshop was tailored to the needs of the six teacher participants, various activities were also attended by Native American teenagers. Five teachers completed program evaluations, in which they affirmed the success of the program and offered specific suggestions for program improvement. Appendices include workshop activities calendar and evaluation questionnaire with teacher responses. (SV)
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Goal of the Program

To give educational professionals a greater understanding of some of the aquatic habitats of Wisconsin through a variety of cultural and scientific perspectives.

Objectives

To give participants a more complete understanding of Wisconsin’s wetlands and other aquatic habitats through exploration from a variety of perspectives,

To give educators an opportunity to learn about Native American culture and discuss issues related to the presentation of cultural perceptions on the environment in the classroom,

To allow educators to gain an understanding of the values of natural areas and how these values are related to cultural paradigms,

To offer materials and contacts to help teachers integrate environmental education into their specific teaching disciplines.

Curriculum

Wetland Perspectives 1995 combined practical hands-on activities, field trips, panel discussions, and lectures to allow educators to learn about the ecology, hydrology, and cultural significance of these aquatic habitats. The varied-perspective approach of the program offered participants a broader examination of the types of information people can accumulate concerning natural areas and how others relate to and define themselves according to their relationship to the environment. In addition, the emphasis on Native American perspectives toward the environment allowed educators to gain specific knowledge about some of the tribal affiliations of Wisconsin with reference to their attitudes toward the environment. It also provided information about the presentation of such information in classroom situations.

Although the focus of this workshop was on the wetlands of Wisconsin, our investigations often moved us beyond these specific areas and into other aquatic habitats or larger cultural contexts. Given that wetlands are transitional systems where upland and water boundaries are difficult to define with precision, we often examined the ecology of nearby drier habitats and deeper aquatic areas (such as lakes and rivers) to gain a fuller understanding of the nearby wetlands. The cultural aspects of this course also offered unique challenges in terms of providing necessary information and connecting such discussions directly to aquatic habitats. Given that Native American cultures are strongly tied to the natural world and often do not categorize focus areas in the same way Western viewpoints might, several layers of cultural
information were offered. First, general information on both particular Native American and Western perspectives on the environment was offered to provide background to these viewpoints. Emphasis was also given to discussion of cultural viewpoints in the classroom. Given this context, cultural information was then provided regarding specific aquatic systems, including wetlands. Due to the importance, complexity, and often subjectiveness of this aspect of the program, this layered approach attempted to give a more complete understanding of this topic.

This two-week workshop began with a week at the Lac Courte Oreilles Reservation near Hayward, Wisconsin. This portion of the program focused on Native American and Western perspectives on the environment and issues related to the teaching of cultural perspectives in the classroom. Activities included field trips to highlight local wetlands, ethnobotany, and discussion of Native American perspectives on the environment. During the intervening weekend participants attended the Honor the Earth Pow-Wow at the Lac Courte Oreilles Reservation. Our second week in Madison offered, in addition to a variety of local field trips, opportunities to meet with representatives from many organizations which deal with environmental education including:

- students from the Institute for Environmental Studies at UW-Madison
- educators and administrators from the American Indian Studies Program at UW-Madison
- representatives from the Wisconsin Wetlands Association
- educators from Edgewood college in Madison

While in Madison participants also had the opportunity to work with a variety of computer programs tailored to their educational interests. Appendix A provides a detailed description of each day's activities.

*Wetland Perspectives* was tailored to fit the interests and needs of the teachers admitted (grade levels, subject specialties, etc.). Program packages which included materials on wetland ecology and cultural issues related to the environment were provided to each participant. In 1995 only 6 teachers were admitted to the program from a list of nine who applied. Five of the teachers were from Madison and the surrounding suburbs, while one was from Hayward, Wisconsin. Unfortunately one teacher was unable to complete the last week of the program due to a medical condition. *Wetland Perspectives* 1995 was linked with the Institute of Environmental Studies' (UW-Madison) Native American Precollege Program which has introduced dozens of teens of Native American descent to important issues regarding the environment. Many of the activities were done in cooperation with this program and funding was derived through the Native American Precollege Program.
Evaluations and Conclusions

Completed evaluation forms from the five teachers who participated in the entire two-week program are given in appendix B. These evaluations indicated that the program was successful in its objectives and offered participants a variety of new perspectives from which they can better understand and appreciate natural areas. It also offered a wide range of useful information that could be used to improve classroom studies. The evaluations indicated that the program should be continued. Based on specific comments made on the evaluations, the following considerations are being made with respect to future program efforts:

1. One of the main concerns with the program involved the cohesiveness of the material, specifically the relationship between cultural perspectives on the environment and information on wetlands. To improve the program in this regard the following modifications are recommended:
   
   a. Include one or two speakers who can bridge the larger context of Native American perspectives on the environment to specific issues connected to wetlands and other aquatic habitats. This might include discussions related to specific tribal problems concerning wetland areas or further discussions of Native American perspectives on aquatic areas. The focus in the current program was on the cultural significance of wild rice and general attitudes toward the environment.
   
   b. Include short (10-15 minutes) introductions to each activity which would specify the relationship of the activity to the overall goals of the program, to other aspects of the program and to the particular perspective examined.
   
   c. Include short (15 minutes), formal discussion sessions at the end of each day to provide group synthesis. This session need not include the worksheets provided in this year’s participant packet, but should include discussion of the perspective experienced during the day, the type of information that was available through the activity, and its application in other learning situations. Time should also be set side for private reflection.

2. Improved coordination between the IES Native American Precollege Program and this program needs to be achieved. Given the financial relationship between these two programs and the relationship to our contacts at the LCO Community College, this program will continue to work in conjunction with the precollege program. Several of the activities done with the precollege program worked well given the structure of these activities. These included our visit to Pipestone Falls with Jerry Smith and Marilyn Benton, our canoe exploration of Chippewa Flowage, and our field trip to a bog (during which we were joined by a small group of students). Other coordinated activities posed two problems. The first was that the discussion leader focused primarily on either the adult or the teen portion of the audience. Several activities, such as our exploration of the Bad River Sloughs and our field trip to see the Gotshall Shelter cave paintings, were presented
on an adult level due to the presence of the teachers. We need to further discuss with each presenter the possibility of restructuring the presentation to appeal to a wider audience, as many of these activities cannot be done as two separate presentations. The second problem involved the coordination of a large group of adults and teens as a unit (approximately 30 individuals). This problem will be addressed with improved scheduling and improved communication between teacher and student coordinators and the discussion leaders.

3. Specific Activity Adjustments

a. The computer demonstration was less successful than anticipated due to the lack of interest in the programs presented to the teachers. Future computer-related activities may include only time for participants to explore the INTERNET (unless other computer programs are made available to this workshop).

b. Examination of a cranberry farm should be included as one of the perspectives examined in the future.

c. Only four of the five general types of Wisconsin wetlands were explored by participants this year (marsh, bog, sedge meadow, and fen). The program will include exploration of river floodplain forests in the future.

d. The survey methods discussion should include an opportunity for participants to construct their own surveys about environmental opinions, perhaps using these questionnaires in conjunction with the teen group in a larger activity.

e. Include a presentation on western spiritual connections to the environment.
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Wetland Perspectives: Ways of Looking at the Landscape
Curriculum Calendar
Activities which overlapped with the 1995 IES Native American Precollege Program are in bold.

Program Week 1: July 9-15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sunday 9</th>
<th>Monday 10</th>
<th>Tuesday 11</th>
<th>Wednesday 12</th>
<th>Thursday 13</th>
<th>Friday 14</th>
<th>Saturday 15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leave for Lac Courte Oreilles Reservation at noon (expected arrival at LCO between 5-6 PM)</td>
<td><strong>Introduction at Pipestone Falls with Jerry Smith and Marilyn Benton (LCO College)</strong></td>
<td>Field Trip Canoe trip on the Chippewa Flowage and Ethnobotany tour</td>
<td>Panel discussion “Discussion of Native American cultural perspectives in the classroom” (Jerry Smith and Marilyn Benton)</td>
<td><strong>Field Trip Bad River Sloughs and Wild Rice presentation</strong></td>
<td>Field Trip Fish sampling with members of the Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission</td>
<td>Honor the Earth Powwow at Lac Coute Oreilles Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Introduction/ Material distribution (Brian Perry)</td>
<td>Lunch Field Trip Chippewa Flowage Dam</td>
<td>Lunch Discussion “Wetlands of Wisconsin and the values of wetlands” (Brian Perry)</td>
<td>Lunch Discussion Survey methods to understand environmental attitudes</td>
<td>Lunch Field Trip Field trip to a northern bog (Brian Perry)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Program Week 2: July 16-21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sunday 16</th>
<th>Monday 17</th>
<th>Tuesday 18</th>
<th>Wednesday 19</th>
<th>Thursday 20</th>
<th>Friday 21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leave LCO at 11 AM and return to Madison between 4 and 5 PM.</td>
<td>Discussion “Considerations in multicultural teaching” (Barbara Elgutaa)</td>
<td>Lecture (9-10:30 am) “Native American Literature” (Chris Jendrisak)</td>
<td>Workshop “Research in the classroom” All day workshop at Edgewood College focusing on small wetland research projects which can be done in the classroom (Robert Bohannon)</td>
<td><strong>Field Trip A visit to the Aldo Leopold Shack and a discussion of environmental ethics (Curt Meine and Nina Leopold Bradley)</strong></td>
<td>Field Trip Wetlands of the UW Arboretum (Brian Perry)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lunch Discussion “Native American Environmental Perspectives” (Milford Musket) Discussion (6-8 PM) Presentation by the Wisconsin Wetlands Association</td>
<td>Lunch Field Trip Cave Paintings (Robert Salzer)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lunch Computer program demonstrations and introduction to the INTERNET in the IES computer center (Brian Perry)</td>
<td>Program Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lunch Presentations by participants of the Native American Precollege Program and social</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B
Teacher Evaluation Form Responses

1. Overall how would you rank this program?
   - Excellent: 4
   - Fair: __
   - Good: __
   - Poor: __

2. What did you enjoy the most and find the most informative?
   (Using a rating scale of 1-5; 1 = most enjoyed to 5 = least enjoyed)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Activities</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pipestone Falls with Jerry Smith and Marilyn Benton</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using Computers for environmental science</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad River Slough exploration</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visit to dam and Chippewa Flowage</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canoe exploration of Chippewa Flowage</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field trip to the Leopold Shack</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field trip to cave paintings</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural discussions with Jerry Smith</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgewood wetland research workshop with Robert Bohannon</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honor the Earth Pow wow</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin Wetlands Association Presentation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field trip to northern bog</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Which of the following lectures did you find most helpful? (Rank in order of importance or usefulness)

In order of importance:

1. Native American Literature with Chris Jendirsak
2. Wetlands of Wisconsin and wetland values
3. Discussion of presentation of cultural viewpoints in the classroom
4. Survey Methods
5. Native American Environmental Perspectives with Milford Muskett

4. What are you going to do with the knowledge you learned from this program?

Incorporate into classroom activities
Share with others (teachers, students, etc.) The appropriateness of this program for next summer
Use it as a basis to continue to learn

I’ll probably try to take my students to a wetland. I will be more knowledgeable about Native American culture and how it intersects with White American environmentalism. This will come out in activities I plan throughout the year related to Native Americans and several units in science.

Use it in class and personally

I hope to incorporate my new knowledge into my everyday classroom teaching. I hope to do some wetland studies with my class as well as share many of my experiences (for example, stories that Jerry told). I will definitely be calling Brian to share his expertise on wetlands and I would also like to work with Robert Bohannon.

Incorporate Native American perspectives into my class

5. Did you feel this program offered a useful understanding of aquatic systems given the wide variety of perspectives offered? Why or why not?

Yes, I certainly understand that there is a whole lot that I don’t know and would take a Wetlands II for more knowledge, but have gotten new knowledge and understanding

I wasn’t always aware when something was a “perspective”. It seemed that the Native American component was not at all focussed on wetlands or aquatic systems although we did visit Lake Superior, the Sloughs, and Devil’s Lake. It seems that there’s the scientific “white” way of relating to the environment and the “holistic” Native American perspective with very little in between those 2 ends of the continuum. I often felt like an Indian walking with feet in opposite
directions. The discussion at the Leopold Shack was helpful as a bridge.

Yes, it was presented experientially as well as by lectures. Laid a good foundation for wetlands. Would like to do other courses on aquatics, flowers, birds, wetlands, etc. Yes, I had never even heard of some of the aquatic systems we talked about and experience. I definitely didn’t care about them or know their value. By listening to our many speakers & by experiencing them I have developed an appreciation for many of them (except the fen too stinky!)

Given that I don’t explore aquatic systems in my classes I can’t answer this easily. It wasn’t useful directly, but indirectly I have a better appreciation for the complexity of these systems. Overall there was very little that I couldn’t use. There were few “pure science” activities and even these were interesting on some level. For non-science teachers it was a good balance!

6. Did you feel the cohesiveness of the program and its overall purposes were achieved given the wide variety of perspectives offered? Why or why not?

Yes, provided a chance for a number of ways to view wetlands & environment i.e.: Native, Philosophy, Science...
Everything really ran smoothly and we had a lot of interesting experiences.

See above. I didn’t feel the cohesiveness. I felt there was a Native American component and an environmental- not even aquatic-systems focussed- that often didn’t mesh. His was like 2 separate programs to me.

Yes, it balanced out well by the 2nd week.

Yes, the fact that we got to hear from so many different people contributed to the success of this program. It was extremely fascinating to hear from the hearts of so many people. They shared their own personal ideas and opinions and really got me to think of what my own perspective towards the environment. I had never really thought about the environment very much but this class achieved its goal, at least with me, by showing me many of the wonders of the environment.

Yes! It’s amazing how many different (useful) perspectives we covered in 2 weeks! The activities were varied and challenged me in a # of different ways. I was encouraged to explore topics in ways I hadn’t had exposure to. I think the varied perspectives of the students in the class as also essential. Great mix of ages, experience, interests & personalities.

7. Did this program provide you with information that is useful to your particular teaching situation? In what ways could this program have been improved to meet your specific needs?

Provided bits and pieces of a lot that I can use. Introduced me to many new concepts and experiences that I can share with children as well as ideas of how to attract interest of other to wetland and mucky areas. It was good it wasn’t aimed at any age group so that everything could be adapted to each teacher’s class.
The morning with Robert Bohannon was the only specific kind of information or “lesson” easily useful and useable although being emersed in storytelling for extended periods and going to many places will undoubtedly affect my teaching. I will only know how or how much as the year progresses because we have not been requested to plan lessons and only during the Wis. Wetlands Assoc. Discussion did we discuss any practical ways to bring our knowledge or knowledge of experts into the classroom. I did greatly appreciate the opportunity to discuss lesson & field trip ideas with the WWA representatives.

Yes - dealt w/ Wis. Native AM. Will investigate wetlands near school & on personal property also gave many resource to contact & develop further

I learned many things that I am very eager to share with my classroom. The aquatic systems, wetlands info, & cultural awareness that I gained will definitely affect my teaching style & curriculum. Most of the activities that we participated in got me thinking about how I could incorporate them into my classroom & I feel that with the information gained I will be able to do this successfully

Yes. The N. American cultural perspective is directly applicable to my class. The stories/myths, personal narratives and personal experiences of N. American people is what I need to give my class credibility. Not being part of N. American culture puts me at a disadvantage. Classes like this give me opportunities I wouldn’t get otherwise. Interacting, laughing, listening, & experiencing the places & people at LCO (and Madison) is something that’s hard to “evaluate”. It has changed me & in turn will change my teaching style & curriculum. As Jerry Smith said, we will take information in & we won’t now immediately how, when or why we’ll visit it again—but we will! It was a perfect way to get in touch w/ N. American (Ojibwa) culture because it’s in keeping w/ the oral tradition. I couldn’t have gotten any of this from a book or lecture.

8. Do you feel the program coordinator addressed your needs during the program? Is there anything they could have done to improve your experience in the program?

Yes, when we as a small group needed flexibility or time to go off on discussion tangents it was allowed. I always felt comfortable about questioning any areas of confusion or unknowns. Brian was always there for us and helped in ways that I’m sure were beyond the call of duty!

I had the need for more concentrated use of time for the purposes outlined in the program’s literature. I found that having hours and hours of “wait” time occupied by desultory chit-chat unsettling. I would’ve preferred putting that time to educational use. When I sign up for graduate credit I expect that I will get organized time beyond the organization inherent in actual field trips. For the most part the field trips were excellent and anything done by Jerry Smith was outstanding. When I signed up for the program I expected that I would learn more about wetlands, wetland plants and animal life. I expected to learn it in detail as one would from a botanist, a zoologist, or hydrologist. Last summer I had a class from Harriet Irwin on wetlands and had learned to identify many plants as well as types of wetlands by visiting them. I felt cheated on this trip in some ways because we did not examine plants or animals closely and we didn’t sample water or even look closely at it. Likewise, except for Jerry Smith’s contributions and the experience of eating at Mary
Ellen Baker’s we didn’t get much in the way of “understanding” or, maybe I should say, little opportunity was made by the program coordinator for us to process what we were experiencing. I wish, for example, someone had told us what wild foods went into the wild food feast, how they were gathered and prepared.

I general I’d suggest prefacing each experience with a 15 - 30 minute formal introduction to the field trip or experience. That would give more direction to the experience. Also some post-trip formal discussion would be useful other than what might or might not happen between a couple of people in the van afterward.

Coordinator should be committed to the adult group and not trying to be part of the teen group unless he brings teachers to it. I don’t believe it’s necessary to be so amenable to a few expressed desires to have a lot of “down time” I came to learn, not have a lot of down time.

Yes. Designate clothing for activity
plan potty stops better
use waiting time for rdg, etc.
Assign reading daily

Brian was great! He answered the questions that I had about wetlands and I feel that he will be an incredible resource person for me when I start teaching about wetlands & other environmental subjects. He balanced the program with enough vigorous activity and lecture activity & reflective time. He is very Enthused about wetlands & his enthusiasm is contagious. I really enjoyed hearing his values of wetlands talk too. He was very sincere & open to our ideas to shape the program. He was flexible and was fun to be around, which I think makes an instructor effective.

Yes. You were very open to our needs & went out of your way to help in any way possible. Thanks! You couldn’t directly have done anything to improve this experience because the improvements I’ll suggest (I think) were out of your control!

Improvements suggested:
- While it’s great being intergenerational, coordinating teacher & student activities was far too complicated to work well. Lots of time was wasted waiting for the student schedules to mesh w/ the teacher’s. Had we been able to go when we were “ready” we would have saved valued time & frustration level.
- If at all possible, reduce the time spent waiting and/or don’t be so strict about being “on time” to events when we all know nobody else will be there! Feeling pressure to be “on time” is the most frustrating when you discover you were rushed/stressed for no reason! Maybe activities to fill-in down time would have helped, too.

9. Were the one-half hour question/discussion sessions each day helpful? Could they be changed to make that time more useful to you?

( Note: One half hour discussion/question periods were originally planned for each day and sheets (included in the packet) where prepared. Due to field trip timing and some lack of interest among the teachers, these sessions were done informally during the program. For this question teachers were asked to discuss this change in the scheduled program)
Our informal discussion served the purpose! It would have been too exhausting to take ½ hour day after many of the field trips. We did this usually while driving.

We didn’t have them.

NA

I guess I would have liked to have done this more formally. It was hard because we were all in different places but I would have liked to spend this time talking & reflecting upon each day.

I liked them when they were informal. Reflection (for me) is easier when it’s sitting around (maybe over dinner) and chatting about different impressions. I liked this shared time.

10. **How important is the stipend to your participating? Would you participate without it?**

It was extremely important for me, I could not have taken the class w/o it.

It helped a lot. I would participate without it if I were assured that unoccupied “wait” time would not occur and that discussions of each field trip or other experience would be carried out.

Really helps when paying for credits

The stipend was nice but it wasn’t the major motivator for me participating in the program. What attracted me the most was the fact that we would be spending time on the Lac Courte Oreilles Reservation. I liked the fact that we were accepted & not treated as tourists.

Right now, no. Changes in my life have made $ matters difficult. If the stipend didn’t off-set the cost of tuition I wouldn’t have been able to attend.

11. **What will you remember most?**

1. The ability of the group to adapt to my needs to having Wyatt with me.
2. Jerry’s stories
3. How good it felt to have a good workout on my legs.

Jerry Smith, Robert Bohannon presentation, Chris Jendirsak presentation
field trips: Canoeing on Chippewa Flowage with talks by Jerry, trip on Bad River, walk up beach, and trip in Sloughs, Leopold Shack discussion at the Shack, gathering wild things at Devil’s Lake (LCO), Gottshall cave paintings

Everything!

The Canoe trip was one of my favorite activities during this program. I had never been in a canoe
before so it was a unique experience. It felt so fantastic being out in the water. I will also remember Jerry Smith. He was incredible. I admired his willingness to share his perspective with us & his spirituality. He is truly a special individual. I hope I have a chance to meet him again. And of course I will remember the friendships that I have made in this class. I felt that this group really formed a special bond that I hope will continue even after the class is over.

Personal interactions w/ classmates - it's great being able to spend so much quality time learning w/ other teachers.
The canoe trip/day. That was a great shared activity w/ the students
The hospitality of the Ojibway people. It’s an honor to have had them open their hearts & lives.

12. Please give any other comment or suggestions concerning the program.

For me I would of liked more time for Jerry to tell stories and go other places with him. But for the time limits it was great.

Involve teachers more formally with the Native American teens. The Monday morning introductions were insufficient especially since many of the teens had next to nothing to say in their introductions.
I would be interested to know from them how their school experiences validate their culture, what appeals to them most, and what is detrimental to them.
Try consulting with Trees for Tomorrow on how they organize their week-long workshops for teachers and with James Oberly of Univ. Of Wis.-Eau Claire (History) for Native American studies. Oberly did teacher workshops at LCO in 1994.

Go on to Level II - have down time Mon. Of second week

This has been the best two weeks of my life. I was really nervous about participating in the program being the “urban girl” that I am but I was extremely satisfied with how the two weeks progressed. I was constantly challenged - physically and intellectually & emotionally. This intense & rewarding experience will be etched in my mind & soul forever. I may not ever run & jump in a bog again, but I will remember what it felt like. I have a new appreciation & awareness for the environment thanks to this program. I will definitely recommend this program to my colleagues.
Thanks Brian for all your hard work, for sharing yourself & your love of wetlands with me, & for sharing your sense of humor.

Do it again! It was worthwhile on so many levels! Time away from home/responsibilities (personal)
Time to interact w/ another culture (professional)
Time to reflect on the beauty & complexity of nature (spiritual)
Time to share w/ other teachers (emotional)
Time to meet lots of people, some who will hopefully visit our classrooms! (Social)
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