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This issue of Pathways returns to the summer theme of story/narrative. Jennie Barron tells a rich story of her baptism-by-fire introduction to inner-city outdoor education as well as an exploration of an emergent design to curriculum planning. Gary Morgan probes notions of cultural stories and our relationship with the wilds. Bonnie Anderson and friends describe their story of the murder mystery at the Goodrich-Loomis Outdoor Education Centre. In all three, you will find both general and specific ideas for designing Outdoor Education curriculum.

The regular columns continue to be a provocative forum for sharing current Outdoor Education thinking in Ontario. Research literature, environmental advocacy, programme ideas, and profiles are among the regular themes. Please send in your contributions concerning these themes and others to add your voice to a regular columnist or keep the column alive. Also note the newer Intersections' column meant to consider theory pertinent to, or profiles of, integrated programmes in Ontario. Pathways is keen to serve as a continuing source of information to promote this exciting curricular development.

1996 marks the 25th anniversary of COEO. Pathways is preparing to join in on the celebration. See you then.

Bob Henderson

NOTE FROM THE EDITOR

In lieu of a letter to the editor from the editor, I would like to share some feedback I received recently. At the Association of Experiential Education Annual Conference in Wisconsin this November, I was approached by a senior Outdoor Educator from the U.S.A. who began to praise Pathways in glowing terms. He praised all aspects of the journal, but mostly he went on and on about the quality of the lay out and the attention to artistic detail. Accepting his praise on behalf of COEO contributors and the editorial board, I realized that his praise was meant, in the main, to people who very much work behind the scene. Hence, I would like to acknowledge the extraordinary contribution of Carrie Mullins and Kim Burton-Ogrodnik. Carrie has worked closely with Kim transferring computer discs and typing and proofing submissions in 1995. Kim co-ordinates the lay out with an editorial board member, handling final details, artistic touches of design and format, and final production. Thanks goes out to Carrie and Kim in 1995 for making us all look good in the eyes of others.

Sketch Pad

ABOUT THE ARTIST

Rick Boersma is a former tree-hugging experiential educator. With roots in Project DARE and Outward Bound, he has recently branched out and become an airport-hugging experiential trainer who wishes he could spend more time in the woods.

Bob Toth's art comes to us courtesy of Merrily Walker. Thanks to both.
COEO.

A new board, a new beginning, a new direction. The times are changing and so must COEO!

By the time you read this, the board, or parts of it will have met twice. Once to get ourselves established, review aojiq items from last year, and chart a course for the upcoming year. The purpose of the second meeting was to start setting a vision for COEO.

This rather daunting task is very necessary, for if we are to survive into the next century, we must have a common vision of where we want to go. Imagine sitting down with a group of ten people to complete a 1000 piece puzzle. Simple, right? Except each of you has been shown a slightly different picture of the completed puzzle. How would you get to the same picture or in our case, the same vision?

Now is the time for us to come to a common picture of what we see ourselves accomplishing over the next five years, putting us into the year 2001. It is appropriate for the new board to include the visionaries of the past. Members of the 25th year committee, some of which are COEO's original founders, were invited to attend our Nov. 20th meeting.

In many ways COEO has come full circle. There are fewer field centers, and outdoor education in many cases is left up to the classroom teacher with little or no budget. However, many things have changed over the last 25 years. When COEO began, our organization was the only one of its kind in Ontario. Now as I scan the internet, there are screens full of environmental organizations all vying for your time and interest. Organizations now seem to be very specific in nature, attracting specific groups of people. One of COEO's strengths is its broad inclusive nature. If you are interested in using the outdoors as a vehicle for your teachings, COEO would love to embrace you. Our membership has changed and we need to address that without forgetting those fortunate enough to be still teaching from a center. If any of this discussion twigs a passion for you, we would love your input.

My internet address is 'menaught.mgll.ca' if you are the 'surfing' type. Names and numbers for the new board members are listed on the inside cover. Please contact us to share your concerns, ideas and visions for COEO!

I am excited to be working with such a talented and diligent team and will be working hard this year to set COEO on a course for the future.

MARGIT MCNAUGHTON
VOICE FOR THE WILDS

Literature must be examined carefully and honestly to discover its influence upon human behaviour and the natural environment to determine what role, if any, it plays in the welfare and survival of mankind, what it offers into human relationship with other species and with the world around us.' (Joseph Meeker 1980:25)

Meeker's challenge, to determine the role of literature, is a difficult challenge, as it forces us to question how and why the stories of others influence our perceptions of self in relationship to Nature. The tradition of storytelling, both orally and through literature, are important vehicle to bring voice to marginalized communities, and the Wilds are possibly the most marginalized communities of all. In keeping with Meeker's challenge, this article will explore how story and literature have provided voice for the Wilds. I will draw examples from stories and literature that speak to me and through which I have heard and felt the Wilds.

To begin, I feel I must explicitly state my belief that the Wilds are indeed a marginalized community, and as such, its voice is oppressed. This statement is not made lightly, I am aware that advocating that the Wilds have voice is a perspective not shared by the majority Western culture. The acceptance of the Wilds as having voice implies that the Wilds collectively are communities of beings and, therefore, must command a greater degree of respect. The perspective of the Wilds as having voice is not new; in fact, its denial has been with us for only the past few hundred years. It was during the eighteenth century, known as the Age of Reason,' that the Wilds were reduced to nothing more than an object (resource) to be domesticated and/or exploited for the sole purpose of human economic wealth (Worster 1977).

In today’s cultural reality,’ however, the idea of voice for the Wilds has little support. I believe, therefore, that as environmental educators, if we wish to effect change, providing voice for the Wilds must be part of our mandate. This is not a new perspective. Few were more aware of the voice of the Wilds and wrote so passionately about them than the Romantics’ of the 19th century. One such writer was John Muir, a late 19th century naturalist. Muir wrote:

How many hearts with warmed blood in them are beating under cover of the woods, and how many teeth and eyes are shining! A multitude of animal people, intimately relate to us, but of whose lives we know almost nothing are as busy as ours.

(Muir 1989:196)

Muir’s passage brings us face-to-face with our anthropocentric world view and challenges this perspective. Clearly, it is no accident that he refers to animals as people, and in doing so, gives them voice.

Muir’s narrative comes from a lifetime of living a basic existence in the Wilds. He knew the voices of the Wild, because he could sense them. These are the voice peoples, living close to the land, all over the world, listen to and revere (Raffan, 1993). The isolation and under stimulation endemic in Western culture makes it convenient to deny these voices. Yet, to deny of the voices of the Wild is to deny a part of our own existence.

PERSPECTIVES OF STORY

Gough (1991) points out that the root of fiction is fictio’ meaning fashioned by a human agent. Therefore, he argues that all ways of knowing are fiction and the idea of non-fiction is simply the taking for granted a common understanding of reality. In the late twentieth century, globalization’ has become the dominant fiction or narrative (Laxer 1993). This narrative represents the peak of reductionist and rational ideology so strongly advocated 200 plus years ago. It is a narrative that presents an unsustainable fiction; its language depends upon the metaphors of Nature as machine. In this
story, an attempt is made to reduce the diversity of all cultures and communities into one homogenenous culture based on the economic capital. A by-product of this form of development is the increased exploitation and marginalization of entire communities of life. Despite and in response to this form of cultural cleansing, however, voices of the oppressed are finding creative and effective ways to bring attention to their oppression, and the arts through story and literature is a major forum to provide this voice.

Storytelling is one of the oldest ways of knowing. It is an essential way of passing on values, world views, and cultural identity. Gough (1991) passionately argues that science is really nothing more than story. This argument is echoed by Evernden (1984) when he identifies the teachings of Descartes as strongly influencing us to marginalize the voice of Nature. He writes:

‘In convincing us that the world is composed of distinct subjects and objects he insulated as from concern with the world and made it next to impossible for us to regard the world as anything but a storehouse of material.’

(1984:54)

In other words, Descartes’ teachings were stories, stories that met the economic agenda of the day. The capitalist culture needed people to see Wild communities as resources, as to do so denied Nature any character of worldhood and therefore, denied people access to it as home (Worster 1977, Evernden 1984).

The rational world view, as prescribed during this Age of Reason, was not accepted as truth by all in Western society. In response to the mechanistic explanation of nature, a number of deeply insightful thinkers wrote of humanity’s place in Nature with passion and vigour. Beginning with Wendel White in the late 18th century, these critical writers spanned over 100 years into the early 20th century, marked by the works of Aldo Leopold. The literary traditions of the Romantics were far more than mere sentimentalism. At its very core was a search for a holistic or integrated perception, an emphasis on interdependence and relatedness in Nature.

Challenge to conventional wisdom through the narrative was a trademark of the movement, as suggested by the following passage:

‘I never saw a discontented tree.
They grip the ground as though they liked it,
and though fast rooted,
they travel...
with us around the sun two million miles a day
and through space heaven knowing how fast
and far.’

(Muir 1989:103).

The passion and unmitigated love for the Nature, articulated by the Romantics, gave wonder a place in our world, and in doing so, kept alive the voices of the Wild. This gift of wonder cannot be underestimated. Evernden (1984:140) argues, if the world is nothing but machination of energy exchange, then it is understood as such and not as a source of wonder. In essence, to wonder is a loss of complacency, it is to be wild. Rachel Carson, whose book, Silent Spring, shocked the western world into acknowledging its self-inflicted degradation of its own communities, knew the importance of wonder. In her book, The Sense of Wonder, she expresses the following hope:

‘If I had influence with the good fairy who is supposed to preside over the christening of all children, I should ask that her gift to each child in the world be a sense of wonder so indestructible that it would last throughout life, as an unfailling antidote to the boredom and disenchantments of later years, the alienation from the sources of strength.’

(1965:43)

To wonder is to see the world from your eyes and to dare to question why. To me, Carson gently but persistently challenges the domestication of thought. It is this process of domestication that John Muir addressed when he wrote:

‘The domestic sheep is expressionless, like a bundle of something only half alive, while the wild is as elegant and graceful as a deer, every movement manifesting admirable strength and character. The tame is timid;
the wild is bold. The tame is always more or less ruffled and dirty; while the wild is smooth and clean as the flowers of his mountain pastures.’ (1989:183).

The honesty of Muir’s writing is unquestionable powerful as it challenges us to confront situated knowledge. Although his perspective is simplistic, he nevertheless exposes domestication as a blunt tool of oppression.

Muir’s narrative critically challenges the dominant perspective. It is the passion of the Romantic’s writings, however, and not the critical commentary, which first drew me to their works, an attraction I still thirst for 15 years later. The literature touches my soul and grounds my understanding in a place I have no words to express. The passion I speak of is not only found in the sonnet, but is also found in the stories. One such story is told by Aldo Leopold. Leopold, who initially trained as a game manager in the rational tradition, recounts the life experiences that reawakened his sense of wonder. He writes:

In those days we had never heard of passing up a chance to kill a wolf. In a second we were pumping lead into the pack, but with more excitement than accuracy. How to aim a steep downhill shot is always confusing. When our rifles were empty, the old gray wolf was down and the pup was dragging a leg into impassable slide-rock.

We reached the old wolf in time to watch a fierce green fire dying in her eyes. I realized then, and have known ever since, that there was something new to me in those eyes—something known only to her and to the mountain. I was young then, and full of trigger-itch; I thought that because fewer wolves meant more deer, and no wolves would mean hunters. But after seeing the green fire die, I sensed that neither the wolf nor the mountain agreed with such a view. (1966:139)

I cannot put into words the impact this simple story has made upon my life. I first read it as a 19 year-old outdoor recreation leader, ready for adventure and to conquer the Wilds. The story challenged my world and called into question my seemingly unshakeable sense of reality.

The narratives of the Romantics, however, have their critics among the environmentalists and critical educators. Although the Romantics initiated a poetic reaction to Modernism, especially to mechanistic materialism and dualism, they remained partially framed within its conceptual outlines, essentially taking a linear view of history (itself rooted in Christian eschatology) (Oelschlaeger 1991:244). Gough (1992), argues that the romantic view of human interrelationship with the earth as expressed by Muir and others, cannot necessarily be assumed to be benign. Gough’s specific concern centres around the feminization of Nature by men. He contends that inherent in ‘romancing’ the earth in an anthropomorphizing image of women as objects of romantic love, implicitly oppresses and exploits Nature in the same way women are oppressed and exploited (1) (1992:12).

As an alternative, Gough (1991) suggests that the stories of the pre-modern’ peoples may hold the key to creating a sustainable narrative. He argues that such stories transcend the implied understanding of difference between ourselves and the earth as found in western culture. He advocates that these stories do something the narratives of modern science fail to do, namely to accept the creation of meaning in the world as a human and communal responsibility. To explain his point, he offers us the creation story as told by D’Angelo First Nations.

Fox was the only man.
There was no earth, only water was everywhere.
And the fox said, I’m lonely — yip yip yip yip yip — I’m lonely — I want to meet someone, and so Fox began to sing in order to meet someone.
He sang yip-yip-yip-yip-yip.
And there — Wooooo — was Coyote.
Hmmm, said Fox, I thought I was going to meet someone.
Eb said Coyote I am someone — and anyway, Fox, what are you doing here, hmmm?
I am creating the world yip-yip-yip-yip-yip-ab bub, I am creating the world.
Obbk, and how are you going to do that, bub fox?
Now Fox thought, and he said: Sing-abb yip-yip-yip-yip!

And as Fox began to sing, there out of the ocean floor came up North America — came up rising out of the ocean floor like a great turtle in the middle of the ocean.

And as Fox was singing there came the trees growing up, up to the sky

And there came all the animal people: there came the Grrr-great big bear people; and there were those shoop-shoop deer people and those ssuss-snake people

And there was the sound, there was always the sound of footsteps — iacks, tracks, tracks — as Coyote was making his way — tracks-tracks-tracks...

(as told by Gough 1991:6)

Snyder writes:

Standing up on lifted, folded rock,
looking out and down

The creek falls to a far valley,
big beyond that
facing, half-forested, dry
clear sky

strong wind in the
stiff glittering needle clusters
of the pine — their brown
round trunk bodies
straight, still;
rustling trembling limbs and twigs
listen

This living flowing land
is all there is, forever

We are it
it sings through us
We could live on this earth
without clothes or tools!

(1975:41)

The poem highlights the importance of listening. By listening, the mind if quieted, the senses calmed, and contact can be reestablished with the earth. Contact that is vital to hear the marginalized voice.

**CONCLUSION**

A common characteristic of all oppression, is that voice is suppressed and is, therefore, denied. In our culture, the voice of the Wilds was denied when it no longer fit into the narrative being created by rational men.’ Descartes, Smith, and Newton’s denial of the voice of the Wilds, however, could not culturally cleanse it’ out of our beings. They could not do this because unlike human constructed realities, the Wilds are a truth that we may choose to consciously deny, but can never truly be cleansed of.
In ignoring other realities and focusing on the fiction of humanity's supremacy over Nature, we have created an environmental crisis. Only through the alteration of the perspectives that reduce all to a commodity can we make real change. The Wilds do have voice and for those who live close to the land the voice is heard daily, but in our mechanistic world we have become isolated from the Wilds and skills to hear its voices have become dulled. I believe that as environmental educators it is our mandate not only to question our perspectives but to also introduce alternative ways of knowing the world we live in. Through humanity's rich history of storytelling, whether in the oral or written tradition, we are provided the opportunity to bring different perspectives forward, to explore different ways of knowing, and most importantly, to provide voice.

Only through the alteration of the perspectives that reduce all to a commodity can we make real change.

GARY MORGAN lives in Parry Sound, Ontario. He has his Masters Degree from the Faculty of Environmental Studies at York University, concern curriculum design for outdoor travel.

FOOTNOTES

1 I've specifically not chosen passages that reflect the feminization of the wilds. I do acknowledge Gough's criticism, however, especially on how it pertains to marginalized voice.
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A MURDER MYSTERY AT THE GOODRICH-LOOMIS OUTDOOR EDUCATION CENTRE

PRESS RELEASE April 17, 1995
To: Associated Press, Thompson Newspapers; CBC
From: Lower Nipigon Times
(with coverage by field reporters Henderson, Macdonald, and Cocivera)
Re: Late-breaking news

BRIGHTON, Ont.—On Saturday, April 15/95, the remains of a young turtle were found in the woods near the Brighton Outdoor Education Centre. Although there was no hard and fast evidence for the grisly deed, initial suspicion turned towards one Nicholas Jackson, whose hatred of turtles is legendary in the Brighton area. However, the RCMP seemed to believe his alibi, and did not include him in the list of suspects released on Tuesday. The suspects, who are reportedly still being held by the RCMP, are (in no particular order): Stewart Miller, a worker at the local co-op; Penny Macdonald, a feisty organic farmer; Bob Thatell, a computer programmer; Ben Clugston, a trapper; Doug Black, a student; Jennifer Etches, a photographer; Cathy Gibson, a teacher; and Jim Sutherland, a contractor. A class of Grade 5 specialists was brought in to assist in the investigation, in hopes that their skills of detection and analysis would succeed where the RCMP efforts have failed.

The detectives set the time of murder at around 8:35 a.m., and through a series of tests including finger-printing, chromatography, water sampling, and plaster-casting, gathered evidence from the scene of the crime. The detectives, while unwilling to make a firm allegation until all the evidence had been examined, nonetheless made several statements to the press, concerning their suspicions, thoughts, and what they had for lunch. (The detectives are operating under pseudonyms to protect their identities, should the murderer seek revenge.) Emily, Brandy, Shannon, and Sarah felt that 'the person who did this was bad.' Kim, Jenny, Ricky, and Matt refused to comment on the crime, apparently to avoid tarnishing the suspects' portrayal in the media. Scott, Ciji, and Jeff voiced their concern for the family of the victim, and 'wished that the person who did this gets caught.' The majority of the detectives, while somewhat noncommittal, seemed to suspect that Doug Black was the guilty party. Lisa and Buddy thought: 'it's Doug Black for sure.' Steven offered: 'Doug Black, you're going to the slammer,' while Kevin allowed: 'he's a goner.' There were some other suspicions, however.

Michelle and Troy felt that: 'it's more than one person.' Dan, Paul, and Jacky forwarded the hypothesis that Cathy set up Doug to take the fall, based on evidence obtained from the plaster casting. Elizabeth and Jamie were convinced that a substantial portion of the evidence was yet to be discovered, while Amy, Eric, and Carrie wanted more information about the suspicious-looking cars parked in the parking lot.

At the time of writing of this article, no one has been charged. As further information surfaces and more expert opinions are collected, it seems likely that the killer will be identified.

MEET THE SUSPECTS:
STEWART MILLER - worker at the local Co-op
PENNY MACDONALD - organic farmer, retired
BOB THATELL - computer programmer
BEN CLUGSON - trapper
DOUG BLACK - student
JENNIFER ETCHES - photographer
CATHY GIBSON - teacher
JIM SUTHERLAND - contractor
DESCRIPTION OF THE DAY

Students walking through the forest stumble upon the scene of a crime. The skeleton of a small animal is found stuffed in a garbage can. A candy wrapper is picked up not far from the skeleton along with a small piece of paper with some handwriting on it. A trail of footprints leads away from the scene. Sounds like a mystery novel or the fruits of a student’s active imagination, but it really took place on April 17th at the Goodrich Loomis Outdoor Education Centre — with some help from Bonnie Anderson, the Outdoor Educator at GLOEC. Anderson recently piloted an environmental murder mystery programme for the students who visit the Centre to discover new ideas about wildlife and the natural environment. As a creative innovation on the regular curriculum, Anderson’s murder mystery combines skills from different areas, problem-solving strategies, and a great time for the students.

Anderson came up with the idea while she was searching for something new that would interest the students and challenge them in many different ways. ‘As a day centre where classes come year after year,’ she says, ‘it’s refreshing to try something different and out of routine.’ The murder mystery does just that: it provides a forum for students to use skills in problem-solving and investigating and it teaches them about environmental issues such as monoculture, impacts of the introduction of new species in an area, hunting, homebuilding, and the effects of vandalism on the environment.

Perhaps the greatest advantage to this type of programme, however, is the hands-on approach to learning that the murder mystery encourages. The students investigate the scene of the crime, take fingerprints, analyze handwriting samples, test water samples, cast footprints, and do a chromatography analysis to check out candy wrappers. They are encouraged to ask questions about the crime and are, in turn, asked questions by the Press about the progress of the investigation. In this manner, the students are really determining the success of their investigations.

Having collected their evidence at the Outdoor Ed. Centre, students return to the classroom to sort and assemble all of the facts. In their investigative teams, the students present their solutions to the crime. Because each team has conducted their own investigation, not all groups will have the same answers, but they are all required to support their claims. In this respect, the murder mystery encourages careful investigation as well as cooperation in groups, and the outcome is dependent entirely on the students.

The wide range of information acquired and the methods of collecting and using that information were a hit not only with the students, but with the teacher, too. Mr. Karl Dyer, the teacher of the Colborne Public School class that was involved in the pilot programme, says he was pleased with the way things went on April 17th. He was impressed with the collection of skills ‘taught,’ during the day and found that the activities done at the Centre were easy to integrate into regular curricula. For example, he thought that the skeleton identification done at the scene of the crime would fit well with a science unit on bones and skeletal systems, and that the murder mystery theme appropriately extended a mystery reading unit done in his class earlier that year. As far as curriculum goes, then, the murder mystery seems to provide all the old skills and techniques in a new, easier-to-digest package.

Enthusiasm among the student participants testified to the success of the murder mystery. Their investigations combined the skeleton detection skills, fingerprint comparisons, and chromatography, along with some practical skills about dealing with the Press and some old-fashioned sleuth instincts. From quips as insightful as He's a reporter! We can't tell him anything! to slightly more questionable generalizations as, It must be Doug Black — all the rest are fogies who wouldn't eat M&M's!, the exclamations of the students showed that they were excited and involved in what they were doing that day.

This has not always been the case at the Centre, says Dyer. He was particularly impressed with the change that the murder mystery offered. Every year it has been more or less the same (hike in A.M. and activity such as
Birds, environment in the P.M.). The hike seemed okay but tried to include too many concepts in too short a time with a look and I'll explain approach," he stated. Anderson's arrival on the scene, however, has allowed for some new initiatives and fresh ideas which, if the murder mystery is any kind of example, appear to be very promising. With students finding their own answers to questions about the environment with Anderson available to facilitate their investigations, students take the initiative, which makes for a more valuable learning process and a highly-motivated class. It also provides possibilities for teachers to use the enthusiasm of their students to extend the murder mystery past the visit to the Centre. *Once students have completed their investigations and justified their claims, teachers encourage them to write up their point of view in a reporter's column. Classes can set up a courtroom to try the accused suspect of his/her crime. There are many options for the integration of the murder mystery into the classroom, depending on the students' and teachers' interests. The murder mystery pilot, then, seems to have been a successful experiment in creative curriculum design. By providing a testing ground for some of the skills and ideas taught in a regular classroom, students can think practically about what they've learned in school. One visiting reporter was heard to say, practical knowledge acquisition when working with hands-on activities in the actual environmental setting is the way to go as far as kids learning about ecology goes. Just look at the intensity out there. 'Thinking in a more specific way, the murder mystery activity involved many educational constructs central to a student-centred/ecological paradigm of teaching (Gough, 1987). Firstly, there was an emphasis on process; on access to information, on learning how to learn and asking questions rather than an emphasis on the right answer. This means that education was structured as an exploration of a reality-centred perceived project rather than as a distribution of propositional knowledge from standardised procedures. There was a cooperative and subjective investment rather than a sense of external assessment and discouragement of personal curiosity. There was a combining of skills/competencies with experience/reflection and an integration of topics. Hence there was an educational setting that fostered student inquiry on their terms, in their way, with the guidance of instructors. This approach is well suited to the excitement of a class visit to a 'special' day centre destination.*

**QUOTATION FROM INVESTIGATORS.
STUDENTS OF COLBORNE PUBLIC SCHOOL GRADE 5/6.
TOLD THE PRESS, APRIL 17.**

'Whoever it was must have bad good balance because he only left right shoe prints.'
'Maybe it was 2 suspects working side by side!'
'Just between you and me - I don't like the look of that other reporter [Henderson] he's pretty rude.'
'It looks like the turtle has been dragged along the ground...'
'It can't be Doug — Doug's a student!'
'I think it's a man wearing two right shoes.'
'He's a reporter! We can't tell him anything!'
'Is that a real press pass?'
'It must be Doug Black — all the rest are old fogies who wouldn't eat M&M's!'

**A SAMPLE OF COMMUNITY OPINIONS**

**THE BRIGHTON TIMES EDITORIAL.**

The Times thinks it is regrettable that more animals have been hurt in the recent disaster at the G.L. Outdoor Ed. Centre. However, we applaud our Brighton Police Force for turning the case over to private investigators. Our focus has to be on more pertinent local issues. With our newly implemented programmes of wildlife management, it seems inevitable that some incidents such as these would take place. In fact, the radical environmental lobbyt, Mackenzie Montague, is ignoring all the steps our community has taken to combat environmental problems. Mr. Montague has never lived in Brighton, and perhaps should stay home and look after his own concerns.
Even Ms. Anderson, a newcomer to our area, seems to have some skewed priorities. Ms. Anderson said, 'The environment is a local issue; no community can function without a healthy environment. It is also an issue on a larger scale. We can't stop at city boundaries — the entire region needs to get involved.'

Perhaps, with time, Ms. Anderson and Mr. Montague will come to understand Brighton's way of doing things. After all, things have been fine until now and will continue to be fine unless people get all riled up.

**EYE ON THE ENVIRONMENT**

**AN ALTERNATIVE NEWSLETTER**

We would like to applaud Ms. Bonnie Anderson, outdoor educator at the G.L. Outdoor Ed. Centre, for forcing people to recognize that environmental disasters are a crime and somebody has got to be accountable.

Thankfully, Mackenzie Montague is here to investigate and supervise the process from an environmental perspective. This is especially useful considering the police department having passed this issue off to some namby-pamby private investigator company. They couldn't even stick around and see the investigation through, but had to gallivant off to the rainforest (which we think is more likely a vacation on a tropical beach somewhere).

Luckily, Ms. Anderson and Mr. Montague are drawing on the support of Brighton's strong student population to solve a crime that the community doesn't seem to care about. We, here at the Eye, hope that the students can do something, and we are willing to provide our support in whatever form necessary.

*Not used in 1995 pilot.

**COURT REPORT**

Court Case Number: 1995-005 'The Case of the Mystery Animal'

Plaintiff: Goodrich-Loomis Outdoor Education Centre

Defendant: Bob Thatell

Verdict: GUILTY

Evidence: Due to Bob Thatell's gardening practices, he has decreased the variety of plant life around the area. As rain washes his pesticides and fertilizers into the watershed, it kills plant life down stream. The deceased in question, the turtle, was starving due to lack of proper food and, while trying to eat a new food source in desperation, drowned in its weakened state.

In the court proceedings, Bob confessed to having tried to cover up his crime by attempting to frame Doug Black. He had been trying to take pictures of the teenagers partying in the woods. He also found one of Doug's shoes and made the trail of one-footed shoe prints for the investigators to follow.

He even confessed to having attempted to frame Penny Macdonald, by spraying her garden to draw attention to her purple loosestrife.

Consequences: The court has sentenced Bob Thatell to 1000 hours of community service consisting of: a) Habitat restoration to fix damages made in his gardening practices at his home and downstream, and b) School visitation to help educate the students and the general public of the dangers of monocultures (areas of limited variety of plant life) and its effect on the environment.

**POSSIBLE HANDOUT FOR PRE-SERVICE MEETING**

**GREEN THUMB PRIVATE INVESTIGATORS AGENCY MANDATE**

Green Thumb Private Investigators is a small, non-profit organization dedicated to serving the sometimes-overlooked needs of your community. We combine a belief in social justice and environmental preservation with rigorous methods of inquiry and investigation. All of our cases are studies via the scientific method. Here's an outline of all the steps we follow:

PURPOSE: Identify for yourselves what you are trying to determine in your investigation. What do you really want to know once you've finished the investigation?
HYPOTHESIS: Make an educated guess at the possible outcome of your investigation. From what you know already, what do you think the outcome will be?

MATERIALS: Make a list of the things you will need to perform your investigation. What have you got to work with?

METHOD: Outline a strategy for conducting the investigation. What steps will you need to take?

OBSERVATIONS: Keep a detailed list of any discoveries you make, data collected, etc. Later you can organize them into tables or graphs.

CONCLUSION: Sum up what you have learned from the investigation or experiment. Was your hypothesis correct or does another idea seem more likely now?

**A SAMPLE OF SUSPECT STATEMENTS**

HARRIET HASSELMEYER

OCCUPATION: Farmer

PLACE OF RESIDENCE: Fluffy Lamb Farm, property adjacent to Outdoor Ed. Centre

STATEMENT: 'I've never even been near the Outdoor Ed. Centre, well except that my farm is near it. Anyway, it's true that wild animals sometimes hurt my sheep and my crops, but I'd never do that....'

JODIE JOHNSON

OCCUPATION: CEO of Bantam Chemical Fertilizers

PLACE OF RESIDENCE: Penthouse Apartment in Campbellford

STATEMENT: 'Look, I've got a factory to run, and I don't have time to answer any of your questions. You people need to spend some time in the real world.'

MACKENZIE MONTAGUE

OCCUPATION: Environmental lobbyist, work on gun control and animal rights issues

PLACE OF RESIDENCE: Smithfield

STATEMENT: 'This is just another example of poor environmental legislation and a lack of respect for wildlife in this country. Big companies don't care about local issues, especially the ecosystem in our backyards.'

LANCE LONGVIEW

OCCUPATION: Hunter/Trapper, part-time help at Fluffy Lamb Farm

PLACE OF RESIDENCE: cabin on Fluffy Lamb Farm

STATEMENT: 'I've seen some strange things going on around these parts. That Outdoor Ed. instructor has been causing a stir around here. We just like things nice and quiet, that's all.'

*Not used in 1995 pilot.

**POINTS FROM BONNIE**

- At a day centre, where classes come year after year, it's refreshing to try something different and out of routine.
- A creative way to learn about scientific process, media literacy, forensic science, etc.
- Very cross-curricular and outcome based
- Mini investigation teams allow students to have not all the same answer — individuality
- Not even the teacher knew the answer so all must work to solution
- Covered all areas of local life occupations, etc.
- Tried to get local people and OPP involved (excellent — credibility)
- All teams put in responses (even teacher)— one team's response was closest
- Covered areas of monoculture, introduction of new species, hunting, home building, classroom use in environment, disturbance of wildlife homes, vandalism as impacts on environment (both positive and negative).

**REFERENCE**


BONNIE ANDERSON is the murder mystery creator, and teacher, at the Goodrich-Loomis Outdoor Education Centre. ALISON BLAIR, MAGINNIS COGIVERA, AND JENNY MAC DONALD are students at McMaster University, who volunteered to help Bonnie create and write up this curriculum project. BOB HENDERSON teaches an Environmental Inquiry course at McMaster that encourages students to get involved in community projects. KARL DYER is the teacher of the Cohono Public School class. All were involved in this write up. Special thanks from all to Alison.
INNER-CITY OUTDOOR ED.
AT WILMA’S PLACE

When I first met Ernie Leblanc, the principal teacher at Wilma’s Place, I had a new and growing interest in alternative education and a more extensive background in camping and environmental activism. I had no previous experience in course design and implementation. I knew virtually nothing about at-risk youth. My ignorance notwithstanding, Ernie recruited me to develop and lead a course for Wilma’s Place, the alternative high school programme for young women at risk, in inner-city Hamilton. The course was to have something to do with environmental education, was to include trips out of the inner city, and was to offer the students a credit-equivalent for physical education. With all the enthusiasm of the uninitiated, I gladly took up the challenge, and arranged to earn an undergraduate independent study credit for it. As much as my story is one of course design in a unique alternative programme, it is also the story of my own experimental learning as a student in the field of outdoor education.

The alternative programme at Wilma’s Place is designed to try to overcome some of the obstacles to retention that students at-risk face in the regular school programme. These obstacles include, but are not limited to (1) poverty and the consequent need to fulfill basic needs such as food, clothing, shelter, and belonging before students can concentrate on academic pursuits; (2) the need of some students to work to supplement family income or, if living on their own, to supplement inadequate student welfare; (3) the need of some students for infant or toddler daycare; (4) the pressing emotional and social needs of students who are living in or running from situations of abuse or severe family dysfunction; and (5) personal obstacles such as poor self-image, a lack of impulse control, and depression (Wilma’s Place, 1991).

All of these obstacles were present for students in the course in question, and affected what we as a group could and could not do.

That three of the students had young children in the programme’s drop-in daycare, and that one student had to leave early every day to work at the take-out at Swiss Chalet, made it difficult to begin class before 12:30 or extend it past 3:00 without a lot of prior planning. In addition, the exigencies of the students’ lives made it hard for them to attend reliably, or, once there, concentrate. Classes could be and were interrupted or missed if a student needed to arrange getting student welfare or legal aid, negotiate childcare with her boyfriend, argue rent hikes with her landlord over the phone, or go to a friend who was being abused by her boyfriend. Doctor’s appointments, hair appointments, a driver’s exam, and sick babies also took their toll. In a class of six, over the course of a year, one student was suspended twice, two students moved, one student had a job transfer out of town, the same one was hospitalized for two weeks, one student was arrested by police and never returned to school, and one became pregnant and chose not to continue with the course. Two others also became pregnant but opted to stay with the course until the end. Four students completed the course. In dealing with these problems week-to-week, I came to see that predictability was a luxury that one could not expect given the instability of these students’ lives generally.

AN EMERGENT CURRICULUM

During the first two months of the course, I worked intuitively, focusing on group development and using hiking, apple-picking, and other outdoor activities to encourage sensory awareness and therapeutic physical activity. I relied heavily on my own personal backpack of tricks—ideas, games, and activities accumulated over years of working as a camp counselor, leadership trainer, and group facilitator.
we got to know each other better and set goals for the year, course objectives became clear to me (see box).

The following is a retrospective course outline, showing what ultimately emerged as the content for our course.

**EVALUATING WHAT CAN'T BE MEASURED**

The problem of evaluation for a course such as this could be approached from many angles. Using the original, sparse requirements for the course, we met the school's criteria by getting out of the city (eight times in fact), by enabling the students to earn credits for physical education, and by linking our activities with a common environmental theme.

The students themselves filled out self-evaluations and course evaluations using a comment-based questionnaire; among other things they were asked to describe the parts of the course that were most challenging/most helpful/most memorable for them, the type of role they took on within the group, the degree of success with which the group handled conflict and decision-making, and the things they would change to make the course or the group work better. Guided by questions concerning their participation, commitment, attitude, and learning, the students gave reasons why they felt they should earn a half credit, three-quarters credit, or full credit for the course. The final decision on credits earned was made by Ernie and myself after considering the students' input.

Despite my asking specific questions, the feedback I received through these evaluations was vague, although on the whole very positive. One student wrote, 'I feel I was able to have a say [in the course] because if I didn't, then we couldn't be called a group. And yes, I was listened to.'

Evaluating the course form my own perspective, I am struck by the richness of opportunity that a course based almost entirely on field trips provided. Each of our trips used the outdoors to develop meaning. Those trips that were planned by the students involved considerable decision-making and organization in the group or in partners just to get the trips off the ground. Trips became then the perfect cooperative, communal venture, to seduce students into participation and responsibility. They provided an opportunity for real-life problem solving, productive stress, student leadership, and goal-setting. The students had to make phone calls and bookings, ask the right questions, request funds, make daycare arrangements, plan lunch and shop for food, find suitable clothing, and organize transportation.

Having the students plan and lead the trips not only created a more democratic, egalitarian climate in the group, but also had a spin-off effect with respect to the students' other courses. By March, Ernie noted that it was the students in the outdoor ed class who were consistently taking leadership roles in their other courses. The other teachers were starting to ask the students to do more and more for themselves because the results had been so noticeable and positive.

Each trip brought the students out of the city environment and closer to the living Earth; each trip challenged them with something new (often perceived as risky), and gave them something to feel competent and confident about; and each trip generated its own stories, jokes, memories, and energy that lingered long after the trip was over. Ernie claimed that the students in Outdoor Ed seemed to have a higher energy level than they had had prior to the course, and that all the stories of funny things that happened this year have come out of that course.

It was not easy for me to relinquish control over planning, or rather to find a role for myself that balanced leadership and shared decision-making. There was a definite tension between the student-centred process of planning which I favoured and the types of activities I considered appropriate. I found myself declaring veto power over the students' decisions when their plans seemed not to be in the interests of outdoor ed (as I envisioned it). I drew the line at go-karting, roller-skating, and Canada's Wonder-
As much as my story is one of course design in a unique alternative programme, it is also the story of my own experiential learning as a student in the field of outdoor education.

TERM THREE
March 26
- introductory slide show of Canterbury Hills
April 2
- communications workshop: role-playing and cooperative exercises
9
- EASTER HOLIDAY
16
- outdoor cooperative games (cancelled)
23
- Canterbury Hills: initiatives and low ropes course
26
- Canterbury Hills follow-up; course evaluation and self-evaluations
30
- picnic at Victoria Park; goodbyes

PATHWAYS

land, and when the students suggested a trip to Niagara Falls and I said no, they began to feel resentful and suspected that I wanted only to approve ideas that I had suggested myself. I realized then that I had failed to establish with the students an explicit set of parameters or criteria for trips. This was a big oversight. By drawing up those criteria together we could have avoided my needing to declare a veto.

Two weeks after I rejected the Niagara plan, the students confronted me with complaints that I was not listening to them and was not really letting them make decisions. I was disturbed but considered this criticism to be valid. I agreed to listen again. They then presented me with a list they had drawn up together of reasons why Niagara Falls could be considered an appropriate trip for outdoor education. I was impressed that they had gotten together to discuss the problem they were having with me, and to come up with the list. This was a very appropriate and mature response on their part. I therefore had to respond in a way that was equally appropriate and mature. I told them that I thought they’d chosen an excellent way to deal with me, and that I was willing for us to consider Niagara Falls for our last trip. I suggested that they do some phoning to find out details (times, costs, etc.), and suggested that they give a report back to the group after the March break. I never heard anything about Niagara Falls again.

This suggests to me that the real issue had to do with the power dynamics the students were experiencing between themselves and myself, and that as soon as this was openly addressed and their concerns and ideas were given validity, the issue faded into irrelevance. What they really wanted was a legitimate say in the course; not the token control I was giving them by approving my own ideas when they offered them. The significance of this dynamic is underscored by Giroux and Trend who argue for the confirmation of student experiences and voices:

[Students need to be] legitimated and supported as people who matter, as people who can participate in the production and acquisition of their own learning, and as people who in doing so can speak with a voice that is rooted in their own sense of history and place. (1992)

In summary, the most successful elements of the course were those in which the student had a significant degree of control or involvement in the event, whether to do with the setting and atmosphere, the event itself, or the organization and planning of it. At the same time, successful events usually had an element of newness or challenge to them. For me, this observation supports the notion that good education is about getting people to do and enjoy things they would not otherwise do. It is about pushing people to move beyond their comfort zones, a move that is essential for growth to occur.

The philosophy of challenge-by-choice was key: the students themselves needed the freedom to choose to be challenged and the power to decide what limits to place on those challenges. They needed to be presented with the opportunities for challenge, but to know that they were the ones deciding whether or not to get up on a horse, use a table saw, sit alone by themselves in the woods, or extend themselves to care about others or about the natural world.

Reflecting on my own experience as a learner in the field of education, I can’t help but notice that this work at Wilma’s Place (my pedagogical baptism-by-fire) involved me in extraordinary experiential learning, stressful problem-solving, risk-taking, and challenge-by-choice — exactly the conditions I was trying to promote within the course itself. The result was an intensely personal and emotional journey. Although I cannot here convey the fullness of this experience, I hope that by sharing the story I have expressed the spirit of adventure in which I undertook this challenge and the energy I drew from learning with the students along the way. While unique to me and the situations of Wilma’s Place, I trust this story to be exemplary of Outdoor Education philosophy and trials, and, therefore, instructive to others in some way. I, for one, certainly could have
benefitted from this story before my experiential experiment in the field of Outdoor Education.

JENNIE BARRON lives near Walter's Fall, Ontario. In 1994-95 she worked at the Christie Outdoor Education Centre for the Hamilton Board of Education.

COURSE OBJECTIVES

1. To get students out of the inner-city environment and give them opportunities for outdoor recreation and a chance to enjoy the therapeutic effects of fresh air, physical activity, stress release, and a change of routine.

2. To develop students’ skills of organizing, asking questions, solving problems, and making decisions by giving students opportunities to plan field trips with minimal assistance from course leader or teachers.

3. To encourage an awareness and appreciation of the natural environment and students’ place in it.

4. To facilitate some understanding of environmental issues and how they affect the students as individuals and as parents.

5. To challenge students through adventure-type programming to take risks and expand their horizons. To build students’ self-confidence and improve their self-image while helping them see and overcome barriers to self-development.

6. To develop students’ communications skills and help them function more effectively and cooperatively in groups.

7. To involve students in their own learning by encouraging self-reflection and course evaluation and feedback.

8. To involve students in on-going projects which demand personal commitment, judgement, and responsibility, and which offer tangible and intangible rewards.

9. To foster group identity, teamwork, and the valuing of each member’s contribution to the group.

10. To give students with young children ideas of things they can do with their children that are fun, healthy, and educational.

Trips became then the perfect cooperative, communal venture, to seduce students into participation and responsibility.

It was not easy for me to relinquish control over planning.

the real issue had to do with the power dynamics the students were experiencing between themselves and myself.
BEElieve It or Not: A To Bee or Not To Bee Dramatization Activity

This is a group activity which can demonstrate how a typical honey bee colony functions. The class group can be divided into 8 categories of bee 'characters.' For each group of bees, actions can be assigned to the group in order to illustrate bee colonists' daily tasks.

Here are some points to get you started...DID YOU KNOW???

QUEEN
- may lay up to 2,000 eggs/day
- is the only fertile female in the colony
- is entirely dependent on workers to feed, clean, and direct her
- spreads pheromones amongst the workers so that they do not rear new queen
- lays fertilized (workers) and unfertilized eggs (drones)

LARVA
- perform somersaults within their cell in order to be facing the right direction when they hatch...after 24 hours, a larva is 5 times its weight

WORKERS
- Nurse Bees:
  - feed larva brood food, a mixture of honey and regurgitated pollen
  - care for the eggs produced by the queen, cleans the cells before the eggs are laid
  - each larva receives several hundred visits from nurse bees each day

GUARD BEES:
- examine incoming bees with their antennae and can detect unfamiliar bees due to their different 'scent'; a scent that each bee possesses due to the queen’s pheromones
- can be seen near hive entrance poised with their mandibles open and their forelegs off the ground ready to pounce on intruders

TEMPERATURE CONTROL
- under hot conditions, they spread droplets of water around the hive leaving them to evaporate
- they stand near the entrance and fan with their wing to create a current of air flowing through the nest
- because of these activities, the breeding area can be 35°C while temperatures outside can be as high as 70°C

RECEIVER BEES
- accept pollen and nectar collected by foraging bees
- they extend their tongue and push it between the mouth parts of the forager as it regurgitates the nectar from its honey stomach
- they then put it into the honey comb cells

FORAGERS
- during a single trip, a bee may visit several hundred flowers to collect its load (10 pollen loads needed for each larva/day) therefore, each colony needs over 1 million loads per year
- nectar is sucked up into its honey stomach while pollen collects on its body hairs, and is then transferred to their pollen baskets on their rear legs
- can not perceive red, but can see ultra violet
- only work on one type of flower at a time
- use the waggle dance if the nectar source is greater than 25m away; if less than 25, use a round dance

DRONES
- do not have ability to gather food
- have larger eyes and antennae used to locate the Queen during her mating flight
  - their only purpose in the hive is to mate with the Queen
  - once they mate... instant death due to genitalia being ripped off!
  - once the gathering season is over, drones are no longer reared!

This listing of bee colonists characteristics/habits comprise a basic outline of the function of the hive as a whole. There are many more characteristics equally ‘wild’ and exciting that can be gathered to further illustrate the complexity of the hive. Having tried this activity several times over the years, we consider this list of facts to be close to a saturation point for high school and university groups. Imagine, though, the fun of presenting this involved interactive dramatization at a gathering of an academic scientific community concerning ecosystems or a seriously minded naturalist club. Not only the presentation of bee details can be made more elaborate, but so too can the array of required actions. Actions, oh yes. This is the heart of any dramatization. Here is a sample that is meant to accompany the above set of details. Numbers here have been based on roughly 60 people. We have done this successfully with a minimum of 20 and have seen an expert, Cliff Sunflower, introduce this activity-based concept to over 100 people at a COEO conference in 1991.

**ACTIVITIES**

**QUEEN**
- stand tall and squat at regular intervals. Be patient, you do get to be quite assertive at one point.
- can wear a crown made out of cardboard and aluminium foil.

**LARVA**
- front rolls will be fine
- four radiating out from the Queen is recommended
- might need floor mats if indoors

**WORKERS (NURSE BEES)**
- you’ll need a brood food station, two large garbage cans will be fine
- Nurse bees travel continually out to brood food (semi-frenzied activity is best) gathering food to be regurgitated in front of the larva (this is best done imaginatively)
  - makes hundreds of trips per day
  - four is a good number
  - sound effects are great to add here

**GUARD BEES**
- stand their ground in front of and beside the front rolling larva
- look mean and spread elbows
- again four is a good number
- must “frisk” incoming bees

**TEMPERATURE BEES**
- fan the busy maze of activity that surrounds the Queen
- four or more is appropriate

**RECEIVER BEES AND FORAGER BEES**
- work together to get food into the hive, into the brood food stations specifically
- FORAGERS visit the flowers in the field (amidst the ever-shrinking audience) both sucking in honey and spreading pollen over their bodies (certainly this constitutes a dance of sorts)
- the RECEIVERS collect from the FORAGERS (that’s an understatement _ review details above)
  - a majority of your group will be involved in these functions, roughly 20 is about right
  - cut out flowers for placement around the room

**DRONES**
- Drones ‘hang out’ around the field, but if the Queen travels on a mating flight, they scurry into action
- live a leisurely life, sit around flexing their muscles
Once these actions are in place and all the audience have an active role, you might introduce a catastrophe to the hive such as an innocent canoe portager dislodging the hive or an all purpose SWARM to wrap up the activity with a collective mayhem. It is important to note that this is only one possible collection of actions. Like the bee facts offered, the actions can be made more elaborate and are open to many interpretations for human activity.

IDEAS FOR A MORE ELABORATE DRAMATIZATION

- Drone bees can be made to comprise all the audience members with glasses (Drone bees larger eyes than Nurse Bee Workers so that they can locate the Queen during her mating flight).
- A new Queen bee is reared when:
  1) the colony increases in size. Therefore, the Queen’s pheromones cannot get passed all the way around the hive.
  2) the Queen becomes too old and therefore cannot produce enough pheromones allowing the workers to rear queen cells.
- Once the Queen has disembodied the genitalia of a Drone, she continues her flight with the hopes of mating with other strong, healthy Drones. The stored sperm she collects will last her a lifetime.
- To get the activity started, I (Elaine) have the students close their eyes and “visualize” they are inside a bee hive. While they have their eyes closed I put on a set of antennae and grab a magic wand to help set the mood for the transformation of people into BEES!

REFERENCES:

Teal, Edwin Way, The Golden Throng, Dodd Mead Company, NY 1940

ELAINE COLE teaches science and physical education at Brock High School, Cammington, Ont. She incorporated the Bee Hive in Action within the social behaviour of animals units for Grade 10 science.

BOB HENDERSON teaches Outdoor Education at McMaster University

Thanks to Cliff Sunflower who introduced this activity to COEO members at the 1991 annual conference at the Leslie Frost Centre. Having used this activity with students ever since, finally the fun, learning, novelty, and overt wildness of this session compelled us to share it in writing.

Thanks to Ben Spergle, a student in Arts & Sciences at McMaster University for this cartoon.
GEOVENTURE TRAVELS TO COSTA RICA

Geoventure has long been synonymous with exploring the environment, and this marks the sixth year that Moira Secondary School in Belleville has hosted the programme. The class of 18 senior students works on an interactive learning by doing basis, and this innovative course up to now had taken them hiking in the Adirondacks, canoeing in the Kawarthas, and cycling through the Niagara region. Never before, however, had the cloud forests of Costa Rica been considered as a destination for study. This year’s major trip would prove to be the greatest life experience of each and every member of the group.

We had learned about Costa Rica in class. We had studied maps, planned, fundraised, and even dreamt about it. It was hard to believe that we were actually going to go through with it. The most incredible of all class trips began at 7:30 a.m., November 26, in front of the school, when 18 students and four leaders loaded their backpacks into a flotilla of cars and trucks, waved goodbye to a concerned group of family and friends, and proceeded to the Toronto airport. With the acceleration of the aircraft, we left our own little world of Belleville far behind, sped off into the unknown, and landed in Costa Rica’s capital of San Jose, five hours later.

Our teacher would not dream of poisoning our spirits by having us stay in a four star resort, so the first night we spent sleeping in a crowded, crude, bug-infested hotel in the heart of the bustling city. With five to a room, we lay there unable to sleep. At midnight, we were saying to ourselves, “What am I doing here?” After our one-night stay in the capital, we moved on to the Pacific Coast and things started to look better.

We camped in a national park and then hiked 12 kilometers to a beach where we swam and went on a nature hike in a dry tropical forest.

Geoventure believes that the world is a classroom, and the answer to any questions can be found within it. With our heads full of questions, we bravely explored many beautiful and interesting places in sunny Costa Rica.

From rumbling volcanoes to roaring Pacific beaches, we hiked, camped, and drove from one magical place to another.

At times I had to pinch myself to make sure I wasn’t dreaming. Every day was a new adventure, completely different from the day before. One day we hiked through a jungle, the next we hiked to a sulphur mine in a cloud forest, and the next we jumped off of a 40-foot waterfall into clear, tropical water. It was like a movie we could not stop watching. We never knew where we’d end up next: at the foot of a still active volcano or running away from scorpions, spiders, and other monsters of the insect world.

It was staggering how different things were from life in Canada. Nothing was the same; the weather, soil, trees, language...everything was different. After lots of travelling, we stopped for four days in Limon, a large city on the Caribbean coast. Here we split up and stayed with selected families so that we could see and experience many sides of the Costa Rican culture first hand. No two houses or families were the same. Some people in the class stayed in large mansions, with hot water and a great view, while others stayed in small tin houses with no hot water or other luxuries we take for granted at home.

The thought of living with people who don’t even speak the same language can be very scary at first. Conversations with the families were often vague and short, but we brought pictures of our families and our snow-covered houses. The white stuff definitely was a point of interest, since some of the Costa Ricans had never seen snow before. One night, all of the Geoventure students and one or two members of each family went to a local dance club. Here, the language barrier was lost and a good time was had by all. It was comforting to us to see that some things were the same.

Sponsored by Canada World Youth, this marked the first time a combination cultural/educational trip to Costa Rica from Belleville.
had ever been tried. The experience was new for Canadians and Costa Ricans alike. Part of this pioneering effort included us assisting in the construction of a research/recreation centre in a section of preserved tropical rain forest.

The entire experience of being in a developing country is one that changes people. By the end of the trip, we had all been changed to some degree. Our outlooks and feelings of tropical developing countries are now based on experience, not just what we could see on TV. The change in the Geoventure class was felt the most the day before we left for home, when we returned to the same hotel that we had stayed in our arrival. The first time we stayed in the hotel with tiny showers, five-to-a-room, and several large insects, we thought, 'We are staying in this!' When we returned 15 days later, we found it the most relaxing, beautiful place we had ever seen and were all too happy to spend the night there.

The trip had been a success. When it was time to leave, we were all eager to go home and see familiar faces and the minus 15°C weather. When we returned to Belleville at 4 a.m., all of our parents were standing there with open arms. I had never missed home as much as I did when I stepped off the bus back at the school with my tan and t-shirt to see my family shivering in the snow. That morning, my parents and I didn't go back to sleep, but stayed up and shared the adventures and experiences of an incredible trip.

ERIK SORENSEN is a student in the Geoventure programme based out of Moira Secondary School in Belleville, Ontario. Hugh Minchely teaches the Curriculum Integration programme.
ANOTHER WILDERNESS: NEW OUTDOOR WRITING BY WOMEN

Editor: Susan Fox Rogers
Seattle: Seal Press, 1994

Fox’s collection of writing illustrates women’s ways of knowing the wilderness. Our myths may have us believe that explorers of wilderness are rugged men who conquer mountains and chew nails for breakfast. Technically, a wilderness is an area where the earth and its community of life are untrammeled by man, where man himself is a visitor who does not remain’ (The U.S. Wilderness Act, Sept. 3, 1964). It can also be argued, from a sociological standpoint, that wilderness is whatever people think it is (Hendee, Stankey & Lucas, Wilderness Management, 1978). Fox’s collection represents women’s views of this latter definition — these tales are by women who dared to adventure into the unknown, to push themselves physically and emotionally into new realms in the outdoors.

Many themes and ideas are represented within these diverse tales. There is flow in Susanna Levin’s Night Skates,’ a tale about rollerblading at night through the streets and hazards of San Francisco, that is reminiscent of Csikszentmihalyi’s studies of experiences where action and awareness merge. Insights into how women preserve under adverse conditions are provided in Endurance on the Ice: ‘The American Women’s Antarctic Expedition,’ Anne Dal Vera’s account of a grueling expedition into the frozen north.

‘Lucy Jane Bledsoe in Solo,’ ‘Gretchen Legler in Wolf,’ and ‘Anna Linne in Superior Spirit’ write about personal transitions — the letting go of someone who has died — through their intense wilderness journeys. ‘In Homewater of the Mind,’ Holly Morris describes fly fishing as a meditative experience; in ‘A City Girl Discovers the Forest,’ Gabrielle Daniels tells of an urban dweller’s discovery of the wilderness; and in ‘A Glacier Summer,’ Barbara Wilson recounts one special summer of glacier climbing in Norway.

‘In Storms Worse than My Own,’ Clarice Dickson provides honest, gut-wrenching insights into how a group of women expeditioners deal with the stresses of group dynamics on an attempted climb of Sultana (near Denali). Alice Evans in In the Canoe Endlessly Paddling recounts how humour — her hilarious thoughts — got her through a seeming endless paddle in the cold, wind, and wet.

Tales of fear also pervade the women’s accounts of their experiences. In ‘River of Fear, River of Grace,’ Geneen Marie Haugen tells of her harrowing experience guiding a raft down the over-flooded Colorado River in June 1983, where she faced a 10+ rapid in out-of-control conditions. Adversity for her bred confidence: The river roared and went silent, an amplified stillness. Out of the resounding hush, I heard a call — the river’s voice, my own; Geneen, ‘If you can do this, you can anything’ (p. 263).

The stories in this collection are both enjoyable and inspirational. Women should read this book to motivate, validate, and better understand their wilderness experiences. Men should read it to explore different ways of knowing wilderness experiences.

CHERYL ESTES, Instructor, SUNY Cortland, State University of New York College at Cortland, NY. Department of Recreation and Leisure Studies

Thanks to Taproot, A publication of the Coalition for Education in the Outdoors, Winter 1995.

GUIDE TO WOMEN’S STUDIES IN THE OUTDOORS: REVIEW OF RESEARCH WITH ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY, compiled and edited by Nina S. Roberts, M.A. This is the 1994 edition and pertains to women’s experiences in outdoor adventure activities. This 45-page guide, listing more than 110 studies and research papers, includes an abstract/summary of findings with each reference. Also identifies over 50 key people across the U.S. who have made research
contributions, and indicates areas neglected by research thus far.

Proceeds to assist in the development of outdoor adventure programs for women and girls in the metro DC area. $10.50 + $1.50 Shipping and Handling. To order, send cheque or money order to Nina S. Roberts, 9703 47th Place, College Park, MD 20740, USA.

Thanks to Environmental Educator NAAEE, May/June, 1995.

**Environmental Views Series, CD-ROM's for Environmental Understanding**

OPTILEARN P.O. Box 997 Stevens Point, WI USA 54481

Phone: 1-800-850-9480 Fax: 715-344-1066

CD-ROM's have arrived. Be they, an interactive slide show format or text reprint to computer, the CD-ROM is now in book stores, schools and homes. One educational series from OPTILEARN, the Environmental Views series, currently offers 10 titles, Endangered Species, Fossil Fuels, Renewable Energy, Soil Erosion and Conservation, Wetlands, Cities and Settlements, Earth Biomes, Mineral Resources and Mining, Ocean Pollution and Solid Waste. Each CD-ROM sells for $49.95 U.S. and contains 100 plus digital photos with an accompanied one paragraph text. Basically you get a compact slide show with text that you can shuffle at will to suit particular applications. Once stored in your hard drive, the Media Centre Lite allows you to create your own photo album of slide/window images. You can augment the window image/text package as presented and/or create your own album. This is an attractive feature.

We reviewed the WETLANDS title. On the positive side, the images were well chosen and covered North America in a thorough manner from tundra to everglades. Certainly the wetlands title, if exemplary of the other titles to the series, suggests that the series would be a useful supplement to secondary and post-secondary level environmental education curricula with a science and geography focus.

On the negative side, the slide/window images lack a referencing title such that it is hard to find specific titles at a glance. The reference number serves the programmer but not the student viewer. You can, of course, insert your own table of contents once the CD is loaded into your hard drive.

The series is readable on DOS, Windows and Macintosh and is an upgrade from the conventional slide shows in terms of flexibility, durability and storage. The ideal is to view the title, for example Wetlands, and then as access to the technology allows, use the idea and format to go to the field, and take selected images to produce and write your own local bioregion wetlands series. Again, you might also augment the existing series. We fear the ideal will rarely be achieved. As this new form of educational packaging gains prominence, we hope the field trip, the outdoor educational experience to the wetlands, remains the ideal, the essential, the given, and the CD-ROM serves as the classroom or home supplement as intended.

William Edwards and Bob Henderson

William is a computer programmer and graphic artist. He had a CD-ROM collection before co-author Bob Henderson knew what the term meant.

They reviewed the Wetland title together.
PROFOUND INTERSPECIES EVENTS: IMPLICATIONS FOR OUTDOOR EDUCATION

Do you remember a moment in your life when you felt a sudden, deep connection to another animal? I can recall a few, including a sublime hour sitting in a field of swaying buttercups observing a groundhog, an afternoon walking with an ex-captive juvenile orangutan in the Borneo rainforest, and the less inspiring, but just as moving, morning spent throwing up in the toilet while my cat, Ralph, sat on the edge of the tub, patiently watching over me.

California researcher Anthony Rose suggests that many natural scientists and other folk whose careers involve working with animals have also experienced, at some point, intense feelings of kinship with other life; he's dubbed such experiences, Profound Interspecies Events (PIEs). While few PIEs have been reported in the scientific literature, Rose believes that they are far from uncommon, especially among ethnologists (those who study animal behavior in natural settings):

Ethologist's lives are filled with experiences that can counter the utilitarian ethos that characterizes nature as something more than a resource for human development and consumption. It is time to use those experiences to promote a naturalistic conservation ethos. (1995, p. 1)

It is his hope that if ethnologists share their experiences, the public may begin to understand and perhaps share their empathy for and fascination with other life. To this end, one of the goals of his research is to develop a database of these anecdotes.

By scouring the natural history and ethology literature and interviewing scientists, Rose has already collected an impressive number of descriptions of PIEs. Contrary to the image many of us have of cool, detached, objective scientists, many of these stories demonstrate the scientist's intense feelings of connection to their research subjects.

Rose's research confirms what a number of environmental philosophers have been stating for years. For example, Neil Evernden asks that we recall that the ecologist was motivated initially by his immeasurable wonder at the existence of life, and the wilderness defender may remember that it was [her] experience, not real estate, that prompted [her] concern' (1985, p. 143).

Outdoor educators play a potentially important role in fostering the PIEs of future ethologists and environmentalists, for these PIEs rarely happen within the confines of a classroom or living room. A sense of wonder and awe at other life tends, for the most part, to occur outside. And according to Rachel Carson, the companionship of an adult who can share this sense of wonder, joy, and excitement can be vitally important (1965, p. 45).

A word of caution is in order, however. Rose suggests that PIEs rarely happen in highly structured settings, so it is not something we can simply work into the curriculum. PIEs cannot be forced. Thus I see the outdoor educator as someone who can provide students with the opportunities to be outside, who can share their sense of curiosity about, and love and enthusiasm for, nature, and who knows when the time is right to offer further information to a student and when to back off and let the student revel, alone, in the joy of discovering something new and profound.

If you would like further information or would like to share your own interspecies' experiences and participate in Anthony Rose's project, contact him by e-mail (biosynrgy@aol.com) or mail (The Biosynergy Institute, P.O. Box 488, Hermosa Beach, California 90254).
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LYNDE MARSH MATTERS

Whether we realize it or not, most of us who live in southern Ontario are suffering from what John Livingston has called 'experiential undernutrition.' Caged within our homes, schools, cars and offices, we interact almost exclusively with humans and human artifacts. Even when we do choose to expose ourselves to the elements, we are confronted with a landscape that has been tamed and homogenized by roadways, monocultures, and urban sprawl.

Many people have become used to this human-inflicted edenium. Some even seem to thrive on it. Others, though, like the for instance, are in a state of constant craving — for the fragrance of pine, the blessing of silence and the company of stars.

It is no easy matter to satisfy this craving south of the Shield. The silver maple which shades my bedroom window is a comfort. And the backyard offers up a toad or nuthatch on occasion. Still, if it is wildness I want, the kind that enfolds and resonates inside me, I have to seek it out. This is often difficult to do without a car unfortunately, since wild places are so few and far between.

One would think, given heightened environmental awareness and the absolute rarity of natural areas in this part of the province, that those wild places which still exist would be treasured, cared for, and accorded society's full and unwavering protection. Such is not the case, alas. Despite the development of guidelines, policy, and legislation that seem to bode well, nature lovers are up against formidable odds in their efforts to preserve the islands of green that remain.

A case in point is Lynde Marsh, a Class 1 wetland located on the northern shoreline of Lake Ontario in Whitby. Lynde Marsh is, in fact, one of the last remaining Class 1 wetlands on Lake Ontario between Hamilton and Cobourg. For the past four years local citizens' groups have been doing their best to protect this place from a massive development proposal for 685 acres of adjacent land. Envisioned is a medium- to high-density subdivision of 5,700 residents which will include three new schools, four high rises, and an industrial park. Worried locals believe that the development poses a serious threat to the marsh which is, among other things, a valuable breeding and feeding ground for American Wigeon, Northern Shoveler, Black Tern, and Eastern Spiny Softshell turtle, as well as a welcome refuge for muskrats, beaver, mink, foxes, and humans.

Concern about the development has been mounting ever since the Central Lake Ontario Conservation Authority criticized the initial development proposals in 1988. The first citizens' group, Friends of Lynde Marsh, formed in 1991. Meanwhile, planning proceeded, and zoning for the site was amended from major open space to residential-industrial in 1992 without any environmental assessment, effectively setting the stage for development.

In autumn of 1994, plans of subdivision came before Whitby Council. Defenders of the marsh splintered into two groups according to preferred strategy. Members of Save The Lynde Marsh decided to pursue, come what may, the no development option. They made Lynde Marsh an issue in the provincial election and convinced the successful Conservative candidate to agree to push for an environmental assessment and to stop a housing project on the lands owned by the province.

Meanwhile, members of Concerned Citizens for Lynde Marsh decided to go before the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) with the hope of influencing how development might occur. Negotiating with landowners, they managed to persuade two of them (the Region and the Province) to adhere to the Ontario Wetlands Policy Statement and its Implementation Guidelines. The third landowner, a private development company, felt that the policy should not apply. Its position was supported at the OMB hearing in May 1995, when the Chair ruled that, in fact, the Wetlands Policy did not have to be strictly adhered to.
Considering the many long years of lobbying and negotiating that went into producing the Wetlands Policy, this is bad news indeed. Of the approximately 2 million hectares of wetland that once existed in southern Ontario, 70-80% has already been severely altered or destroyed, and the decline continues at 1-2% per year. When will it stop? How can we get it to stop? The citizens groups involved in the Lynde Marsh issue have already incurred costs of $70,000. They simply cannot afford to push the matter further in the courts. Even if they could, they would find themselves having to rationalize their position as if the rarity of a class 1 wetland in the Golden Horseshoe does not speak for itself.

This crazy situation reminds me in a way of what outdoor educators are up against, having to rationalize everything they do in terms of outcomes. Outcomes! Are we so alienated from our animal-selves that we have to spell out in so many words the benefits to be had from nature experience and from maintaining the very possibility for such experience? Apparently we are—which is cause for dismay, but no reason to give up.

If you are concerned about the Lynde Marsh issue, ask your MPP to take a stand and insist that the Wetlands Policy be upheld. For more information, phone Johanna Tito of Concerned Citizens for Lynde Marsh at (905) 668-1317 or Glen Rae of Save The Lynde Marsh at (905) 666-5334.
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ENGAGEMENT, EVALUATION AND INTEGRATED PROGRAMMES

There is no doubt that initiatives such as integrated multi-credit high school programmes have created much interest over the past few years. However, as Bert Horwood pointed out in the June issue of Pathways, "we are rich in silent, practical knowledge, but weak in public, disciplined research knowledge" (1995, p. 17). This paper addresses two of the four major problems arising from integrated packages that Bert mentioned in that article, research and evaluation. To begin, I will introduce the notion of 'engagement' as another feature that contributes to the integration of programmes. I will then discuss how engagement may be a useful means of evaluating integrated programmes.

Before extending the discussion begun by Bert Horwood about the nature of what makes integrated programmes effective, it makes sense to begin by identifying two assumptions underlying this discussion — first, that integration fosters an educational climate in which learning and development is similar to life outside of school. Second, that learning by doing has a history that extends beyond recent calls for relevance in schooling. It is important to point out that learning by doing is considered to be a hall-mark of outdoor education at its best. Learning by doing in the form of apprenticeships, internships, cooperative education and work-study linkages have been with us for some time.

ENGAGEMENT

The notion that engagement contributes to the integration of learning may appear to be obvious. It is, in the sense that if one is not engaged, then one might not be learning and developing one's capacities to live a good life. But engagement is an interesting concept with the potential to be understood many ways. The following example illustrates this point. Two students are members of a class building a house (Kozolanka 1993). The first is observed standing off to the side of the house for most of the afternoon, leaning on his shovel, watching his classmates scurry about. The second spends the same time unloading and stacking a pile of lumber from a delivery truck. Which one is engaged? Both? Neither? Why? My first reaction to Robert was that he was just dogging it and not engaged in what was happening at all. I felt differently about the second student, Paul — who appeared to be quite engaged. I subsequently asked both of these students what was happening with them while they were doing what they were doing. Here are their replies:

Robert:

[I was thinking!] That this is like a pattern through the years. I think everyone has just built one [a house], and then another group's building another, and you get a whole bunch of people building houses just to make a community or something (p. 164).

Paul:

[I was thinking!] That these are just stupid houses, Like — I don't like any of the houses around here, really. Because they're just-like... Like this one right here is just stupid-looking, the way it is like a box with the corners cut off (p. 162).

I was surprised by their responses. I realized that their engagement had little to do with the opinions formed by my observations. So, which one was engaged? Both? Neither? My hunch is that they both were — but in very different ways. Furthermore, their engagement changed according to circumstances — something I call a pattern of engagement. I think that these circumstances are influenced by the presence or absence of the features that contribute to integration identified by Bert Horwood (1995, p. 14). Put another way, these features may determine the nature of one's engagement...
which can be a pattern of involvement or a path of participation that meets the patterns and paths of others from time to time as we act in communities. So one’s engagement is in part defined by one’s relationship to others — in much the same way that Bert’s features are defined by their relationships with each other. For example, experiential learning can be more or less experiential depending on the nature of authentic experiences or challenging action one may find in a particular programme. As students work with circumstances they form unique but interconnected patterns of engagement that are changing and shifting constantly. The shifting nature of their engagement is rather like the reflections in three mirrors held in a triangle facing each other. Each time one or another is shifted then the image reflected in each mirror shifts as well — the circumstances change and so do perspectives.

EVALUATION

Thus far I have confined the definition of engagement to an additional feature in Bert Horwood’s description of what contributes to integration. But there is value in seeing engagement as a kind umbrella idea too. It is here that we can address issues of evaluation. Meta-engagement might describe how a student manages her membership in the community of learners of which she has become a member.

For the students in the programme I studied, their perceived engagement or lack of engagement was a multi-faceted phenomenon which did not respond well to traditional behavioural attempts at evaluation. For example, Paul was assessed as one with a chronic ‘bad attitude,’ an opinion I could not share. But was he engaged? I will say he was — to the extent that he was able to critique the house design and offer alternatives to boxes with the corners cut off. Assessing Paul using behavioural criteria, for example his ability to meet certain objectives measured by corresponding performance criteria, is problematic. It represents a common dilemma found in integrated programmes — that of finding ways of evaluating students without falling into the trap of using methods which may not be appropriate to the nature of these programmes.

It may be useful at this point to step back to examine the competing perspectives we find in learning theory and, by association, evaluation. On the one hand, we have conventional evaluation which is grounded in the understanding that learning and development is something that happens primarily inside the heads of individuals — in other words, learning happens from the inside-out. The idea here is that mental operations are universal. This perspective, known as a centred view has tended to dominate practice in most mainstream schools. On the other hand, we have a perspective that sees learning and development as something that happens initially from the outside-in where particular cultures, societal institutions and historical moments combine to influence mental functioning. This perspective is known as a ‘de-centred’ view — one which has tended to dominate the experiential schooling usually associated with outdoor education. A centred view is underpinned by the theoretical weight of developmental and behavioural psychology and holds that individuals acquire uniform learning capacities, as illustrated in Piaget’s developmental stages. A de-centred view though, is underpinned by a group-oriented view of learning that emphasizes learning from the outside in. In this view, cultural forces and interactive experience are seen to dominate learning and development where, for example, all reflection is preceded by experience. This is found in the research done by Gilligan (1982) where women were seen to have developmental realities distinct from men. Put simply, a centred view holds to a individualistic perspective while a de-centred view holds more to a collective or cultural one. In schools these tensions get played out in many ways but nowhere are they so strong as in the area of evaluation. The dilemma for teachers is conflict-laden because individualistic imperatives pull in one direction, for example in the need for asserting ones uniqueness, while collective or cultural imperatives such as the need for
community, push in the other. The answer to the dilemma does not lie in choosing one perspective over the other. When attempts are made to combine these two perspectives we often get the kinds of conflicts which are common to evaluation within integrated curriculum packages. One such conflict involves the use of behavioural criteria as the sole means of determining a student's engagement — in much the way that Robert and Paul were evaluated. The answer to the dilemma lies in the ability of teachers to locate these behavioural outcomes in broad contexts such as those found within integrated programmes. When this is done the two competing perspectives are seen to be contextualized and situated.

The middle position between centred and decentralised views is referred to by Lave & Wenger (1991) as a 'situated' view and is underpinned by a new field of study called cultural psychology (Schweder 1990) which suggests that mental processes connected to understanding are socially shared where persons and communities mutually constitute each other (Jahoda 1992, p. 167). A situated view of learning and development is one in which knowledge is seen to rest collectively in a community where it is continually undergoing reconstruction as a result of daily ongoing practical activities. An example of this would be a community of practice such as a construction crew building a house or a group of teachers in a school. In these communities the relations need to be dynamic in order to be effective. For example, while certain things remain static in construction and teaching, like following plans, good practice is quite often characterized by a capacity to 'fly by the seat of one's pants.' This view of knowledge contrasts with that of a centred view which is concerned primarily with the acquisition and assimilation of information in the form of schemata or formulas which individuals then apply to various situations. It contrasts too, with a decentralised view in which collective forces dominate and the individual is defined from without through communal endeavors. To sum up then, a situated view can be a response to the push and pull of individualistic and collective forces through which we as humans manage to establish an identity within what are called communities of practice (Lave & Wenger 1991). If we choose to hold to a situated view of learning and development then it follows that evaluation that is also situated should be our primary concern.

Returning now to our discussion of finding appropriate evaluation for integrated programmes, we may see that one's view of knowledge will determine how one attempts to evaluate it. If we hold to a centred perspective, where knowledge is mostly perceived to be information and the fulfillment of established social roles, then one will be content with evaluation that seeks to measure such capacities. For example, both Robert and Paul were so perceived as marginal students by their teachers — Robert as marginal because he did not seem to be working and Paul because he had a bad attitude. We may see then, that although processing information and fulfilling certain social roles may be desireable — these approaches can also become designs for conformity. This is possible because the behaviours or patterns of engagement that students enact are expected to fit certain pre-conceived ideas. When we hold to a de-centred perspective we run into similar problems. Here the emphasis is on the ability of a student to 'get along' and contribute to the group. Problems arise when the nature of how this is supposed to happen is (again) pre-conceived. Viewed differently, Paul's challenge to the design of the house could become an opportunity for discussion and reflection. Designs which encourage only compliance are troubling in schooling contexts such as integrated programming and outdoor education because these programmes in many ways promote individual variation and development within community. So the question remains, how might one develop an evaluation design that accommodates both of these perspectives without falling into the trap of using evaluations that first, speak to one or the other exclusively and second, avoid rule-governed ideas about performance? The answer may lie in an emphasis on neither of these competing...
perspectives alone but in an approach to evaluation which would be determined by the particular context or situated nature of experience.

**THREE SUGGESTIONS FOR EVALUATION**

Teachers and schools who wish to evaluate students within integrated programmes may need to be conscious of the competing traditions described above. Is to be engaged" enough or do students need to be engaged in a certain prescribed manner? Do evaluations need to take a fresh view — transcending rule-driven accounts? In other words, can we give up the idea of evaluating behavioural performance alone; whether it involves information-processing or being able to function in a group? Being able to do either or both says little of one’s ability to engage in the transformative potential of experience. Take for example the experiences of Robert and Paul. Robert was evaluated on his perceived inability to fit into the group and do the job. Paul too, was evaluated on his inability to model a ‘good attitude.’ Both of these responses are behavioural means that ignored the situated nature of their engagement. When Robert was afforded an opportunity to talk about his perceived ‘non-participation’ it was understood differently. The same was true for Paul. Originally, both evaluations ignored the capacity of both students to reflect on the nature of their engagement in the community of which they were members.

So, how would we evaluate a student’s capacity to act within a community of learners? Bert referred to the Australian University which developed carefully disciplined anecdotal reporting as one option. There are other good examples too, but what I think is important to remember is that integrated programmes need to develop their own methods and rigour. To that end I propose that student evaluations for integrated programmes begin with at least three characteristics. The first characteristic is that evaluations should be locally grown’ wherever possible — that they be developed out of local needs. In other words, evaluation design might be more sympathetic to programme design. For instance, if students are building a house then the exercise of due care when it comes to the safety of others might be a primary concern. Secondly, whatever means are developed should be perceived as intrinsically worthwhile activities in themselves, otherwise there is danger in falling into the trap of providing recipes for compliance that tend to be meaningless and exploitive. In the integrated curricular programme I studied, the quality and incidence of journaling deteriorated when students were informed that their journals would be marked. I suspect that journals became less of a safe place for self-expression and personal growth issues. Thirdly, evaluations of students should center around an examination of the nature of student participation and membership in broad contexts — such as the community in which they might be working and studying. In this instance we might ask that students account for their engagement as it relates to others in the programme. This implies that students might well be asked to evaluate themselves as individuals and each other as members of a learning community. Each of these characteristics may be expanded and developed into more robust versions of what has been briefly presented here. For example, the third characteristic can be expanded to include an examination of the underlying assumptions that comprise the social relations in which students are involved. It could also accommodate Paul’s house critique as more than just an attitude problem.

These characteristics are not the final word on evaluations within integrated programmes, but are intended to add clarity to an emerging debate. The gist of the argument is that integrated programmes need evaluation designs that fit with their curricular and instructional designs. To sum up, this paper has addressed two of the four major dilemmas arising from integrated programmes identified by Bert Horwood. The first is in the area of evaluation and represents an attempt to theoretically map out some of the landscape in which integrated programmes function. Connected to this is the
idea that evaluations should reflect programme design and to that end a framework has been proposed. The second is in the general area of research and is intended to extend our knowledge base in two areas: by adding to the features that contribute to integration and by introducing the notion of meta-engagement as a concept that may help in determining the nature of student involvement in these programmes.

ENDNOTES

1. The four major problems are in the areas of — teacher training, research, grading/evaluation, and money.

2. Horwood’s six central features of all integrated curricula are: experiential learning, whole process, authenticity, challenge, responsibility, and community.


Thanks for suggestions and editing must go to one of the communities of practice of which I am a member:
Bert Horwood, Nancy Jackson, Arlene Stairs, and Jan Swaren.
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AWARDS 1995

The PRESIDENT'S AWARD is presented to an individual who has made an outstanding contribution to the development of the Council of Outdoor Educators of Ontario and to outdoor education in Ontario.

This year's recipient is Linda McKenzie. Linda has been an active member of COEO for many years. She has been primarily responsible for organizing the Spring Celebration conferences held each year at the Leslie M. Frost Centre. In addition, she has held the position of Regional Representative for the Northern Region for the last three years. In this capacity, she has organized a number of workshops for people in that area of the province. She has been an effective member of the COEO Board of Directors, driving from South River to Toronto in all kinds of weather (especially bad weather in the winter) for meetings. Linda was primarily responsible for the organization of this year's Annual Conference and anyone there couldn't help but be impressed by her seemingly endless energy. Linda uses her knowledge of outdoor education every day in her role as a teacher at Project Dare. Congratulations, Linda, and thank you for your outstanding contribution to COEO.

The DOROTHY WALTER AWARD FOR LEADERSHIP was created in 1986 to give recognition to an individual who, like Dorothy Walter herself, has shown outstanding commitment to the development of leadership qualities in Ontario youth. The individual should have demonstrated a commitment and innovation in leadership development, to learning in the out-of-doors, to personal growth in their own life and service to an organization or community.

This year's recipient is Mary Jeanne (M.J.) Barrett. M.J. is a member of the Pathways editorial board and is an organizer, indeed initiator, of the Bark Lake colloquium concerning integrated curricula programming. She has provided sound leadership in curriculum design, setting an example of putting innovative ideas into practice at Mayfield Secondary School and elsewhere. This year, she has also won a Peel Board of Education Award for her outstanding contributions to education.

The ROBIN DENNIS AWARD is presented to an individual or outdoor education programme or facility having made an outstanding contribution to the promotion and development of Outdoor Education in the province of Ontario. The award was created in tribute to Robin Dennis, one of the founders of outdoor education in Ontario in the 1950s and 1960s, and is presented annually by the Boyne River Natural Science School and the Toronto Island Natural Science School.

The Robin Dennis Award recipient for 1995 is Bert Horwood. Bert is well known amongst COEO for his passionate and thoughtful commitment to outdoor/experiential education. His contribution takes many shapes. He is a fixture of high esteem at COEO gatherings as a featured workshop and keynote presenter. He is a key contributor of ideas, current research, and programme activities via Pathways, and he has influenced the lives of countless students through his quality teaching in the Outdoor Experiential Education programme at Queen's University. Throughout COEO circles, Bert is an advisor and inspiration as he continues to offer the insight of a sage among us and research studies exemplary of the most youthful and enthusiastic within our field.
CONFERENCE REPORT 95

Branching Out, this year's annual conference, ran successfully the weekend of Sept. 22-24 at COEO's favourite conference site—the Leslie Frost Centre in Dorset. There were over 70 folks in attendance, mostly classroom teachers, for whom the programme had been geared. A wide variety of sessions provided lots of hands-on activities I am sure were used the following week. Feedback for the workshops was extremely positive. A pet on the back and a heartfelt thanks goes out to all our presenters for doing a wonderful job of teaching and inspiring us. Equally important, though, were the participants. Guess what was most frequently mentioned as the BEST part of the weekend—the people! What more can I say—COEO folks are an outdoorable bunch. Thanks to all for joining us. Look for highlights of the conference in the next Pathways.

CONFERENCE REPORT 96

Congratulations to Linda McKenzie and all other organizers and contributors for the 1995 Annual Conference. While participants at the COEO Conference were engaged in their program, some other COEO members shared the same facility as participants at a parallel conference. On the same September 23-25 weekend, the Frost Centre hosted another of their highly-impactting, experiential native study conferences for educators.

At the 1995 Frost Centre gathering, an announcement was made on behalf of a small core team who have created plans for the 1996 Annual Conference. The theme and ideas have been carried forward from the Arowhon 1994 conference...1994-95-96...Yes, some continuity actually does exist in the fragmented 1990s.

Part of the 1996 Conference is themed toward celebrating 25 years of COEO, the organization; honouring the 'Trailblazers' among us; and seeking wisdom from those Trailblazers in back to the 'future' type of sessions. That theme will be traced through all COEO functions in 1996. The dominant conference theme continues as first expressed at Arowhon: 'First Nations contributions to outdoor and environmental education.' The process of moving forward the vision and venue should be of interest to readers.

The first vision was to host the conference at Bark Lake where the infusion of native resource people would have helped to strengthen their successful (though embryonic) native youth leadership development courses. The (re)exposure of COEO membership would have (re)acquainted many with that metamorphosing centre. Dates and rates were confirmed for such a 'seeding' type of conference for Bark. Unfortunately, the closure of Bark Lake necessitated a rethink.

The core team turned their thinking toward a real conference partnership with a First Nations community. This would be less traditional than a conference which invites native resource people to a non-native facility to contribute to and blend with, basically, a non-native function. Conferencing on native land, in a native community, changes the balance in human relationships. Conferencing in a native community would leave the bulk of conference income in that community. Although a departure from tradition, the planning team liked the idea and felt the membership would also.

Where? became the next item. Brainstorming of possible communities within a few hours of the greater Toronto area (Yes, most of the COEO membership is centred there) came up with these possibilities. (This is not a complete list; it is what the team knew about.)

6 nations near Brantford
Curve Lake near Buckhorn
Rama near Orillia
Cape Croker near Wiarton
Whitefish Bay on Manitoulin Island

Discussion flowed through the sites, considering what we knew of potential facilities, of known native resource people, of other pros and cons. Curve Lake was approached. On the edge of the Canadian Shield, with a wonderful
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native art gallery and gift store (Whetung), strong traditional Ojibwa culture, it had workable conference facilities in and around the village. However, the annual Curve Lake Pow Wow is held the last weekend in September. This is a celebration that involves the whole community; a tradition that is inviolate. Even hosting a COEO Conference the weekend before would not work. Pow wow preparations are lengthy and involved.

Oshweken is a village which centres 6 Nations administration, culture and business on reserve land near Brantford. It will be the host site for the COEO conference the last weekend in September 1996. It is in the Carolinian forest zone with ancient oak and hickory giants dotted along river floodplains. The village has locations for plenary and small group conference sessions. There is a range of accommodation in and near Oshweken. The village venue will require more movement from session to session than usual. That and a host of other factors will go into planning a partnership programme over the next few months.

The COEO folks who have been asked about this conference vision and venue have said they quite like it. As more information is shared on sessions, resource people, celebrations, apppellations, incantations, and fun...we hope you will like it too.

---

CLARE MAGEE teaches Outdoor Education
at Senaca College, King’s Campus
NATIONAL SURVEY SHOWS PROMISING TRENDS in GO FOR GREEN News

As you know, reduction of pesticide use in our parks and home gardens is a concern of Active Living — Go for Green! and our principal sponsor, Health Canada. Gardening is one of the most popular outdoor activities in Canada, and parks are an important setting for other forms of outdoor recreation. Consequently, we feel that it is important to provide information about health risks — and ways of reducing those risks — as well as encouraging Canadians to be active outdoors.

The Naturalization Report, commissioned by Active Living — Go for Green!, provides an overview of the situation in Canada regarding pesticide use and the level of acceptance of the naturalization process. The encouraging news is that pesticide use is on the decline, at least in parks. However, home gardening use is still a problem area according to Statistics Canada reports indicating over-use. There is a need, then, to work to lessen the unnecessary use of pesticides.

Co-incidental with less use of pesticides is the growing acceptance of naturalization. Indigenous species are more readily available and require less water and maintenance due to their long-term adaptation to their surroundings. This can mean lower costs related to seeds, maintenance, pest and weed control, water requirements, and so on.

Reduction of pesticides and promotion of naturalization is thus a two-for-one initiative which helps create physical environments that promote safe, outdoor, environmentally-friendly, active living. The Report provides some background information and a base-line to the issues.

To order a copy of the Naturalization study, call the Active Living — Go for Green! office at (613) 748-5787. Cost $5.00.
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Explore New Territory! Create Your Own Adventure!

Graduate teaching assistantships* are available in Outdoor Teacher Education at Northern Illinois University for the 1996-97 school year, beginning in early January or Mid-August. The assistantships involve outdoor teaching at Lorado Taft Field Campus, Oregon, Illinois.

Because the teaching is primarily with public school students and university juniors and seniors, priority is given to those applicants who have had several years of experience in the elementary or secondary schools or nature and outdoor centers.

The assistantships pay a stipend of $411/month for 9 months, include a waiver of tuition for 3 semesters, and partial room and board for nine months.

For applications and further information contact Dr. Knapp, Lorado Taft Field Campus, P.O. Box 299, Oregon, IL 61061.
(815) 732-2111.

*In order to be awarded the Graduate Teaching Assistantship, you must apply to the Graduate School and be accepted.