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INTRODUCTION:
Wolves and Humans

The skull of a wolf with rows of jagged teeth . . . samples of scat in little plastic boxes . . . a plaster footprint bigger than a kid's hand . . . the pelt of a wolf that spans the length of several desks . . .

Students watch in awe as their teacher lifts these items one by one out of the Wolves and Humans Box, a self-contained educational unit that travels to public schools in Montana, Idaho, Wyoming and beyond.

The box was developed specifically to teach about one of the most controversial topics in the northwestern United States -- wolves. Comments from teachers who have used the wolf box are overwhelmingly positive, but in some rural communities, teachers have found it controversial. In some places, the discussion of wolves is almost taboo.

Love them or hate them, wolves are making a comeback. After fully supporting the eradication of wolves to make room for settlers in the early 1900's, the U.S. government came full circle and listed the gray wolf as an endangered species in the Northern Rockies in 1973 when it first enacted the federal Endangered Species Act.
Wolves are to be protected until their population reaches levels defined by the Northern Rocky Mountain Recovery Plan, approved in 1987. The recovery goal is ten breeding pairs in each of three areas (northwest Montana, central Idaho, and Yellowstone National Park). In 1987, biologists observed the first denning wolves in 50 years in Glacier National Park, and Montana is currently approaching its recovery goal with seven breeding pairs.

The public responded with an astounding 160,000 comments to the draft Environmental Impact Statement during the comment period from July 1993 to November 1993. An Environmental Impact Statement for the Grand Canyon drew 225,000 comments during a comment period, and while several other issues came close, the degree of response from the wolf recovery draft Impact Statement ranks as one of the five largest for any proposed Federal action in the country to date (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 1994).

The final Environmental Impact Statement for wolf recovery was released on May 4, 1994, and Congress is expected to approve the plan. Reintroduction of wolves to Yellowstone National Park is scheduled to begin as early as the fall of 1994.

The high level of public concern and the timeliness of the recovery plan clearly underscore the need for discussion of the issue and continued education efforts over the next few years. It was in
response to these needs that the *Wolves and Humans* traveling educational box was developed.

The only formal study of the wolf box to date measures changes in students’ knowledge and values as a result of the unit in their classrooms, and the corresponding effects of varying levels of teacher pre-service training (Lett 1993). Lett conducted this study primarily in urban towns with “self-selected, environmentally conscious” teachers, and raises the question of whether a study in rural towns might provide different data. While evaluation forms are included with most boxes, not all are returned. After three years of circulation, no assessment of teachers responses to the wolf box has been done. As the recovery plan for wolves in the northwest approaches full throttle, it is a good time to evaluate the wolf box and make improvements before the next school year gets underway.

This paper provides empirical support for traveling boxes as effective teaching tools, followed by a synopsis of the development of the wolf box. An evaluation of the wolf box details the demographics of where it has been, teachers’ comments, and stories of communities that found it controversial. Finally, suggestions are offered to improve the box and to provide support for teachers who wish to address issues rather than avoid them.
"BOXES" AS TEACHING TOOLS

Traveling educational boxes have clear advantages over more traditional teaching methods such as lectures, worksheets and textbooks. They bring something new into the classroom, pique students' interest and hold their attention. "Hands-on" objects -- things students can feel and manipulate -- engage students more directly in learning. It is commonly believed that people retain 10% of what they hear, 30% of what they read, 50% of what they see, and 90% of what they do.

The activities included in the wolf box range from simple lessons on wolf ecology to experiential games that help students understand the issues and the relevance to their lives. Research on the efficacy of methods dealing with attitude change indicates that experiential methods such as role plays, simulations and application of the values in real-world situations are the most effective (Stokes and Crawshaw 1986). Many other studies consistently indicate that non-traditional approaches that include inquiry, cooperative learning, and the use of issues and controversy are more effective than teacher-directed methods such as lectures (Johnson et al. 1985;
Lubbers 1990; and Schwaab 1982).

Traveling boxes also show a great deal of promise for reducing some of the barriers to effective environmental education. A national sample of environmental education programs by Childress (Childress 1978) found that inadequate funding and insufficient time were the greatest constraints on the development of environmental education curricula. In a study of Montana schools (Gunderson 1989), K-6 teachers cited fourteen factors that prevent or detract from a strong emphasis on environmental education. Among them are: limited time for scheduling and planning, controversy, inadequate teaching materials, fear of science, lack of administrative support, inadequate background, discipline problems, and inadequate funding. A traveling box can address many of these concerns.

With a phone call and a nominal fee for shipping, a teacher can arrange for two weeks or more of an interdisciplinary unit full of engaging activities. A novice teacher can not expect to open the box and present an effective lesson, but with sufficient preparation it can be a time-saver. The teacher manual that accompanies the box contains background information and additional references that can be invaluable.

Rural schools have a lot to gain from traveling boxes. Smaller tax bases usually mean tight budgets. Rural teachers, because of their
distance, do not have access to the same teacher training opportunities as their peers in urban centers. A traveling unit is a particularly cost-effective way to share resources, span long distances and reach a large number of students.

Most proponents of environmental education would like to see kids outside more, but the reality is that logistics and expense are major barriers. A traveling box is one way to bring kids and nature closer together.

The best boxes often contain rare and expensive materials, such as skulls and pelts, that individual schools usually cannot afford, or cannot obtain without a special permit. They also are produced as a collaborative effort by educators and resource people, and extensively tested and reviewed before they begin their travels.

The demand for the wolf box, and the recent proliferation of boxes on other subjects in Montana (MEEA Guide To Educational Trunks in Montana 1994) suggests that this tool is meeting a critical need for teachers in the region.
DEVELOPMENT OF THE WOLVES AND HUMANS BOX

Patricia Tucker, a National Wildlife Federation biologist, developed twenty-five identical wolf boxes with support from the U.S. Forest Service and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. These governmental agencies, which are responsible for public education pertaining to the recovery of wolves, saw the collaboration as a cost-effective tool to educate the public.

The wolf box was modeled after the “Threatened and Endangered Species” box developed at the University of Montana, which proved popular with area teachers and kids. It was designed to teach wolf ecology and debunk some of the myths associated with this controversial animal (Tucker 1994). In 1992 Tucker left the National Wildlife Federation to run Wild Sentry, a program which brings a live wolf and slide presentation to schools throughout the region.

Before the Wolf Box began circulating in the public schools in the fall of 1990, it was thoroughly reviewed for accuracy, content and balance by a variety of professionals. Steve Fritts, the Northern Rocky Mountain Wolf Recovery Coordinator for U.S. Fish and Wildlife gave it rave reviews, as did Bill Reudiger, the Threatened,
Endangered, and Sensitive Species Program Leader for the Northern Rockies Region (Region 1) of the U.S. Forest Service. Responsibility for the Wolf Box lies with the Information and Education sub-committee of the Central Idaho Wolf Recovery Committee (an interagency committee appointed by Congress); members that reviewed the box hail from U.S. Fish and Wildlife, the Forest Service, the Bureau of Land Management, the National Park Service, Idaho Fish and Game, Idaho Animal and Plant Health Inspection and Animal Damage Control.

Despite all the preparation, no one was too surprised when the Bitterroot Stockgrowers Association caught wind of the wolf box a year later and criticized the Forest Service at an October 1991 meeting for promoting the box ("War Over Wolves" 1991. See appendix H). The Forest Service defended the box as a sound educational tool, and suggested that a committee representing the Stockgrowers present its concerns.

The Stockgrowers believed that the activities and lessons in the box could not be balanced because it was developed by the National Wildlife Federation, a special interest group. They also objected to the use of taxpayers' dollars to distribute and promote the box. The Stockgrowers took issue with the box's message that "healthy wolves don't kill people" and felt that the lessons were misleading.
about the danger of wolves. Finally, they believed the box should provide more information about the damage wolves cause, and the historical and economic reasons for their eradication (Bitterroot Stockgrowers 1991).

To consider these comments, a committee of about thirty agency scientists, public-affairs specialists and educators met in 1992 and reviewed the box again in detail. In 1993, the Recovery Committee asked the National Wildlife Federation to make the following changes: 1) include more on the history of attitudes, beliefs and fears of the pioneers; 2) clarify that the wolf is dangerous (specifically in the video entitled Timber Wolf); 3) explain the eating behavior of wolves (i.e., that they are a threat to livestock, and do not eat all they kill); and 4) label the videos with the suggested grade levels (Central Idaho Wolf Recovery Steering Committee 1993).

Since the twenty-five wolf boxes spread throughout the region are often booked or in transit, and would be difficult to collect, no changes have been made to the original design (Smurthwaite 1994).

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service called a meeting in February 1994 to update members on the status of the recovery plan, and the interest in education seems to be resurrected now that the political wheels of recovery are turning. The interagency work group believes
that "the Information and Education program is an integral part of the recovery program, is intertwined with the monitoring, research and control programs, and draws heavily on the information that they provide. Many myths and legends can be dispelled by utilizing current information...(U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 1991)."

Although the extent of the effort depends heavily on the funding Congress appropriates for educational purposes, the work groups are convinced that "public understanding and acceptance of the wolf is vital to its recovery (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 1991)."

Consequently, the success of the wolf box is vital, and a thorough evaluation of it is in order.
EVALUATION OF THE WOLF BOX

Demographics

Wolf Box Locations:

Wolf boxes are currently available from twenty-two locations in the region. In Montana, there are two boxes in Missoula and one each in Billings, Bozeman, Browning, Fortine, Hamilton, Helena, Kalispell and West Glacier. Wyoming has five, in Cheyenne, Cody, Lander, Moose and Yellowstone National Park. Idaho also has five, three in Boise, and one each in Coeur D’Alene and Ketchum (see appendix D for details).

Wolf Box Use:

There is no central location that keeps records of requests for the boxes. It is impossible to tell exactly where the wolf boxes have been or how many students have been reached because of differences in the comment forms, varying degrees of success at collecting the forms from teachers, and incomplete or easily misinterpreted information.

Six of the twenty-five wolf boxes are not suitable for evaluation
(three have recently been sent to new locations and three are not yet completed). Of the nineteen locations with established boxes, fourteen report collecting comment forms. Out of the five who did not collect forms, one was unaware of any evaluation forms, two keep a list of users but no comment forms, one used to keep them but discontinued doing so because no one ever requested them for evaluation, and one did not respond to a request for information.

Of the fourteen who collected comments forms, nine passed them on for evaluation (either by sending them to the National Wildlife Federation over the years, or directly to me after I requested them). Four did not send them in time for this study, and one reported throwing them away since no one had requested them before. Consequently, only nine of the nineteen boxes (47%) are represented in the following data.

A total of 233 comment forms were received, accounting for approximately 13,000 students and a total of 64,150 classroom hours. Each student was exposed to the wolf unit for an average of 4.93 hours.

There is no way to know what percentage return each location realized, although some locations felt their return was generally good, between 50% - 80%. An estimate of 50% return would indicate that the wolf box was actually used by twice the rate represented,
(or approximately 475 times and presented to 26,000 students over three years). Extrapolating to include the other half of the locations that are not accounted for would bring the total to 52,000 students. However, these numbers are only speculative, since the trunks became available at different times, and interviews with staff at each location suggest that use varies widely (some boxes are checked out by teachers and some only are shown as part of a presentation by the staff... comments ranged from "usually booked solid" to "not being used much lately").

Responses were then sorted by school year, giving the following results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School year</th>
<th>Total students</th>
<th>Total hrs.</th>
<th>Avg.# hrs./stud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990-1991</td>
<td>4853</td>
<td>23,430</td>
<td>4.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991-1992</td>
<td>3963</td>
<td>19,929</td>
<td>5.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992-1993</td>
<td>3518</td>
<td>17,031</td>
<td>4.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data suggest that the use of the wolf box has steadily decreased over the past few years, not increased. It is also possible that the decreasing numbers are a result of teachers not returning comment forms after having done so the first year or two, or of staff at wolf box locations not encouraging the return of the forms as strongly as in previous years.

Since the wolf box is used predominantly in Montana, students from other states were subtracted out to calculate what percentage
of Montana students in grades K-12 have seen the wolf box.

According to school year, results are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School year</th>
<th># of Montana students</th>
<th>% reached*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990-1991</td>
<td>4495</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991-1992</td>
<td>3171</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992-1993</td>
<td>2687</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This number is based on enrollments for each year according to the 1993-1994 Directory of Montana Schools, Office of Public Instruction.

Again, extrapolating to account for communities not represented by comment forms, the percentage of students reached is probably somewhere between two to three times this number, or 9% for 1990-91, 6.12% for 1991-92, and 5.04% of Montana students reached during the 1992-93 school year.

Responses indicate that the wolf box visited approximately 500 classes throughout the region, representing the entire gamut from a Kalispell, Montana home-school with one fourth grader, to Redeemer Lutheran school in Wyoming with ten students, to multiple grade levels in Stevensville and Billings, Montana and Viola, Idaho (see appendix for comprehensive list). The box has also traveled to a zoo, a nature preserve, university classrooms, hunter-education courses, teacher conferences, summer camps, and as far away as Texas, Tennessee, Colorado, Ohio and Alabama.
The classes that use the wolf box are predominantly at the elementary level. Students in preschool through sixth-grade account for 75% of students reached. Grades seven and eight make up 9%, and 10% are in grades nine through twelve. Less than 1% represent college level or teachers. The general public represents 2.5% (i.e. at open houses or national parks) and the remaining 2.5% were not reported. It should be noted that Glacier National Park reported an additional 1800 visitors, and the Summit Environmental Center at Big Mountain reported that "thousands" of visitors viewed the box. These were not accounted for by comment forms, but indicate exposure to the public is higher than the data show.
Compilation of Teacher Comment Forms

A sample of the comment form provided to teachers is in appendix I. Responses to the question, "Which items were most useful?", gave the following results (out of 233 total):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item used</th>
<th># teachers listing item as among most useful</th>
<th>Percent*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pelts</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>86.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skulls</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>69.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Videos**</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>61.8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaster animal tracks</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>46.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher's Guide/activities</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>36.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scat</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>34.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassette/howling activity</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>27.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood wolf puppet</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>20.6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecosystem blocks activity</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>18.9 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>17.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photos</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12.9 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felt story board</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swatches of prey fur</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8.6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posters</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolf stamp</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Games</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.7 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Numbers add up to more than 100% because teachers listed multiple items as most useful.

** Many teachers just listed "videos", but of those who specified a title, they preferred the following:

- **White Wolf** - mentioned 25 times, once by a first grade teacher, but primarily by grades 3-12.
- **Timberwolf** - mentioned 12 times by grades 1-7, but primarily 1-4.
- **The Wolf: Real or Imagined?** - mentioned 5 times, gr.1,4,7,K-12
- **NWF Wolf video** - mentioned only once by grade 4.
Regarding items **NOT USED**, teachers responded with the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item not used</th>
<th># teachers listing item</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Felt story board</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>23.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecosystem blocks</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>23.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Videos*</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>19.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood wolf puppet</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>18.9 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Road runner” map tool</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>16.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maps</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11.6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities (some)*</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolf stamp</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scat</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photos</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books (some)*</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassette/howling activity</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posters</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaster animal tracks</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skulls</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.7 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* For videos, activities and books, many were reportedly not used because they were not appropriate for the age group; many teachers did use the age-appropriate items in that category. However, many others did not use these items; lack of time was cited as the primary reason. If classes are using the wolf box for an average of five hours, apparently not much time is spent on multiple videos, or extended activities.

The additional materials that teachers would have found useful varied widely. A significant number, 115, or 49.4% made no suggestions, perhaps because they felt the box was complete. Many thought there was much more information and activities than they could present. The other half made suggestions ranging from “more time” to “a real wolf” to “touchable scat”. The most frequently
listed suggestions (those that were mentioned more than once) are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Materials suggested</th>
<th># times listed</th>
<th>% of teachers*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More time</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19.8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More literature-based books</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larger pictures/posters</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prep-manual sent earlier</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More videos for younger grades</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info on current pack territories</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A real wolf</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A resource person / speaker</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other skulls (whole elk, moose, prey, other carnivores)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubber stamp of wolf track</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.6 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* These numbers reflect the percent of teachers who made suggestions, not the percentage of teachers who returned comment forms.

Responses to the question, "How did the students respond to the box's contents and curriculum?" were all positive. The most frequent response was with "excitement/enthusiasm," followed by "they loved it!" Not one teacher listed a negative response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term describing response</th>
<th># of responses</th>
<th>% of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excited/enthusiastic</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>33.1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loved it</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>24.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interested/attentive</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>19.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyed it</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curious/wanted to learn more</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8.6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positively</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8.2 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other words used to describe student response include: "learned a lot," "fascinated," "impressed," "appreciative," "excellent," "motivated," "concerned," and "they inhaled it." One teacher wrote, "I have never seen them so excited and enthusiastic; we had a terrific week." A third-grade teacher in Cheyenne, Wyoming wrote, "Total interest. I couldn't teach enough nor could they get enough... We have continued to study wolves for several more weeks."

The next question on the comment form, "Did the attitude and knowledge of the students change as a result of using the box? In what way?" received an overwhelming "yes," but this response should be interpreted with caution. Attitude change is very difficult to measure, and usually is most accurate over time. What constitutes an attitude change can be easily misinterpreted as an increase in knowledge, and because the one question asked for a judgment of both, the answers are difficult to tabulate.

The question was either left blank or not asked on thirty-one (13.3%) of the forms. Several answers did not fall under yes or no categories; eight teachers (3.4%) said they "could not tell" and suggested it would need to be studied over time, and one said, "I hope so!"

Of the ten teachers (4.3%) who said NO, the larger portion believed their students' attitudes did not change because they already had a
positive attitude. It is not clear how many of those felt students’ knowledge increased. The breakdown of NO responses is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th># teachers</th>
<th>% of teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Already positive attitude</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough time / exposure*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness increased / attitude remained the same</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude unchanged since kept activities safe/non-controversial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealt with adults / attitudes firmly ingrained / not likely to change</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* One classroom had the box for 30 minutes and the other for 4 hours.

The YES responses totaled 226 (97%) and yielded a wide variety of ways in which teachers felt knowledge and attitudes changed. The predominant answer, given by seventy-two teachers (30.9%), related to increased knowledge, understanding or awareness of wolves. Typical comments in this category were “they were surprised at the social closeness of wolves” and “they were impressed with the intelligence of wolves.”

The second most frequent response, from twenty-two teachers (9.4%), suggests that the box moderated views of the wolf as “man-killers,” “pests,” “ruthless,” “dangerous,” “evil” or “bad”. Nineteen teachers (8.2%) reported that students developed or felt a greater
sense of respect or appreciation for the wolf. Eighteen teachers (7.7%) said students recognized the existence of varying viewpoints, became aware of other values or attitudes, saw the "other side" or got "food for thought". The wolf box also alleviated predisposed fears of the wolf, particularly those based on stories or myths, according to sixteen teachers (6.9%), and an equal number reported that students recognized the wolf is part of the ecosystem (has a "place in nature"), and were less influenced by misconceptions, stories and myths.

Other attitude changes, each reported by less than 5% of teachers, include: students feeling more sympathetic or understanding of the plight of wolves; expressing more positive attitudes; becoming aware of the link between human actions and changes in habitat; being more curious and interested to learn more; believing the wolf has a right to live and should be protected; considering reintroduction as an option when they previously did not; and wanting to see or hear wolves in the wild.

Measurement of knowledge and attitude change is left up to individual teachers, with methods ranging from classroom discussion to formal quizzes and tests. Relying on self-reported evidence is probably not the best way to assess knowledge or attitude change, since teachers have a vested interest in the
accomplishments of their students.

In the only other study of the wolf box, Lett (1993) detected an increase in knowledge after exposure to a week-long unit on the wolf box, but a statistically insignificant change in attitudes toward wolves. Lett posed several possibilities for the lack of significance, including 1) student attitudes may have been already positive, leaving little room for change, 2) the studies were conducted in fairly liberal, more urban settings where media coverage of wolves might be generally balanced and accurate, and 3) teachers who volunteered for the project had positive attitudes toward wolves which could have been passed on to students prior to the formal study. As Lett concluded, there is clearly a need to assess the wolf box in rural areas where wolves are more controversial. In the next section, case studies of teachers in more rural areas shed light on this issue.

The final question teachers were asked, "What other kinds of box programs would you use if they were available?" yielded an amazing variety of requests, indicating that teachers feel there is still a tremendous need for hands-on units. One teacher said, "I would use any kind of program if it was as informative and useful as the wolf box." Another said "any with the same kind of thought and preparation as this." Most requests were for specific animal boxes,
but several indicated a need for boxes addressing issues. The top vote-getters (those that received more than five requests) are listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of box requested</th>
<th># of requests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bears</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Grizzlies received 21 requests)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birds (including 13 for raptors, 14 for eagles, and 7 for owls)</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cats (primarily mountain lions)</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental issues*</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elk</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endangered Species</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trees</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reptiles/amphibians</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology/rocks and minerals</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bison/range animals/management</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plants (a few specified native)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain goats/sheep</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Americans</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fur-bearers (otter, beaver, mink, martin)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodents</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insects</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinosaurs</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Requests for environmental issues boxes included the following topics: Rainforests, awareness, pollution, biodiversity, acid rain, global warming recycling, and “making a difference.”
According to the comment forms, students love the wolf box. Teachers give it rave reviews. Agency resource people see it as an integral part of their program to educate the public about a controversial predator that is becoming more common in our surrounding wild areas. In three years, the wolf box has reached about 50,000 school children throughout the region, with only one publicly documented criticism, that of the Bitterroot Stockgrowers.

If wolves are so controversial, how is it that the wolf box is apparently a resounding success? Is it because the box was carefully planned, thoroughly reviewed, and presents fair and balanced information about wolf ecology and recovery?

If one made an evaluation based strictly on the comment forms returned by teachers who used the box, that would be the obvious conclusion. But there is a fundamental problem with this type of evaluation: it leaves out all of the people who did not use the wolf box, and fails to address their concerns. Are ranching communities unwilling to discuss wolf ecology? What about people near the proposed recovery areas? Are the teachers in these communities afraid to tread on controversial ground? Most importantly, are children in these communities not hearing the whole story on the
To examine this further, I searched for stories of teachers who experienced difficulties; surely somewhere the wolf box must have been greeted with something between skepticism and outrage.

I called teachers who had ordered and then canceled the wolf box, and some who never used the wolf box but made positive comments about the *Threatened and Endangered Species* box. I identified a handful of teachers, all in rural towns, who found themselves in difficult situations because of the wolf box.

Their stories are important for several reasons. Most importantly, some students were prevented from learning about an issue in the classroom. In some communities this would be considered censorship.

The stories also illuminate the difficulties many teachers face as they attempt to offer students a balanced presentation - not just on wolves, but on any number of controversial issues. Other teachers can benefit from the opportunity to consider the implications of bringing controversy into their classroom.

And finally, these stories can enlighten wolf advocates, environmental educators, agency employees, school administrators, parents, and ranchers alike. If we take time to listen to other viewpoints, focus on building bridges, and seek common ground, we
can set a better example for our children and prepare them to participate in the discussions. In a healthy and diverse society, a range of viewpoints exists; it seems logical to inform students about them. After all, when they reach their eighteenth year, we expect them to know where they stand on issues and vote accordingly.

In the following stories, teachers’ names have been fictionalized to protect their privacy.
Mary learned about the educational boxes while in a teaching methods course at the University of Montana in the fall of 1992. During her student teaching in a Darby elementary school, Mary ordered the Threatened and Endangered Species box. Her students loved it. At parent-teacher conferences, parents mentioned it was something their children remembered. Mary wrote on the evaluation form she returned with the box, "I was thrilled with the response of parents, students, and my supervising teacher. This is a great resource. Thanks!"

When Mary mentioned to her principal that she wanted to schedule the wolf box, however, she ran into problems. The school secretary told her that a junior-high teacher had gotten students involved in a debate about some controversial topic, and the parents "went haywire." Apparently the town was not generally supportive of discussions of controversial issues; this was the secretary's impression because a certain number of parents had spoken up about not wanting controversial issues discussed in the classroom.

Mary's colleagues generally were supportive of her interest, but hesitant. Her supervising teacher did not encourage her to order the wolf box. None of the teachers or administrators at Mary's school
had reviewed the contents of the wolf box or the lessons contained in it.

Since Mary was "only" a student teacher and might someday apply for a teaching position at this school, she admittedly kept things low key. With some support, Mary says she would definitely use the wolf box in the future. She feels...

...there is a great need to educate other teachers. They need to be informed and shown what's in the boxes. You need to use good judgment with what you use for your age group, but teachers are supposed to be providers of information. You should be able to show both sides in a balanced way, and students can make their own decisions and choices. Discussing values might be sensitive, but it's my job to give students something to think about.

Frances is a teacher in Corvallis, Montana. She heard about the wolf box from a teacher friend at another school, and like Mary, had a chance to review it in her teaching methods course at the University. Frances ordered the box when she was a student teacher, but canceled it due to lack of support. She recalls:

My supervising teacher reviewed the materials and said I better not use it. Her reason was that it was too controversial. She might have been supportive of the lessons, but I felt she was looking out for me, trying to protect me from any negative feedback from the parents or principal.

Frances' school uses and likes the Threatened and Endangered
Species box. She admits that she “didn’t want to rock the boat” when she was a student teacher, but is planning to ask the principal if she can use the wolf box. Frances asserts:

It is too valuable a lesson not to teach. Kids need to get the facts and make their own decisions. I’m trying to create open minded, thinking people. Teachers do have to prioritize, though. Younger children shouldn’t have to make difficult decisions on issues relevant in their own lives, for instance if logging is good or bad, or if their dad is a bad person for cutting down trees. They just need an awareness that there are existing viewpoints. My main goal is to keep a good relationship between home and school. Little kids should have a secure home and a happy and loving learning environment. But along with that we need to encourage responsible earth stewardship. We should teach children to take care of the earth, and understand how their actions affect it.

In both Mary’s and Frances’ communities, as in the hundreds of other communities whose teachers have used similar boxes, there are probably a significant number of parents who are supportive of these hand-on activities being in their children’s classrooms. Unfortunately, they are too often a silent majority. In these communities where controversy, or the perceived potential for controversy, has prevented the discussion of issues, teachers indicate it is usually the result of an outspoken minority of residents who make their opinions known. The following two stories show how things can go awry when parents are not aware of what is
happening in the classroom.

Kelly is a middle-school teacher in Libby, Montana. She heard about the wolf box at a conference, and has seen it, but has not used it because it does not fit with her curriculum very well. She mentioned to other teachers that it appeared to be a good resource, but no one in her school has used it yet. When Kelly addresses current issues in her science curriculum, she covers topics like recycling, packaging, acid rain, and the greenhouse effect. One particularly effective unit she did was on wetlands, where the students acted out a town meeting. Students looked at different sides of an issue, developed arguments and practiced debating skills.

"I'm not sure I would do a similar activity with wolves or the logging issue though, because of the community," Kelly reflected, referring to a bad experience after a classroom discussion on soil erosion. One spring she noticed a local river, usually a crystal clear stretch of water, was running brown with sediment. She briefly mentioned logging as one possible contributor to the problem during classroom discussions, and one student went home and told his parents that the teacher "blamed it on logging." Shortly thereafter, this student's parent attended a local conference where he implied in front of a hundred or more people that the Kelly was misinformed.

The school principal was supportive and expressed his
disappointment to the parent, who apologized. But when it was suggested that the parent write a letter to the editor to publicly clear the air, he did not. Kelly recalls:

There were letters to the editor that were negative about us (the teachers), but I never felt that my job was threatened. Our administration is generally supportive. We do a lot with critical thinking skills and problem solving, encouraging the kids to back up their opinions with research. The hardest part is not feeling like you can express your opinion fully. The students often ask 'well, what do you think?' and it can be uncomfortable. It's a lot easier to shy away from controversy than face it; that takes a lot more energy. I'm always sure to let the parents in on our discussions of issues. I might be setting myself up for problems, but it clears the air, and is more professional.

Jill taught in a one-room schoolhouse in Molt, just outside of Billings, Montana. She felt her students had a “negative mindset” toward wolves and would benefit from additional information on the subject. After preparing for the discussion, she brought in the box. The next day, a parent who was a cattle rancher, complained to a board member, who in turn contacted Jill. She defended her lesson, and said she gave a balanced presentation, but felt it didn’t matter.

The kids might have been open to a new perspective, but when they went home and told their parents, the shit hit the fan... Some people are so entrenched in their bias, they are not willing to look at another point of view. And if they have control over you, your job might be on the line... I think the wolf box is terrific, but it should come with a warning for small conservative towns that says
Jill is now teaching in a larger school district.

In the next story, conflict again results in a teacher leaving the school, but because of continued efforts by other concerned citizens, the controversy ultimately leads to success.

Pat Tucker, the wolf biologist who produced the wolf trunk, had been talking with Rachel, an environmental educator and former teacher in a small Montana town. They felt there was a critical need to educate the community because a wolf had been shot by a local rancher who claimed he thought it was a dog. Rachel contacted Amy, a friend of hers who was a first- and second-grade teacher at the school, and offered to schedule Tucker’s program on wolves. Amy, ecstatic about the opportunity, approached her principal and was given the go ahead to schedule the program and the wolf box.

The rancher’s wife, who happened to be the school’s acting librarian, heard about the wolf program at a staff meeting and told her husband about it. He called members of the school board; they met and decided to cancel the program. The school secretary informed Amy that the program would have to be canceled. Surprised, Amy demanded an explanation from the principal, who said that she had not gone through the proper channels, and that a
permission form would have to be signed by parents.

In the meantime, Rachel had booked the community hall for an evening wolf presentation, put up flyers, and received coverage in two local newspapers. To maximize Tucker's time in the area, Rachel called Martha, a teacher at a nearby school to see if her class would be interested in the wolf program. At Rachel's suggestion, Martha called her school board to get approval. One board member said no, but the others agreed that since it was a public school, they should let the kids see varying viewpoints; the program was approved.

Amy's students were disappointed when she told them the program had been canceled, so she suggested they attend the presentation at the community hall that evening. Almost one-hundred people packed the hall, including the rancher and his wife. Rachel recalls that many of the attendants clearly did not like wolves, but they listened to Tucker's program and there was no uprising. The program at Martha's school was a great success.

Tucker felt it was important to follow up with the school that canceled, and sent an express mail letter asking for an explanation and for the letter to be put on the agenda for the next board meeting and read aloud.

Amy, who had been in her position for five or six years, felt her investment of time and energy in trying to present the wolf issue in
a professional manner had been trivialized by an unprofessional administrator and school board, and she ended up resigning and moving out of that community.

Rachel's involvement continued. She explains, "I felt it was my moral and ethical obligation as a community member and teacher to speak up." She worked hard to encourage other supporters to run for positions on the school board as they came up.

Tucker offered her program again the next year. The principal got approval from the school board, with the stipulation that the kindergartners were not included. Two board members came to the program and were finally satisfied that it gave a balanced representation of the issues. Rachel said with some relief in her voice:

So it came full circle. Our mission was accomplished. But not without heartbreak and damage. The situation with Amy was demoralizing and unprofessional, but ultimately there was growth. Teachers are scared. Sometimes it's more trouble than it's worth and they're not inclined to stick their necks out.

Rachel wanted Amy to know that what she did was appreciated, and wrote her a letter. "I had to let her know what happened after she left, that the program was approved and went fine," she said. "What she did took courage, and made a difference. I told her she shouldn't feel defeated, and could hold her head up high."
Rachel paid a price for her involvement as well. "They probably wouldn't hire me if I wanted to teach there." But she has cheered on other teachers as they seek and get funding for similar projects. "I felt alone at first. I couldn't have done what I did without support from my friends and professional colleagues. Ultimately, a lot of good has come out of the struggle. Especially for the kids."
Success Stories

As the majority of teachers' comments testify, most rural communities do not experience such pains over the wolf box. Examples of success with the wolf box crop up in towns neighboring those that experienced difficulties. The following stories reveal teachers who were successful in dealing with the issues. (Teachers' real names are used in these accounts because they were not the subject of controversy.)

Lee Anne, a 10th grade teacher in Moscow, Idaho, looks for activities in the box that deal specifically with controversy, conflicting values, and wolf reintroduction. She uses the wolf box to support a "critical thinking" unit, and would like to see more lessons developed for this approach. She has her students debate the pros and cons of reintroduction, and wants them to learn how to evaluate sides of an argument and judge a presentation for accuracy and balance. She explains:

The wolf box is an excellent cross-curricular tool. Our high school teaches a joint unit with English and Biology, and I wish we had (a wolf box) of our own to use all year. Our school is supportive of teaching issues, but the parents are not always supportive; we try to make them feel welcome to express their views.

Ruth taught 6th -12th grade boys at a correctional school in Miles
City, Montana. She used the wolf box to supplement their writing curriculum, and had the students clip related newspaper articles and editorials and post them in the classroom. Through their research and discussion the students discovered that the school librarian was opposed to wolf reintroduction, and they engaged the librarian in a dialog that Ruth felt was productive. Ruth was able to deflect any criticism of her approach by referring to the curiosity and excitement generated by the discussion.

Tom felt that some parents in Gardiner, Montana, a ranching community on the border of Yellowstone National Park, would object to a classroom discussion of wolf reintroduction. He purposely avoided the activities that were controversial, kept the parents informed, and invited them into the classroom to participate in the discussions. (None attended.) Tom chose to address issues with a topic that was less emotional in his community -- grizzly bears. Through role plays and discussions of bear management, Tom felt he was able to convey the various issues students needed to understand without putting himself in a predicament. He explains:

I wanted to present the topic in a neutral way. Each parent should be responsible enough to show their children sides of issues, but you're not always lucky enough to have all open-minded parents. You have to pick and choose your topics carefully.
On his evaluation form, Ron, a sixth grade teacher in Hamilton, Montana, expressed a desire for more information and activities dealing with the controversial aspects of wolves. He had students respond to letters to the editor, and write to a group that opposed wolf reintroduction to learn how to develop an argument. Ron does simulations and role plays on land use issues, such as strip mining, and would like to see similar activities developed for the wolf box. He said:

The wolf box is a totally defensible tool. It has contemporary substance to it; it's relevant. Kids really like looking at real situations. It's a basic teaching skill, too. (Students) will run into controversial issues all their lives and need to learn about the values behind the issues.

The reasons for success or failure of the wolf box can not be ascertained from the teachers' stories alone; certainly each community is unique and the situations were complex. However, the primary difference between these communities appears to be a climate of support for teachers to engage students in discussions of issues.

Teachers who have limited experience teaching controversial issues, and are not supported by their colleagues and school administrators, are likely to feel ill-equipped to deal with parents
or school boards who do not see the educational benefits of discussing issues. Teachers who include parents, use the box as part of a program that teaches critical thinking, and have support from their administration are more likely to succeed.

If a teacher is convinced that issues have a place in the curriculum, and that it is the responsibility of an educator to provide students with information and experience related to issues, he or she can use a tool such as the wolf box, and back it up with support from current educational literature. With enough preparation, teachers and administrators can provide students with the tools they will need to participate in discussions about issues. Suggestions for teachers are provided in appendix A.
Analysis and Recommendations: The Wolf Box

In general, the wolf box appears to be an effective tool for teaching wolf ecology. Students respond with enthusiasm, and teachers find it valuable. A school could develop a tool like this only with a major investment of time and money.

While students appear to learn a lot about wolves, it is not clear to what extent their attitudes change, if at all. Long-term studies might shed some light on this. In any case, the box has been carefully designed to present a balanced and fair picture of wolves and the issues surrounding their recovery, and reviewed by a variety of experts. Teachers will find a wealth of information to teach a complete unit on an animal that is often misunderstood, and can provide students with skills needed to understand related issues if they choose to.

Wolf Box Locations: With twenty-five boxes available for wolf education in the region, I believe that more students can be reached. The data suggest that less than ten percent of Montana students were reached in the first year, and fewer in each of the following two years. A smaller percentage was reached in Idaho and Wyoming.

With appropriate funding from Congress and increased publicity, the wolf box could find its way into more classrooms. If the offices
that maintain the boxes can keep identical records, there will be a more accurate way to keep track of the circulation. Perhaps a new evaluation form could be designed, and incentives provided for their return.

**Wolf Box Use:** The data reveal that a relatively small number of middle- and secondary-school students are benefiting from the wolf box (nine and ten percent of total students reached, respectively). While the hands-on materials in the box are popular with all ages, the activities designed to familiarize students with different viewpoints and issues work especially well with the older grades.

Suggested activities such as debating the pros and cons of a compensation program that reimburses ranchers for losses, and interviewing people with different viewpoints can be excellent for dealing with the finer points of the issues. Since upper-level students are fast approaching voting age, more of them should be exposed to the box, and a higher priority should be given to the activities that build critical thinking skills.

It is difficult to tell how many teachers know about the wolf box, and how many would feel comfortable addressing the more controversial aspects of wolf recovery. Promoting the box at conventions, teacher training workshops and via school newsletters will raise awareness. Training and support should be provided for
teachers who want to learn more about teaching critical thinking skills and issues. Based on my interviews with teachers, there is apparently a need for this type of training in rural areas.

Efforts to make the box available to the general public could also be stepped up. There is only limited time in the national park setting, but other avenues could be pursued in our communities, such as neighborhood forums and presentations at civic club meetings. This responsibility does not have to fall on the shoulders of agency employees; any interested people can find support for this type of approach. For instance, the North American Association for Environmental Education offers a series of booklets and workshops that train citizens to deal with environmental issues in a neighborhood forum setting (NAAEE 1993).

**The Contents of the Box:** Teachers' comments indicate the contents of the box could be improved. While what they requested most, *time*, can not be provided, there are ways to maximize their time with the box.

Almost eight percent of teachers who made suggestions wanted the teacher's manual for a longer time. One could be sent to them earlier so they would have more time to prepare. Better yet, the manual should be made available for schools to purchase, so it could
be shared with other teachers and examined at their leisure.

The teacher's manual was ranked as less useful than the pelts, skulls, videos and tracks. It would be more user-friendly if some suggested lesson plans were provided for different grade levels, and for varying lengths of time. A secondary teacher who only has the box for a week might start at the front of the manual and run out of time before reaching the activities that address the issues. The current organization of the manual seems to encourage use of the science activities.

A significant number of teachers felt there was a need for more age-appropriate books and videos. Suggested literature-based books include *Julie of the Wolves; Call of the Wild; The Nine-Mile Wolves; The True Story of the Three Little Pigs; Ruff, the Wolf; and Lobo, King of the Currumpaw*. It would be helpful to include copies of traditional fairy-tales like *Little Red Riding Hood* and *The Boy Who Cried Wolf*, along with a book like *Wolf Stories*, that balances the presentation with more positive stories from around the world. The addition of such books would increase the effectiveness of the box as a cross-curricular unit.

More videos were requested specifically for younger children. Suggestions were *Never Cry Wolf*, which would be good for discussing the difference between stories and facts, and *Winter*.
Wolf, which would be excellent for helping children in grades three through six explore different feelings and attitudes towards wolves in a rural community. The only video in the box currently that is specifically for younger children, Timberwolf, focuses on baby wolves and is too simple for many third graders.

Teachers of younger grades also expressed a need for more posters or large pictures so all students could view simultaneously. Slides or overhead transparencies might also work for this age group.

Students would benefit from more information about current wolf packs. A file of newspaper clippings of the media coverage of wolf sightings, updates on the recovery plan, and maps showing current territories would make the discussions even more relevant to kids, especially in communities near recovery areas.

Several teachers requested a resource person or speaker; a list of speakers in their area (including agency people, ranchers and biologists) would be useful. In areas where teachers are concerned about presenting all sides accurately, speakers can be especially helpful.

The activities that address the controversial aspects of wolves are intertwined with background material and other activities. This probably works well in most classrooms, because the issues are related to the facts. But for teachers who want to use the wolf box
specifically to examine the issues and focus on critical thinking skills, it might be difficult to ferret out the corresponding activities. A concise booklet outlining these activities and some guidelines for managing conflict in the classroom would be helpful.

And finally, for teachers who live in communities that simply will not tolerate a classroom discussion on wolves, perhaps the wolf box is not the answer. A box on “current issues” might be developed that covers a variety of topics. As students examine toxic waste disposal, recycling efforts, endangered species legislation, or mining laws, they could acquire the skills needed to learn the facts and understand the diverse viewpoints on other issues.
SUPPORT FOR TEACHERS:
Teaching Controversial Issues

When researcher John McAulay asked more than five hundred teachers about how they handled controversial issues, eighty percent responded that they did not touch such matters in their classroom (Dunfee and Crump 1974).

The teachers' stories show that addressing issues can be risky. Discussions of environmental issues often involve consideration of human values, attitudes and behavior and their impacts on the ecosystem, and sometimes imply that change is necessary to conserve resources. This can be threatening to rural communities whose economies and way of life are driven by and dependent on the use of resources. Rural communities often are polarized, and educators face a difficult task in addressing the issues.

Although conflict can be uncomfortable, evidence suggests that it tends to stimulate the intellect. Jean Piaget, Lawrence Kohlberg and other learning theorists discuss the concept of "cognitive disequilibrium" and its role in intellectual and moral development.
(Kohlberg 1984 and Purpel and Ryan 1976). When students work through moral dilemmas, for example, where a conflict is presented and they are asked to decide what they would do in the given situation, they benefit from the opportunity to consider other viewpoints and defend their own. Since productive conflict appears to promote the development of cognitive and moral reasoning, it has a valid place in the learning environment ("Teaching About Controversial Issues" 1989).

Further support comes from professional educators who are calling for a greater emphasis on "critical thinking skills." Most educators are familiar with Benjamin Bloom's *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives*, which first appeared in the mid-1950's and is the most widely used method of classifying thinking skills. He defined six levels of thinking, beginning with knowledge and progressing through the increasingly complex stages of comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis and evaluation (Tiedt, et al. 1989). The essence of Bloom's taxonomy is that well-designed lessons develop students' "higher order" thinking skills.

In 1985, philosopher Robert Ennis listed specific skills that provide a way to evaluate such lessons. They are: clarifying issues and terms, identifying components of arguments, judging the credibility of evidence, using inductive and deductive reasoning,
handling argument fallacies, and making value judgments (Tiedt, et al. 1989). Teachers can focus on these specific, measurable skills and explore a controversial issue without overstepping the bounds of professionalism.

Christie Ford, an elementary teacher in Oregon, created a critical thinking center in her classroom based on an idea developed by Susan Kovalik, an educational consultant in San Jose, California. The center is based on her belief that...

...two of the essential skills needed by students who will be facing environmental challenges in the future are those of critical thinking and the ability to problem-solve. Rather than being taught what to think, students need to be able to develop a process for 'thinking through' an issue -- locating resources, and working out creative solutions based on all the facts and resources available (Ford 1993).

As with any educational program, the goals and objectives should be clear. According to Tiedt, et al. (1989), a critical thinking program is a success if students can:

1. Be aware that they do think all the time.
2. See their own thinking as having value and demonstrate a growing sense of self esteem.
3. Take time to think, to reflect on what they are doing and recognize that emotions affect thinking.
4. Take pleasure in original, creative thinking, including humor, their own and that of others.
5. Recognize the importance of collecting data to substantiate decision making and to reflect on the process. Demonstrate willingness to change a decision.
based on new evidence.
6. Express their opinions in speaking and writing, providing evidence to substantiate their opinions; present an argument; recognize different perspectives from which we can view issues.
7. Engage in individual and group problem solving; respect ideas contributed by others, different points of view.
8. Engage actively in constructing meaning as they interact with others.
9. Question the thinking of others - underlying assumptions, knowledge, expertise - but also recognize the existence of different perspectives; willingness to try on different points of view.
10. Act as informed young citizens who know and care about what is happening in the world around them.

Some of the activities in the wolf box are based on these types of objectives and are good tools for guiding students to an understanding of issues. But they can only be effective if teachers choose to use them.

Like Ennis, Ford uses specific terms that provide a framework for planning activities at the evaluation level. Words like criticize, debate, argue, support, evaluate, justify, conclude, and defend all evoke an image of students who have moved beyond rote memorization and fact-finding and are engrossed in learning and growing. Addressing issues in the classroom is a good way for a teacher to build these critical thinking skills into the curriculum and insure that more of this level of learning will take place.
Conclusion

The wolf box appears to be an effective tool for teaching wolf ecology. According to teachers who have used the box, it also is effective for dispelling myths about this controversial predator. The only study that attempted to measure the change in students' values as a result of the box is not conclusive; a long term study would need to be conducted to shed light on this.

Based on the results of my study, I conclude the wolf box is not being used to its potential. More students could be reached, as well as a greater cross-section of the communities in the region. Improvements to the box can be made, i.e. making the teacher's manual more widely available, and adding selected books and videos. Support should be provided by school administrators for teachers in communities where the wolf box appears to be controversial. With additional support and training, teachers will be more likely to use the activities in the box that were designed to prepare students to deal with controversial issues.

Government officials who are responsible for wolf recovery in the Northern Rockies see the wolf box as an important educational tool,
and are convinced that "public understanding and acceptance of the wolf is vital to its recovery (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 1991).”

The wolf box will not help them accomplish their goals if it is used only as part of a science unit. It needs to be used as it was designed -- an interdisciplinary unit that not only teaches wolf ecology, but also leads students to understand human values and attitudes, consider a range of solutions, and develop the skills necessary to participate in the debate. The activities in the wolf box that address controversial issues were carefully designed with these objectives in mind, but they can only be effective if teachers choose to use them.
Appendix A

SUGGESTIONS FOR TEACHERS:
Teaching Controversial Issues

When discussing controversial issues, the teacher focuses less on providing information and shifts his or her role to that of a “facilitator.” The goal is to provide a safe, supportive atmosphere where the emphasis is on the process of sharing opinions, acquiring and judging new information, and making and reflecting on decisions. Selected activities should minimize polarization and maximize the quantity and quality of issues.

Some guidelines and ideas to be considered by teachers who want to present controversial issues are listed here. (Some of these ideas are adapted from the brochure “Guidelines for Dealing With Different Viewpoints” produced by the Alaska Department of Education, and the article “Teaching About Controversial Issues,” Teaching About Toxics, California State Environmental Education Guide, 1989).

1). Know yourself.
   What is your purpose in teaching a particular issue?
   Do you have the skills to deal with the emotions of kids, parents, and board members?
   What are your biases on the issue?
   Are you comfortable stating your opinions on the subject or should you arrange for speakers to present ideas?
   Do you want to continue living in the community you teach in?
   Consider the importance of your job and weigh it against your feelings of what an educator’s responsibilities include.

2). Know your community.
   What is the economic base of your community?
   What do students’ parents do for a living?
   What is the range of opinions on the subject you want to teach?
   Let parents know well in advance of the unit; ask for their ideas, and invite them to participate.
   For a hot topic, sponsor a forum in the multi-purpose room or town hall; assign older students to attend and write up an article for the school paper.
   Look for support from the silent majority; don’t judge your community or make decisions based on negative feedback from an outspoken minority.

3). Establish a good rapport with colleagues and administrators.
   Be professional; back up your opinions with research and examples of success stories.
   Become an expert on critical thinking, debate, or communication skills.
   Share your ideas with other teachers; work as a team; look for activities that dovetail with English, Social Studies, etc.
   Arrange for skeptics to preview activities and give feedback; have allies on hand in case they don’t see the benefits of what you’re doing.
If criticized, respond in a professional manner; be sensitive to their concerns; provide references and explain your goals; don’t be defensive.

4). Lay a good foundation in the classroom.
   Establish a supportive atmosphere; build trust, respect and openness to inquiry.
   - Set ground rules (no name-calling or attacking someone’s character); conflicts must be about ideas, not people.
   - Examine the definitions and history of the words “conflict”, “controversy” and “issue”.
   - Explain to students that adults/teachers disagree about the role of issues in education; let them share their ideas.
   - Provide students with historical information about the issue; make it relevant.
   - Respect the right to privacy, and the right of students to keep opinions and perspectives to themselves if they wish.
   - Set a tone that values diversity and tolerance for other opinions, but make it clear that ideas based on ignorance or prejudice are less acceptable.

5) Select your issues carefully.
   Do your homework, and plan ahead; know various viewpoints and draw on a wide variety of resources.
   - Consider your age-group; introduce younger students to the concept of controversy; allow older students to explore it in depth.
   - If a topic appears too controversial or emotional, consider selecting an issue that is “not in their backyard”; after developing the thinking skills, you may be able to explore the more controversial issue by comparison with a safer issue.
   - Save extremely emotional issues for older students who have a background in examining issues.

6). Include students as much as possible.
   Make it fun! Set the tone for adventure, risk-taking.
   - Let students select from a variety of proposed issues.
   - Provide opportunities for them to make decisions and engage in actions relating to the issue; get them into the community and allow them to learn it for themselves instead of just telling them how it is.
   - Have them prepare questions for guest speakers; let them interview people with diverse opinions.
   - Let students teach each other; assign presentations, group projects and community actions and share them with other grade levels.
   - Make sure they focus on valuing the evolution of thinking rather than only the views expressed.
Appendix B
Contents of Wolves and Humans Box

Peits: wolf and coyote
Swatches of fur from wolf prey species
Skulls: wolf, coyote, elk, dog (some boxes)
Plaster casts of tracks: wolf, coyote, mountain lion, elk
Scat samples: wolf, coyote, dog, elk
Poster of wolf
Rubber wolf stamp
Wooden puppet of wolf that can be positioned to demonstrate different behavioral postures
Set of wooden blocks that illustrate the plant, herbivore, and predator communities and what happens when one, or part of one, is eliminated
Cassette tape of wolf bowls, song and musical activity
Photos evoking different emotions about wolves
Baby Wolf by Beth Spanjian
Videos: Wolves — Timber Wolf Alliance video (for children age 8 and younger)
Wolves — National Wildlife Federation video
White Wolf — National Geographic video
The Wolf: Real or Imagined? — video on history and mythology
Road runner (measures miles of road on a map)
Map of potential wolf range
3-ring binder with:
   1)Background material: Approximately 1 page large print on each of 18 subjects such as track identification, hair examination, predator/prey relationships, viewpoints, etc.
   2) Suggested activities, discussion topics, and questions to go with each of the above subjects
   3) Getting to Know the Wolf — A school outreach project of NPS
   4) The Wonder of Wolves — a Story and Activities — Denver Museum of Natural History
   5) Wolves — Zoo Book series
   6) Looking at the Wolf — Teton Science School
   7) Wolf Recovery in the Northern Rocky Mountains — Audubon and National Fish and Wildlife Foundation booklet
   8) Wolves in the Northern Rockies: Commonly Asked Questions — National Wildlife Federation brochure
   9) Wolves: Identification, Documentation, Population Monitoring and Conservation Considerations
   10) "Let's Tell the Truth about Predation"
   11) "Introducing Livestock-Guarding Dogs"
   12) "Of Wolves and Livestock"
   13) A Summary of the Northern Rocky Mountain Wolf Recovery Plan
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## Appendix C

### TABLE OF CONTENTS: WOLVES AND HUMANS BOX
(by subject)

### I. General Information

- How to use the box
- Suggested reading list
- Acknowledgements and sources of materials
- List of box contents
- Care of box contents

### II. Background information and suggested activities

- Tracks and trails (uses casts of tracks)
- Wolf identification (uses pelts)
- Skulls (uses skulls)
- Howling (uses side A and B of cassette tape)
- Smell
- Body language (uses wooden wolf puppet)
- Scat (uses scat)
- Pack life
- Pups (uses felt story board)
- Territory
- Prey (uses wolf prey bag)
- Livestock
- Survival requirements (uses felt story board, map measurer)
- Why should we recover wolves? (uses blocks)
- Wolf management laws
- History and evolution (uses rubber stamp)
- Viewpoint (uses set of photographs and side A of cassette tape)
- Working with wolves

* "Missing" page numbers at the end of each section are for future additions to the manual

(continued on back)
TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

III. Video synopses and study guides

   The Wolf: Real or Imagined?  III:1
   White Wolf  III:2
   The Timber Wolf Alliance wolf video  III:3
   National Wildlife Federation wolf video  III:4

IV. Getting to Know the Wolf

V. The Wonder of Wolves

VI. References

   Zoobooks: Wolves
   Looking at the Wolf
   Wolf Recovery in the Northern Rocky Mountains
   Wolves in the Northern Rockies: Commonly Asked Questions
   Wolves: Identification, Documentation, Population Monitoring
      and Conservation Considerations
   Let's Tell the Truth about Predation
   Introducing Livestock-Guarding Dogs
   Of Wolves and Livestock
   A Summary of the Northern Rocky Mountain Wolf Recovery Plan
   Getting to Yes on the Wolf
   Attitudes of Hunters and Residents Toward Wolves in
      Northwestern Montana
Appendix D

Wolf Box Locations

"Wolves and Humans" Traveling Educational Box Locations
Idaho, Montana, Washington and Wyoming

Box #

1. Lucille Hilbert or Susan VanRooy
   Montana Natural History Center
   P.O. Box 8514
   Missoula, MT 59807
   (406) 243-6642

2. Renee Askins
   Wolf Fund
   Box 471
   Moose, WY 83012
   (307) 733-0740

3. Suzanne Laverty
   Wolf Recovery Foundation
   P.O. Box 793
   Boise, ID 83701
   (208) 939-4290

4. Joe Decker
   Glacier National Park Headquarters
   West Glacier, MT 59936
   (406) 888-5441

5. Beth Pargaminian
   Idaho Panhandle National Forest
   Coeur D'Alene, ID 83814
   (208) 765-7411

6. John Ormiston
   Supervisor's Office
   316 N. 3rd St.
   Hamilton, MT 59840
   (406) 363-3131

7. Joe Fontaine
   U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
   P.O. Box 10023
   Helena, MT 59626
   (406) 449-5225

8. Dan Carney
   Blackfeet Fish and Game
   Box 850
   Browning, MT 59417
   (406) 338-7207

9. Dennis Jones
   Flathead National Forest
   1935 Third Ave. E.
   Kalispell, MT 59901
   (406) 758-5204

10. Science-Math Resource Center
    Reed Hall Room 126
    Montana State University
    Bozeman, MT 59715
    (406) 994-3440

11. Don Smurthwaite
    Bureau of Land Management
    Idaho St. Office/3380 American Terrace
    Boise, ID 83706
    (208) 384-3015

12. Jane Roybal/Meridy Parker
    U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
    2617 E. Lincoln Way / Suite A
    Cheyenne, WY 82001
    (307) 772-2374

13. Kathy Teter
    Curriculum Resource Center
    Room 102, Education Building
    Eastern Montana College
    Billings, MT 59101-0298
    (406) 657-1687

14. Lucille Hilbert or Susan VanRooy
    Montana Natural History Center
    P.O. Box 8514
    Missoula, MT 59807
    (406) 243-6642

15. Robin Spahr
    Sawtooth National Recreation Area
    Star Route
    Ketchum, ID 83342
    (208) 726-7672

16. Lynn Johnson
    Murphy Lake Ranger Station
    P.O. Box 116
    Fortine, MT 59918
    (406) 882-4451

17. John Gahl
    Idaho Fish and Game
    P.O. Box 25
    Boise, ID 83707
    (208) 334-2633
    (for UPS - 600 S. Walnut / 83712)

18. Bob Naney
    Okanogan National Forest
    1240 S. 2nd
    Okanogan, WA 98840
    (509) 826-3387
    - OR -
    Bill Gaines
    Wenatchee National Forest
    600 Sherbourne
    Leavenworth, WA 98826
    (509) 782-1413
19. Tom Rider  
Wyoming Game and Fish  
260 Buena Vista  
Lander, WY 82520  
(307) 332-2688

- OR -

Dick Baldes  
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
170 North 1st St.  
Lander, WY 82520  
(307) 332-2159

20. Dennis Hammer  
Wyoming Game and Fish  
2820 State Highway 120  
Cody, WY 82414  
(307) 527-7125

21. Carol Alette (this box is not for general teacher check out)  
National Wildlife Federation  
240 N. Higgins  
Missoula, MT 59802  
(406) 721-6705

22. Norm Bishop  
P.O. Box 56  
Yellowstone National Park, WY 82190 **  
(307) 344-2210

23. Jeff Haas  
3704 Griffin Lane S.E. / Suite 102  
Olympia, WA 98501-2192 **  
(206) 753-9440

24. Homeless  
Currently in National Wildlife Federation office  
Needs wolf skull and pelt  
Will probably go to central Idaho?

25. Pat Tucker (not a complete box)  
Wild Sentry  
833 Harrison  
Missoula, MT 59802  
(406) 549-5245

* Boxes at these locations supplied their own wolf pelt and wolf skull
** Boxes at these locations supplied their own wolf pelt

This list is current as of May 15, 1994
Use of "Wolf Box" (By City)
Appendix F
Letter From Bitterroot Stockgrowers Association
to Bitterroot National Forest

BITTER ROOT STOCK GROWERS ASSOCIATION
HAMPTON, MONTANA, 59840
JAY MEYER
PRESIDENT

14 November 1991

Subject: Wolves and Humans Educational Resource Box

To: Ms. Bertha C. Gillam
Forest Supervisor
Bitterroot National Forest

1. A committee of the Bitter Root Stockman's Association have
thoroughly reviewed the contents of "THE WOLF BOX" presented
at the October meeting of the Bitterroot Stockgrowers. A commit­
tee of five people spent four hours reviewing each video, reading
the printed material and also individually reading and studying
the material we were not able to cover at the first meeting.
A second meeting was held ten days later and we thoroughly discus­
sed and composed the rough draft of this letter. We then held
a third meeting to formally compose this letter.

2. The label on this resource box states that the material was
developed by the National Wildlife Federation in cooperation
with the U.S. Forest Service, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
and the Central Idaho Wolf Recovery Committee. Our main object­
tion is the biased nature of the content as prepared by the spec­
cial interest groups. There are many false and misleading state­
ments in the printed material and videos. There is not histori­
cal data presented concerning damage caused by predation, reasons
for eradication, or present damage done by wolves where they
now exist.

3. The contents of the material does not give warning to the
children that the wolf is an extremely large and dangerous wild
animal. Historical records tell of many stories of wolf attacks
on humans, and documents show wolves have killed people. This
material states emphatically that the wolf is a shy, curious
creature.

4. Mr. Ormiston, U.S. Forrest Service Wildlife Biologist, stated
at the Stockgrowers meeting that these were only distributed
by the U.S. Forest Service and that the Forest Service was
not endorsing this program. He also stated at that meeting
that he had not reviewed all of the contents of the box. In
fact, the label states that the kit was developed
by two special interest groups in cooperation with two Federal
Agencies. The biases of these special interest groups make
a balanced picture impossible. Therefore we feel that taxpayer's
dollars should not be used to distribute and promote this box.
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5. VIDEOS

A. National Geographic THE ARTIC WOLF. The photography is very good. The film covers one summer in the life of a wolf pack and one gets the impression that the wolf eats very little as this pack kills one musk ox calf and a few rabbits.

B. National Wildlife Federation Video. This is the most balanced film, but there could be much more evidence on livestock predation. The fact that wolves often kill much more than they can eat is hardly discussed.

C. Timber Wolf Video. This video is very biased in favor of wolves. Wolves are presented on a par with pets as cute, playful and loving. It does not warn that wolves pose a danger to humans and in fact, states that they are not dangerous. Since this film is targeted toward children less than eight years old, this omission is inexcusable.

D. Wolf Real or Imagined. This film is the most objectionable and we question its educational value. The drawing of the naked female walking with the wolf need not have been included in the film. The sexual reference raised in the story of Little Red Riding Hood needs to be mentioned to the teacher before this video is shown. This video should not be shown without some background material for the teacher and none is included.

6. Other Materials

A. Felt Board. Again the content plays on the child's sympathy as humans take over wolf's territory. One story justifies the wolf preying on livestock and minimizes the loss and personal tragedy for the boy.

B. Wood wolf puppet. The material makes reference to "your" wolf. This could encourage ownership of a wolf. The cards with the puppet do show the social behavior and social structure within the pack.

C. Colored Blocks. This is an extremely oversimplified picture of the complex nature of ecosystems. Man and wolf are portrayed as equals at the pinnacle of the structure. Nowhere in this presentation are man's agricultural pursuits portrayed.

D. Printed material. The book for the younger children show the wolves as cute, roly-poly and loving. This tends to equate their nature with domestic dogs which would be a dangerous falsehood for children. The material in the looseleaf binder contains many false statements. Such statements as "It is difficult for wolves to make swift clean kills, and wolves often eat every scrap including bones and marrow." do not equate with reality. The bias of the printed word speaks loudly.
7. The Test

A. Question 4. Almost all wolves kill cattle and sheep. This should be true as the principal reason wolves were eradicated in the lower 48 states was their predation of livestock.

B. Question 5. Wolves are often bruised and their bones broken by kicks from animals they are trying to kill. This should be false as wolves are large efficient killers and the words "are often" implies that a large portion are injured in their attacks on their prey. There is no indication in the historical records that this is true.

C. Question 8. Wild, healthy wolves are known to have killed people in North America. This should be true. There is ample evidence of this in the history of the wolf in North America.

D. Question 9. Wolves usually kill more than they can eat. This should be true. Again there is ample evidence in the historical records and modern day references showing that wolves often kill more than they can consume.

E. Question 10. Wolves kill most of the deer they see. This question is very ambiguous. It could very well be true from the evidence provided by Game and Fish of Alaska, British Columbia and Minnesota. The question is also very misleading to those taking the test.

F. Question 19. Wolves tend to pick the youngest, oldest and sickest prey animals because they are the easiest and safest for them to kill. This question is true except for the sickest. Many times wolves will pass up sick animals in their quest for food. Wolves concentrate on the young and have been known to kill up to 95% of the crop of the young in their prey. Wolves are opportunists and kill the first thing they see. They are powerful enough to kill any animal in North America and when in packs, this can and does include the grizzly bear.

8. In conclusion, our committee, which represents the Bitterroot Stock Growers feel that this program should be immediately removed from distribution by the U.S. Forest Service. Taxpayer dollars should not be used to promote a special interest group's agenda.

Respectfully Submitted,

Ken Kershner
Jon H. Lienemann
Margie C. Lienemann
Robert Christ
Jerrian Jones

BITTERROOT STOCKGROWERS COMMITTEE
WHO AM I?

Answer the following true and false questions. Then on the other side color the numbers of the true questions gray and the numbers of the false questions green.

(T) 1. Wolves eat mostly large animals like deer, elk, and moose.
(T) 2. A pack of wolves is a family group.
(T) 3. By 1930, wolves were exterminated in most of the lower 48 states.

(F) 4. Almost all wolves kill cattle and sheep.
(F) 5. Wolves are often bruised and their bones broken by kicks from animals they are trying to kill.
(F) 6. Wolves eat mostly mice and ground squirrels.
(F) 7. Most wolf packs have more than 15 wolves in them.
(T) 8. Wild, healthy wolves are known to have killed people in North America.

(F) 9. Wolves usually kill more than they can eat.
(T) 10. Wolves kill most of the deer they see.
(T) 11. Wolf packs defend their territories from other packs.
(F) 12. Wolves are bold and aggressive around people.
(T) 13. One of the reasons wolves howl is to tell strange wolves to stay away.

(F) 14. Wolves howl at the moon.
(F) 15. Wolves curl their tails like huskies or malamutes.
(F) 16. Most wolves weigh about 100 pounds.
(F) 17. Wolves don’t bark.
(F) 18. Wolves are born with their eyes open.
(F) 19. Wolves tend to pick the youngest, oldest and sickest prey animals because they are the easiest and safest for them to kill.
Appendix G
Letter From Central Idaho Wolf Recovery Steering Committee to National Wildlife Federation

February 16, 1993

Pat Tucker
National Wildlife Federation
240 N. Higgins
Missoula, MT, 59802

Dear Ms. Tucker,

After careful review of the contents in the wolf box that the National Wildlife Federation prepared under contract with the Central Idaho Wolf Recovery Steering Committee, we request some changes. Most of these changes can be sent to us in duplicates of 4, and we will add them to the wolf boxes. Some materials will have to be sent back to you for editing.

The consensus of the Steering Committee is that the following areas be changed/added:

1. A historical briefing of why the early settlers shot wolves - the attitudes, beliefs, and fears of American pioneers towards "wilderness" and its predators. Suggest adding to the teacher's guide and/or as a "living history" play performed by the children.

2. The video, Timber Wolf, states that "the wolf is not dangerous". This statement should be removed and clarified - the wolf is a predator and very dangerous to some species - wild and domestic. The message that the wolf is a wild animal should be clearly understood after experiencing the wolf box.

3. Labels need to be created stating "Viewing Audience - age/grade" for all videos in the wolf box to become more "user-friendly" for the teacher and to benefit the comprehension of the students.

4. Information for the students and teachers on the wolf's eating behavior - why some animals killed by wolves aren't eaten, why domestic animals are easier prey than wild species, the historical and current threat to livestock, etc.

5. Provide a list of all materials in the wolf box. In the box reviewed, a very biased "test" was found and an unauthorized video. When the box returns to the agency, contents will be checked against the list and unofficial items removed.

Thank you for making these corrections. We would like to make the changes for this school year. Please let us know when to send the video Timber Wolf for editing. If you have any questions, please contact Susan Reinhard at (208) 638-0784, Payette National Forest.

Chuck Liddell
Acting Chair
USDI Fish & Wildlife Service
496 Overland Road, Boise, ID 83705
War over wolves

Stockgrowers blast Forest Service over wolf education

By PAT RHODES

The Bitter Root Stockgrowers Association took aim on the Forest Service in a Wednesday night meeting in Hamilton because the agency is making a wolf educational kit available to local schools.

The box, which contains hides, skulls, games, puppets, study plans, videos and other material, was put together by the Montana Wildlife Federation and does not present a balanced look at wolf recovery, according to a consensus of the 50 stockgrowers that attended the meeting. The organization further told John Ormiston and Dixie Dobbs, who represented the Forest Service at the meeting, that a federal, tax-supported agency is out of line promoting the wolf material in the schools.

Ormiston spoke to the group saying that the Endangered Species Act "says wolves will be recovered and the wilderness area in the Bitterroot is part of the recovery area." He added that there has been a dramatic increase in wolf activity in the northern Rockies and that it takes 10 breeding pairs in an area for a specified length of time to remove an animal from endangered status. "We are rapidly reaching that status in the Glacier Park area," he said.

At the present time, it is illegal to shoot wolves in the United States, according to Ormiston. He explained that the six wolf boxes are designed for use on the sixth grade level and that the Bitterroot Forest Supervisor's Office in Hamilton is responsible for one box. Forest Supervisor Bertha Gillam sent a letter to the schools this fall making the box available to them.

See Wolves, page 3
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"The Forest Service is involved because we think it (the box) contains sound, educational information," Ormiston said.

Ormiston said that there is not a "documented case in the U.S. of a free-ranging wolf killing a human being. We see wolf-hybrids attacking people all the time and there are a number of deaths caused by hybrida."

Stockgrower Bob Christ of Hamilton suggested that if the National Wildlife Federation and the Montana Wildlife Federation want to promote the wolf program in the schools — "let them do it but why should the Forest Service, a taxpayer-funded agency be responsible for it?"

Ormiston answered that he believes the kit contains "legitimate educational material. We are not involved in promoting wolves." He added that the Forest Service would have no problem promoting educational material about beef, rangelands, and other agricultural information — "if the information is sound and provided to us."

Dees added to Ormiston's comment that the video, "Beef, the Essential Element," promoted by the stockgrowers' organization could be put out to the schools.

Stockgrower Mike Nichols asked Ormiston and Dees who had reviewed the whole wolf box of materials to see if it is biased and Ormiston said that the endangered species supervisor in the Forest Service Regional Office in Missoula had reviewed the wolf material -- "to his satisfaction," and there is nothing in the box saying that wolves should be reintroduced," Ormiston said.

Stockgrower Lloyd Rockeman said the Endangered Species Act is up for review in a year. "It's a hoax and a danger to agriculture," he added.

Ormiston suggested that a committee from the stockgrowers work with the Forest Service to critique the wolf program and help develop a program showing the other side of the issue. "The box is not reserved for the next couple of weeks and we will put a moratorium on it," he said, so the committee can review it.

Bitter Root Stockgrowers President Jay Meyer of Stevensville appointed a review committee composed of Jon and Margie Lienemann, Christ, Jerriean Jones and Ken Kershner to work with Ormiston on reviewing the wolf box. Boone Jones was appointed an alternate member of the committee. The membership also approved sending a letter to Gilliam expressing the local organization's feelings on the wolf subject.
Stockgrowers review wolf box

Education plan raises objections

By PAT BHODES

A Bitterroot Stockgrowers Association committee has reviewed the wolf box made available to schools by the Forest Service and delivered a summary of objections to the Bitteroot Forest Supervisor's office on Friday.

The five-person committee began its review following a stockgrowers' meeting last month with John Ormiston and Dixie Dies from the Forest Service regarding the wolf boxes. The boxes, which contain hides, skulls, games, puppets, study plans and videos, were put together by the National Wildlife Federation and are made available to schools as educational material. Ormiston defended the Forest Service's role in distributing the boxes saying: "The Forest Service is involved because we think the box contains sound, educational information.

Ormiston suggested that a committee of stockgrowers work with the Forest Service to critique the wolf program and help develop information that would show the other side of the issue. The committee has met several times in the interim and their findings were approved by the stockgrowers at a meeting late last week.

"We obviously need to present something that is as balanced as possible. We're not in the wolf business."

Dixie Dies, Forest Service

According to the committee, the label on the wolf box states that the material was developed by the National Wildlife Federation in cooperation with the U.S. Forest Service, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the Central Idaho Wolf Recovery Committee. "Our main objection is the biased nature of the content as prepared by the special interest groups," the committee wrote. "There are many false and misleading statements in the printed material and videos. There's not historical data presented concerning damage caused by predators, eradication, or present damage done by wolves where they now exist. Therefore we feel that tax-payers' dollars should not be used to distribute and promote this box."

The committee listed each item in the box with accompanying critiques, including one on three videos. Among the play materials in the box are a felt board, a wooden wolf puppet, colored blocks and printed material. "The content plays on the child's sympathy as humans take over wolves' territory," the review states. A book for younger children shows wolves as "cute, roly-poly and loving. This tends to equate their nature with domestic dogs which would be a dangerous falsehood for children," the committee wrote.

See Wolf, page 8
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The committee also took issue with the false statement that almost all wolves kill cattle and sheep. The stockgrowers said the false statement should be indicated as true because “almost all wolves kill cattle and sheep”. The principal reason wolves were eradicated in the lower 48 states was because of their predation of livestock.

Another question on the test dealt with human safety and states: “Wild, healthy wolves are known to have killed people in North America.” The question, according to the Wildlife Federation, should be marked false but the stockgrowers disagree. “Wild, healthy wolves are known to have killed people in North America.” There is ample evidence of this in the history of the wolf in North America,” the committee stated.

The committee, and the organization as a whole, has concluded that the wolf box should be “immediately removed from distribution by the U.S. Forest Service. Taxpayer dollars should not be used to promote a special interest group’s agenda,” they state in the review delivered to the Forest Service.

The wolf box also has been shown to the state conventions of both the Farm Bureau and Grange organizations, and both organizations are taking action on the issue.

Jon Lienemann, a member of the stockgrowers review committee, said the organization has videos and printed material dealing with the impacts of wolf reintroduction and the history of wolves in the U.S. and will make it available to the Forest Service.

Bitterroot Forest Public Affairs Officer Dixie Dies said Friday she has received the report from the Stockgrowers but had not had time to read it. Nevertheless, she said the Forest Service “welcomes this kind of input and will forward it on to the Central Idaho Wolf Recovery Task Force, an inter-agency group composed of representatives from the Forest Service, the Bureau of Land Management, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Animal Damage Control and Idaho Fish and Game.”

Dies said a decision on whether to continue making the boxes available to schools is unlikely to be made here. “We will send the information on to our public affairs people in the Regional Office and on the Payette National Forest in Idaho.”

Since the wolf issue arose, school superintendents have expressed some concern that the information in the boxes be equitable, Dies said. “That’s our concern too,” she said. “We obviously need to present something that is as balanced as possible. We’re not in the wolf business.” She added that it will be some time before any final decision on the boxes could be expected.
Wolf danger is underestimated

Dear Editor:

On Oct. 23, Mr. John Ormiston, a biologist with the U.S. Forest Service made the statement that "there is not a documented case in the U.S. of a free-ranging wolf killing a human being." I would like to offer the following to refute this statement.

Saint Paul Daily Globe, March 8, 1888. “New Rockford, Dak., March 7 — The news has just reached here that a father and son, living several miles northeast of this city, were destroyed by wolves yesterday. The two unfortunate men started to a haystack some 10 rods from the house to shovel a path around the stack when they were surrounded by wolves and literally eaten alive. The horror-stricken mother was standing at the window with a babe in her arms, a spectator to the terrible death of her husband and son, but was unable to aid them. After they had devoured every flesh from the bones of the men the denizens of the forest attacked the house, but retired to the hills in a short time. Investigation found nothing but the bones of the husband and son. The family name was Olson. Wolves are more numerous and dangerous now than ever before known in North Dakota."

Some will say that these wolves were rabid, but this is unlikely as there has never been a recorded account of a rabid pack but many accounts of single rabid wolves. Early forts in the west such as Fort Laramie, Wyo., and Fort Larned, Kan., record accounts of rabid wolves coming in the posts and attacking humans.

I also have a report by John James Audubon, where a wolf attacked two men in Kentucky near the Ohio border in winter. One was killed and the other escaped. This was in his book, “The Quadrupeds of North America,” three volumes, New York, 1851-54. Also George Bird Grinnell of his book “Trail and Campfire — Wolves and Wolf Nature,” New York, 1897 described an attack on a girl in Northwestern Colorado and was only saved because her brother responded to the attack and killed the wolf.

The Bitterroot Stockgrowers will have copies of these attacks available. The material was compiled by a Mr. Troy R. Mader of the Abundant Wildlife Society of North America. Since the Central Idaho Wolf Recovery starts less than five miles west of Hamilton and the whole west side of the valley, people in this area need to learn the historical truth about wolves and not the hype of the special interest groups. When you study the information available, you will come to the conclusion that we do not need wolves in Yellowstone, Central Idaho or any other place in the Rocky Mountain areas.

Jon H. Lienemann
Hamilton
School nixes wolf program
Ranchers apply pressure to school board

By TOM REED
managing editor

If Lander elementary school children want to learn about wolves, next week, they'll have to visit a reservation school.

Bowing under pressure from a few area ranchers, Fremont County School District No. 1 officials have canceled a program which would have brought a live wolf into Lander elementary schools.

The program, called Wild Sentry, features a 100-pound black wolf named Koani and is presented by Montana wildlife biologist Pat Tucker. The wolf, which was born and has lived all its life in captivity, is used by Wild Sentry in classrooms all over the country. This week and next, the program will be featured in all of the schools on the Wind River Indian Reservation.

It was to have been featured in Lander's elementary schools, as well.

But when some county ranchers heard that the educational opportunity was coming to Lander classrooms, they howled with dismay. According to Lander citizens invited to wolf evening program

Lander citizens will get a chance to learn about wolves at a program scheduled for April 20.

Wild Sentry, an educational program which features a 100-pound live wolf, will be coming to the town's community center at 7:30 p.m. on April 20.

The program is free and runs an hour and a half.

Superintendent Wayne King, several school board members received calls from disgruntled ranchers and as a result, the district's involvement with the program was cancelled.

"It was more political than anything," admitted King.

"We've got a bond issue coming up and we don't want to rile people up over this. We don't want to make people mad right now."

King said he did not know who the ranchers were nor did he reveal the school board members.

See WOLF, page A-3.
Wolf program scheduled for community, schools

By TOM REED

Lander school children — and their parents — will get a chance to see a wolf education program after all.

Wild Sentry, a program that partially features a live, 100-pound female black wolf, will be coming to the Lander schools system tonight at 7 p.m. in the high school girls' gymnasium.

“It’s open to anyone who is interested,” said Fremont County School District No. 1 Superintendent Wayne King.

The Wild Sentry program was to have come to the town’s three elementary schools this week, but King cancelled those appearances last week after a few ranchers complained. Following the cancellation and a story which ran last week’s Wyoming State Journal, a furor erupted and King decided to have a program that would be optional to school children and their parents rather than one that was mandatory.

(Under the old schedule) it was not scheduled for all the kids,” said King. “This way, it’s open to people who want to come, including parents.

The original program was to have been presented to first and second graders at North; and third and fourth graders at West, Hudson and South elementaries. But a few unnamed ranchers called school board members asking for equal time for a program on wolves presented from their point of view, said King. “They said ‘we would like equal time’ and I felt that I just didn’t want the kids stuck in the middle (of the controversy),” said King.

RANCHING INTERESTS are concerned over a federal plan to reintroduce wolves into Wyoming’s Yellowstone Ecosystem and the wolf has become one of the hottest topics in the nation. But Wild Sentry is not an advocacy program, said Bruce Weide and Pat Tucker, program hosts.

During the show, Tucker and Weide show slides of cattle which have been preyed upon by wolves. “We feel it’s important to give facts about wolves and wolves do take livestock,” said Tucker.

The program has been shown all over Montana, Wyoming and Idaho as well as other states. “In northern California, we hit the rancher’s side of the story hard because everyone there is pro-wolf,” said Tucker.

All in all, the program attempts to give a balanced educational, biological picture of the wolf, said Tucker, a wildlife biologist.

In the Swan Valley of Montana, the program met with some opposition as well, continued Tucker.

MEANWHILE, Ranchers who have concerns about the potential reintroduction of wolves into Wyoming have made their impacts that such an action might have on their community, spoke out following King’s decision.

Darlene Vaughan, past president of the Fremont County CattleWomen, noted that her group had some concerns over the Wild Sentry program.

“We felt it was important for our kids to get both sides of the story,” said Vaughan, who ranches up Sinks Canyon with her husband, Dave. “It’s important for them to understand the consequences of wolf reintroduction as well as the advantages.”

Ron Weber, a Lyons Valley rancher, said that to his knowledge only two ranchers — based in Cowheart, not Lander — called school board members complaining about the pending wolf program.

Weber said that predator control has become a real concern to ranchers and the wolf is part of that picture. “Right now, the coyotes are so bad out at my place that there are no rabbits at all. I lost a calf the other night and those coyotes just ripped that little guy’s guts right out. From the tracks, I’d say there was about four or five of them.”

Another area rancher, Tony Malberg, said that the wolf has become the symbol of the environmental movement and of preservationists. Malberg also said it was important for members of the ranching community to attend the adult-oriented wolf program scheduled for Wednesday at the See WOLF, page A-6

Wolf (from page A-1)

7:30 p.m. in the community center.

IN ADDITION to tonight’s program, Wild Sentry will be appearing on Tuesday night at 7:30 p.m. at the Wyoming Indian High School auditorium and again in Lander at 7:30 p.m. at the Lander Community Center on Wednesday evening. All events are free and open to anyone who wishes to attend.
Wolf program is cancelled

(from page A-1)

who had been called.

But sponsors of the program — which include the Wyoming Outdoor Council, the National Wildlife Federation, the Shoshone and Arapaho tribes, the Wind River Associates, the Wyoming Wildlife Federation and the Joint Business Council of the Shoshone and Arapaho tribes — are dismayed at the district’s decision to cancel.

“It’s important to make as many decisions as possible to have good education for our children,” said Donn Kesselheim, with the Wyoming Outdoor Council. “This decision was not based on education, it was made for political reasons and that’s a real shame.”

NEXT MONTH, the district will attempt to pass a $2.3-million bond issue for capital improvements at various schools. Rancher support of the issue is important, said King.

“This is just one of those things that we thought would be better to leave alone,” King said.

The cancellation comes at the last minute which is an additional problem, said Kesselheim. Next week, Wild Sentry (based near Missoula, Mont.) was to have come to West Elementary on Monday, South Elementary on Wednesday and North Elementary on Friday. “There isn’t time to fill in the holes for the cancelled programs,” said Kesselheim.

“This was a real chance for our children to get accurate and fresh information on what a wolf is all about. It’s frustrating.”

“It reminds me of book burning,” remarked June Rain, chief of the Wyoming Wildlife Federation. “I have seen their (Wild Sentry’s) educational program and it is just outstanding. People in the audience, whether they are pro, anti or neutral, come away with a better understanding of wolves.

“Our children in this state will be faced with wolf reintroduction and the best thing we can do is to understand what these animals are all about,” she continued. “It is outrageous that a special interest group can push around our educational system like this. But it is typical of the intimidation tactics — both physical and emotional — that the livestock industry exerts on all public lands issues.”

“It is just unbelievable,” remarked Tom Dougherty, with the National Wildlife Federation. “I wonder if they should go through the Lander school library and burn a few books as well. This program is not about poisoning little children’s minds about wolves. It’s about what wolves eat and do and where they live.”

Dougherty added that the program has been in schools all over the west, including Montana and Idaho and is strictly educational.

THE WILD Sentry program will continue at reservation schools this week and next.

Observers of the program, which premiered in this county at Arapahoe School on Tuesday, characterized it as biological and educational.
LETTER TO THE EDITOR

'Misstatement of the year'

To the editor:

In the article on why the wolf program was cancelled also reported some quotes by environmentalist Donn Kesselheim contains the misstatement of the year. His quote, "This was a real chance for our children to get accurate and fresh information on what a wolf is all about. Unquote.

This type program with a domesticated wolf being portrayed as an animal in the wild is totally in error. My dog, a Belgian Tervuren, could pass for a wolf in looks, actions, and intelligence, but he has papers to prove he is a registered dog and he can catch anything that jumps up in front of him.

A domesticated wolf would obey commands like a dog, it will show the same affection that a dog does but it can pass back and forth between wild and domesticated as fast as my dog does. All wild animals must be mean and vicious to survive, and by this I mean wolves, coyotes, coons, mink, weasels and bobcats. To bring a domesticated wolf into a classroom and compare it to a wild animal is nothing short of an out and out falsehood.

Ralph Urbigkit
C C 31 Box 4
Crowheart

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

Some 'unfortunate stereotypes'

To the editor:

The most unfortunate thing about the cancelation of the wolf-education programs in Lander schools is that a few vocal ranchers have once again reinforced the stereotype held by so many non-agricultural people, the impression that ranchers are intolerant. We know that most ranchers don't fit this description: we know because we're friends with a number of ranching families. One of the things that we stress in the Wild Sentry programs is how important it is for ranchers and conservationists to be polarized by the wolf issue. We all have too much in common to be at each other's throats. Much of what we love about the West is imperiled. We should be allied in an effort to protect our common interests.

The Wild Sentry program focuses on education not advocacy. The Lander school system has invited us to present our school program to interested students and their parents on Monday night, April 18 at 7 p.m. in the high school girls' gymnasium. We will also present the adult program Tuesday night (April 19) at 7:30 p.m. in the Wyoming Indian High School Auditorium and Wednesday night (April 20) at 7:30 p.m. in the Lander Community Center. We hope that people from all backgrounds and viewpoints will attend.

Sincerely,
/s/ Pat Tucker, Bruce Weide,
Wild Sentry

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

Liked wolf program

To the editor:

We have just returned from Wild Sentry's wolf program at Wyoming Indian High School. How unfortunate our children in this school district were denied, by the Fremont County School District No. 1 officials, this educational opportunity because of political reasons.

The program is both informative and entertaining. Montana wildlife biologist Pat Tucker, and storyteller Bruce Weide, use personal experiences and traditional stories, such as Little Red Ridinghood, to reveal misconceptions many people have, and to educate the children about the wolf's life and habits as a predator. The program features a natural history lecture and slide show, as well as an opportunity to meet the wolf, Koani. This program is not about reintroduction. It is about education. Pat Tucker mentioned, briefly, that each side of the wolf controversy should listen and communicate with one another.

Our children are growing up with the reintroduction issue. We believe that the best way to make a decision is to be educated. By learning everything possible about the wolf, we can make our own decisions. We were naive enough to believe our school district officials held this same opinion about education. How sad our children are being denied the opportunity to make up their own minds.

We hope the citizens of this community will take the opportunity that our children were denied to see this educational program tonight at the Lander Community Center at 7:30.

Sincerely,
/s/ Retha New
/s/ Marian Doane Collins

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

Commends King, condemns 'book burners' comment

To the editor:

It is a sad day indeed when local school board members are accused of being proactively motivated "book burners" by representatives of anti-educational and anti-social organizations, such as the Wyoming Outdoor Council, the National and Wyoming Wildlife Federation, and others, in connection with their request for equal time on the Lander elementary school wolf program.

Bringing a tame pet wolf onto the classroom to educate the children about these beautiful animals is no more than the proverbial "fox in the hen house." A pack of wolves in the wild is far different in every way than the precious little jewels that are raised in a secure location.

I believe Superintendent King has done the right thing in his commendable action of encouraging this presentment into schools for educational purposes. In doing so, he is helping people to understand this magnificent animal and to develop an appreciation for it.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

Disappointed in school action on wolves

To the editor:

I am very disappointed in the Fremont County School District #1 Board's decision to cancel the wolf program presentation.

The board and superintendent have denied my children an opportunity to learn educational information to be gleaned from these amazing animals. I have worked to bring several wolf presentations into schools in Colorado and attended several such programs.

I believe that wolves are good pets and can be kept as pets. Wolves and wolf hybrids should be kept at pets. Wyoming does not. The benefit the wolf program is also presented.

It is a heartwarming experience to see with children when a live wolf is brought into schools. The wolves go right up to the children with enthusiasm. Teachers in awe of this magnificent animal and delight in the learning experience these classes receive.

My message to the school board is to want my children to have wild animal presentations to come into their schools. I want them to experience all the visual, sound, touch and verbal interaction that takes place when people and animals come together to teach one another about a specific topic. They breed show, do presentations and train me. The learning goes hand in hand, never stopping.

I encourage everyone to attend the wolf presentation April 20 at 7 p.m. at the community center. They are here to teach all of us about a wild animal.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

Who minds (school) hen house?

To the editor:

When is the hen house hen house?

The administration, school board, the system. Maybe the wolves are.

If the article in the Wyoming State Journal, April 13, 1994, "School Niws Wolfe Program," is accurate then my opening question is accurate. If it is not then I think the patrons of FCS #1 deserve the truth. Was the decision to cancel the Wyoming bond issue due to the good of the children or to stifle avoided good policy? Did the unknown number wasn't one of them said for cancellation or merely equal time?

I have returned home late on April 14 to read the aforementioned article. I subsequently called a school board member, who knew nothing more than what the article stated and said I wanted to know that the school program was "coming to town." I then called Superintendent King and said that he didn't want to talk about it anymore. And I made a decision because he didn't want the kids "caught in the middle." I thought it was a good idea to have the kids involved in the decision and not have the kids involved in the Wyoming State Journal article.

I am very disappointed in the Fremont County School District #1 Board's decision to cancel the wolf program presentation.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

... a sad commentary

To the editor:


It is a sad commentary that Fremont County School District No. 1 Superintendent Wayne King canceled the wolf program presented by Wild Safety for the students in Lander.

I watched the program on April 11 at Wyoming Indian High School and it was informative and not controversial. While it is a wolf model it is a Wyoming Wolf Program, presented by Wild Safety for the teachers in Lander.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Controversy, election impact worries kill Lander school wolf program

"It is not pushing any political agenda ... wolf reintroduction. It was purely educational."

— Stephanie Kessler, Wyoming Outdoor Council director

LANDER — School officials last week cancelled a program about wolves at three local schools following complaints that threatened to make its presentation controversial, said Fremont County School District No. 1 Superintendent Wayne King.

Other Fremont County and Wind River Reservation schools, however, are continuing with the program as scheduled, according to Wyoming Outdoor Council Director Stephanie Kessler.

The complaints of three parents, combined with a request from a rancher wanting to provide information that shows the negative side of wolves in the wild, prompted the action for Lander's schools, King said.

"It was more political than anything," King said. "We've got a bond issue coming up and we don't want to rile people up over this. We don't want to make people mad right now."

"We've got a bond issue coming up and we don't want to rile people up over this."

— Wayne King, school superintendent

Kessler said the district's decision to cancel the program is "unfortunate because it had been planned months in advance."

The presentations planned by Wild Sentry through its Northern Rockies Ambassador Wolf Program tries to dispel some of the myths about the wolf and to give information about its behavior and biology, according to a brochure. The program, which includes appearances by a 100-pound black wolf raised in captivity and a dog companion, is offered through the Montana Natural History Center by wildlife biologist Pat Tucker and writer/storyteller Bruce Weide.

"It's a science education program about the wolf, it is not pushing any political agenda at all regarding ... wolf reintroduction," Kessler said. "It was purely educational."

"It was assured to me that it was strictly an educational program," King said. However, the controversy surrounding wolf reintroduction in the Yellowstone ecosystem led him to cancel it. School board members initially contacted him and asked him to reevaluate the program, he said.

King said he had concerns about the controversy that could be created — and potentially affect children — because people opposing wolf reintroduction wanted an opportunity to present programs to students.

Wild Sentry scheduled 15 programs in Fremont County during a two-week period. Funding comes from a number of sources, including WOLF Audubon Chapter of Wyoming, the Wyoming Wildlife Federation, the National Wildlife Federation, the Joint Business Council of the Shoshone and Arapaho tribes, the Wind River Associates and Fremont School District No. 1.

Only the Lander school programs were cancelled. A public program is now slated in Lander at the community center on April 20.

King said the district had agreed to provide $150 for the programs, and likely would not make that payment because the program won't be given in local schools.

The program was selected by the district's gifted and talented education coordinator for its educational value. King said. It would have been presented to lower elementary and some junior high students involved the gifted and talented program. The coordinator and building principals made the initial decision without involvement of the school board and superintendent were not involved, he said.

King cancelled the program Wednesday "with the board's blessing," School Board Chairman Ken Stroh said.

The people who contacted Stroh "are definitely against wolf reintroduction," he said. Further, the district did have a concern that the controversy surrounding wolf reintroduction could affect a $2.5 million bond election May 24 if the program was allowed, he said.

"I understand they've cancelled because they've gotten some calls from constituents who don't like the idea and I guess they're afraid it's going to affect the bond issue," Kessler said.

The district is asking voters to approve $2.5 million for maintenance and educational items including roof repairs, parking lot repairs and new technology equipment.
Appendix 1
Sample of Teacher Comment Form

NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION
NORTHERN ROCKIES NATURAL RESOURCE CENTER
240 N. Higgins, Missoula, Montana 59802
(406) 721-6705

WOLVES AND HUMANS BOX EVALUATION FORM

Please complete this evaluation form and return it with the box

Name: Nancy Deskins Work phone #: 428-7683
School: Primrose Montessori Pre School
Address: P.O. Box 3384 600 South Ave. E. Missoula 59806
Grade: Pre School
Number of students who used box: 35
Number of hours box materials were used in classroom: 25
Date of box use (month and year): May 1991

Which items were most useful?
Peels, scat, foot prints, posters, film, info, in notebook that was appropriate for children ages 2-5

Which items were not used?
All other items which were too advanced for pre school aged children

What additional materials would you have found useful?
Possibly a box with info. on common animals found in Montana - rabbits, buffalo, bison, wolverine, weasel etc.

How did the students respond to the box's contents and curriculum?
Very excited and interested

Did the attitude and knowledge of the students change as a result of using the box? In what way?
The children seemed to feel more comfortable about wild animals - they especially liked the scat!

What other kinds of box programs would you use if they were available?
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