

## **Evaluation of Project WILD Delivery Activities in Colorado**

**Steven J. Bissell; Colorado Division of Wildlife (unpublished report)**

**August 1992**

### *Evaluation:*

- state systems of delivery to teachers
- response of individual teachers who are trained
- impact on students who are exposed to Project WILD materials

Cantrell (1987 and 1991): makes the assumption that the best test of Project WILD is one of utilization. There are a good many curriculum aids available to teachers and the reasons for using them probably fall into two categories; one of ease of application and one of quality or expected outcome. Project WILD fits both of these criteria.

Project WILD, by its nature of being supplemental and integrated according to the needs of individual teachers, is not conducive to outcome evaluations. The exposure to Project WILD by students is not discrete, and therefore it is difficult for an evaluation to separate the impact of Project WILD on students within the educational milieu.

Evaluation methods: focus groups, survey, phone survey

Discussion indicated that implementation may be affected by follow-up training. Use falls off, limited effort to implement after first year. -- interest high in more training in the form of workshops.

Teacher motivation in environmental education or science seems to be a primary factor in use of Project WILD materials.

Project WILD activities that include active participation are used most.

Elementary guide used most often.

Number of activities per year varied widely according to grade level taught, length of workshop attended, and according to which of the three guides is used.

- highest use among K-6 teachers who attended a one week course for credit

Project WILD activities are used in science units to the greatest extent (80%). Project WILD is not the exclusive program used by teachers.

Overwhelming majority of teachers exposed to Project WILD felt it accomplished goals of ease of use and quality in the teaching environment.

## **2/Bissell -- August, 1992**

Project WILD trained teachers were strong advocates for Project WILD. Teachers expressed frustration in the level of support for environmental education at the national and state level.

Teachers felt that Project WILD promoted some positive attitude changes and generally increased knowledge about wildlife.

Uniform support was expressed for more follow-up to the initial Project WILD workshop or college course.

High name recognition for Project WILD; limited name recognition for Colorado Department of Wildlife.