

**Current Status of Environmental Education  
Funding in Wisconsin Survey - 2006**

**1. County in which you are employed:** \_\_\_\_\_

There was an even distribution of respondents from throughout the WAEE five membership regions.

Breakdown of the 76 respondents by regions:

North = 13      North East=15      West Central=18      South Central=15      South East=15

**2. Position: (please circle primary position)**

- a) Classroom Teacher – Public School
- b) Classroom Teacher – Private School
- c) School Administrator
- d) Program Administrator
- e) Nature Center Employee
- f) County/City Park and Recreation Employee
- g) Non-formal Educator
- h) WI DNR Employee
- i) Other \_\_\_\_\_

Seventy percent of the respondents to the survey were affiliated with school districts; ALL from public school districts, none were from private schools. Breakdown of respondents by individual positions:

Classroom Teacher – public = 34  
Classroom Teacher – private = 0  
School Administrator = 10  
Program Administrator = 4  
Nature Center Employee = 5  
County/city Park and Recreation Employee = 2  
Non-formal Educator = 5  
WI DNR Employee = 1  
Other = 15

The “Other” category was marked by respondents who worked at state and county agencies, non-classroom teachers (support teachers) and university professors.

Grouping the nine position options listed on the survey into four general categories, the following breakdown occurs:

Schools = 53 (70%)  
Non-Profit = 12 (16%)  
Agency = 8 (10%)  
Other = 3 (4%)

**3. What percentage of the EE programs offered through your place of employment are designed for each audience below? Please write numbers into the appropriate spaces.**

- a) \_\_\_\_\_ % Students
- b) \_\_\_\_\_ % Teachers
- c) \_\_\_\_\_ % Professional Staff
- d) \_\_\_\_\_ % Adult General Public
- e) \_\_\_\_\_ % Youth General Public
- f) \_\_\_\_\_ % Other \_\_\_\_\_

**Students:** 54 respondents reported that their place of employment offers some programs that are designed for students. All 54 respondents, indicated that at least 50% or more of their programs are geared toward students. The breakdown of student programming as reported by the 54 respondents is as follows:

100% = 21 respondents  
90 – 99% = 14 respondents  
75 – 79% = 11 respondents  
50 – 74% = 8 respondents

**Teachers:** 38 respondents reported that their place of employment offers some programs that are designed for teachers. Only 3 respondents indicated that ALL of their programs are geared toward teachers. The breakdown of the teacher programming as reported by the 38 respondents is as follows:

100% = 3 respondents  
50 – 99% = 2 respondents  
21 – 49% = 2 respondents  
1 – 20% = 31 respondents

**Professional Staff:** 16 respondents reported that their place of employment offers some programs that are designed for professional staff. Only 2 respondents indicated that ALL of their programs are geared toward professional staff. For the majority of respondents, 10, professional staff programming counts for less than 20% of their total programming. The breakdown of professional staff programming as reported by the 16 respondents is as follows:

100% = 2 respondents  
50 – 99% = 2 respondents  
20 – 49% = 2 respondents  
1 – 19% = 10 respondents

**Adult General Public:** 31 respondents reported that their place of employment offers some programs that are designed for the adult general public. However no more than 50% of programming is reported by respondents as geared toward adult general public. The majority of respondents, 15, indicated that less than 10% of their programs are geared to the adult general public. The breakdown of adult general programming as reported by the 31 respondents is as follows:

50% = 2 respondents  
30 - 49% = 6 respondents  
10 – 29% = 8 respondents  
1 – 9% = 15 respondents

**Youth General Public:** 22 respondents indicated that their place of employment offers some programs designed for the youth general public. Only 1 respondent, indicated that ALL programs at his/her place of employment are for youth. The majority of respondents, 19, reported that less than 50% of their programs were geared for youth. The breakdown of youth general programming as reported by the 22 respondents is as follows:

100% = 1 respondent  
50 – 99% = 2 respondents  
20 – 49% = 8 respondents  
10 – 19% = 6 respondents  
less than 10% = 5

**Other:** Only 6 respondents indicated that they offer programs for someone other than the five potential audiences included in the survey. Reasons given by respondents for selecting “Other” are: respondents did not know the target audience, no set number for target audiences exist, or volunteers and families were listed. The breakdown for Other programming as reported by the 6 respondents is as follows:

1 – 25% = 3 respondents

26 – 50% = 1 respondents  
 51 – 100% = 2 respondents

**4. Please circle the approximate number of people served by your place of employment annually.**

- a) 0 – 500
- b) 501 – 1000
- c) 1001 – 5000
- d) 5001 and over

Question four had 74 respondents.

Responses	Number of respondents	Percent
a) 0 – 500	24	33%
b) 501 – 1000	20	27%
c) 1001 – 5000	18	24%
d) 5001 and over	12	16%

**5. Please indicate the percentage of funding your place of employment receives from each category below.**

- a) \_\_\_\_\_ % Program revenue
- b) \_\_\_\_\_ % City/County/State governmental support
- c) \_\_\_\_\_ % Grants/Foundations/Gifts
- d) \_\_\_\_\_ % Membership
- e) \_\_\_\_\_ % Other \_\_\_\_\_

There were 65 responses to this question (out of 76 total survey respondents). Of the 65 responses:

- 71% indicated the largest percentage of their funding came from **City/County/State government** support
- 15% indicated the largest percentage of their funding came from **Grants/Foundations/Gifts**
- 14% indicated the largest percentage of their funding came from **Program revenue**
- 5% indicated the largest percentage of their funding came from **Membership**
- There were no responses indicating that “other” sources made up the majority of their funding

*(percentages add up to >100% because 3 respondents had two sources as their highest sources – 50% each – these were counted in each category, and because of rounding)*

31% (20) of the programs report one funding source  
 69% (45) of programs report receiving funding from multiple sources.  
 25% (16) receive funding from 3 or more sources.

**Breakdown of primary sources of funding by affiliation**

Of those responses that indicated **government support** was their primary source of funding:

- 35 (76%) were schools
- 6 (13%) were agencies
- 5 (11%) were non-profits

Of those responses that indicated **grants/foundation/gifts** was their primary source of funding:

- 6 (60%) were schools

3 (30%) were non-profits  
1 (1%) was agency

Of those responses that indicated **program revenue** was their primary source of funding:

6 (67%) were schools  
2 (22%) were non-profits  
1 (11%) was an “other”

Of those responses that indicated **membership** was their primary source of funding:

3 (100%) were non-profits

*(numbers add up to >65 because 3 respondents had two sources as their highest sources – 50% each – these were counted in each category)*

### **Breakdown of affiliation and sources of primary funding**

Of the responses:

44 (68%) were schools

35 indicated primary source of funding from government support  
6 indicated primary funding through program revenue  
6 indicated primary funding through grants/foundations/gifts

*(numbers add up to >44 because 3 respondents had two sources as their highest sources – 50% each – these were counted in each category)*

12 (18%) were non-profits

5 indicated primary source of funding from government support  
3 indicated primary funding through grants/foundations/gifts  
2 indicated primary funding through program revenue  
2 indicated primary funding through members

7 (11%) were agencies

6 indicated primary source of funding from government support  
1 indicated primary funding through grants/foundations/gifts

2 (3%) were “other”

1 indicated primary funding through program revenue  
1 indicated primary funding through membership

### **6. Please circle the dollar amount that best represents your place of employment’s 2006-2007 budget.**

- a) Up to \$50,000
- b) \$50,001 - \$100,000
- c) \$100,001 - \$500,000
- d) \$500,001 and over

There were 73 responses to this question (out of 76 total survey respondents). Of the 73 responses:

Responses	Total number of respondents	Percent of total
a) Up to \$50,000	18	25%
b) \$50,001 - \$100,000	10	14%

c) \$100,001 - \$500,000	11	15%
d) \$500,001 and over	34	46%

**Breakdown of budget by affiliation**

Of those responses that indicated a budget **up to \$50,000**:

- 15 (83%) were schools
- 2 (11%) were agencies
- 0 (0%) were non-profits
- 1 (6%) were other

Of those responses that indicated a budget **of \$50,001 - \$100,000**:

- 6 (60%) were schools
- 1 (10%) were agencies
- 3 (30%) were non-profits
- 0 (0%) were other

Of those responses that indicated a budget **of \$100,001 - \$500,000**:

- 2 (18%) were schools
- 0 (0%) were agencies
- 7 (64%) were non-profits
- 2 (18%) were other

Of those responses that indicated a budget **of \$500,001 and over**:

- 28 (82%) were schools
- 4 (12%) were agencies
- 2 (6%) were non-profits
- 0 (0) were other

**Breakdown of affiliation and budget**

Of the responses:

51 (70%) were schools

- 15 indicated budgets of up to \$50,000
- 6 indicated a budget of \$50,001 - \$100,000
- 1 indicated budgets of \$100,001 - \$500,000
- 28 indicated a budget of \$500,001 and over

12 (16%) were non-profits

- 3 indicated a budget of \$50,001 - \$100,000
- 7 indicated budgets of \$100,001 - \$500,000
- 2 indicated a budget of \$500,001 and over

7 (10%) were agencies

- 2 indicated budgets of up to \$50,000
- 1 indicated a budget of \$50,001 - \$100,000
- 4 indicated a budget of \$500,001 and over

3 (4%) were "other"

- 1 indicated a budget of up to \$50,000
- 2 indicated budgets of \$100,001 - \$500,000

**7. Please circle the statement below that reflects the current overall funding level for environmental education in your place of employment for fiscal year 2006-2007 compared to fiscal year 2005-2006.**

- a) There has been no change in EE funding
- b) Funding for EE has increased
- c) Funding for EE has decreased

**If there has been an increase or decrease in EE funding, please describe the change and its effect.**

**Overall response**

There were 75 responses  
53 (71%) were schools  
12 (16%) were non-profits  
7 (9%) were agencies  
3 (4%) were "others"

**Breakdown by Status**

51 respondents (67%) indicated that there has been no change in EE funding

Of these:

- 37 were schools (70% of the schools responding)
- 8 were non-profits (67% of non-profits responding)
- 3 were agencies (43% of agencies responding)
- 3 were others (100% of "others" responding)

10 respondents (13%) reported an increase in EE funding

Of these:

- 8 were schools (15% of the schools responding)
- 2 were agencies (29% of agencies responding)

14 respondents (18%) reported a decrease in EE funding

Of these:

- 8 were schools (15% of the schools responding)
- 4 were non-profits (33% of non-profits responding)
- 2 were agencies (29% of agencies responding)

**Comments**

Those reporting there has been no change in EE funding:

- no money specific to ee. Each teacher uses it appr
- Most funding for EE programs that occur outside of the classroom have to be funded by outside sources. Does not seem a priority within our district.
- we receive funding for trees for tomorrow workshop for students
- I do not know of any funding, maybe central office would I
- nothing specifically for ee
- there has been no change to the funding. However the cost of transporting students has risen and the cost of supplies

Those reporting increased funding:

- There is \$50,000 more for general environmental education grant program this year than last year. The amount of funds available is unpredictable because it is based on a surcharge on environmental fines collected the previous year. Hopefully the effect will be more groups applying for grants.
- We received several grants for work on indicators of behavior change and conservation leadership training
- new program/partnership with a nature center
- being awarded two ee grants has allowed us to begin to expand and enhance our program to be more sustainable and accessible.

- we are attempting to become a Green Certified building and have concentrated on ee as one of the major components. i.e, recycling, green cleaning products, school air quality, high energy boilers etc.
- received WEEB grants totaling approx \$18,000
- grant funding allowed us to implement new programs that are being funded by our district's general fund. The increase is positively effecting our environmental ed. Programs.
- we received a weeb grant which the district is matching to put together our school's school forest education plan
- The district matched a weeb grant allowing for further growth in ee as a curriculum component and allowed for expansion at the school forest site
- \$5,000 grant for this year

Those reporting decreased funding:

- I classify my whole job as EE, my supplies, services and travel budget has been cut by around 20%. Please note - I am responding to the above questions only from my job and budget our whole program is much larger in terms of numbers reached and budget. I have done much of my program funding through grants run through the Rock River Coalition. That has gotten tougher this year.
- We have had a decrease in funding the past 4 years and it has had little impact on programming, but has impacted the training and recruitment of volunteers staff.
- Funding for EE within the place of employment comes from the Friends Group (85%), salary for the Educator position comes from the WI DNR, additional funding is donated from other organizations, groups or individuals. Total budget is only \$4000, while the property budget is much more.
- We have lost one large overnight residential school due to budget cuts and increase in busing costs.
- school funding has not kept pace with the rising cost of education. Programming has been cut. Expense budgets have been cut. This reduces our school ability to reach students.
- a grant has run out, so we have less money.
- 50% of our contributions come from industry, which has seen a tightening of margins and increased speculation on education giving.
- we received two weeb grants, and they were great in helping us develop a nature trail in our school forest for educational purposes, make signs, develop and educational CD rom about the trail, develop curriculum to use with the trail, and the like. This funding has expired. We hope to apply for another weeb grant in the future but it would be nice if there were some other funding sources.
- due to the low numbers, ee classes at BHS were cancelled, therefore funding dropped to \$0.
- very little change, students pick up more of the costs
- there has been a decrease in program funding. We have increased our grant applications to help with this issue.
- there is no funds for field trips to ee locations
- more competition, less grant money available, fewer members, lack of interest in the environment
- Our school district has seen increases in enrollment, thus increasing the number of students utilizing facilities and ee programs we offer. However, funding has been locked at last year's level.

**8. Please circle the statement below that reflects the current status of EE programs in your place of employment for fiscal year 2006-2007 compared to fiscal year 2005-2006.**

- There has been no change in EE programming
- Program opportunities have increased
- Program opportunities have decreased

**If there has been an increase or decrease in EE programming, please describe the change.**

**Overall response**

There were 74 responses  
 52 (70%) were schools  
 12 (16%) were non-profits  
 7 (9%) were agencies  
 3 (4%) were "others"

### **Breakdown by Status**

35 respondents (46%) indicated that there was no change in EE programming

Of these:

- 27 were schools (52% of the schools responding)
- 4 were non-profits (33% of non-profits responding)
- 3 were agencies (43% of agencies responding)
- 1 was "other" (33% of "others" responding)

30 respondents (39%) reported an increase in EE programming

Of these:

- 20 were schools (41% of the schools responding)
  - \* 11 indicated growth of school forest as reason for the increase
- 5 were non-profits (42% of non-profits responding)
- 3 were agencies (43% of agencies responding)
- 2 were "others" (66% of "others" responding)

9 respondents (12%) reported a decrease in EE programming

Of these:

- 5 were schools (10% of the schools responding)
- 3 were non-profits (25% of non-profits responding)
- 1 was an agency (14% of agencies responding)

### **Comments**

Those reporting there has been no change in EE programming:

- We have very few EE Programs @ our high school - the only one is the Env Sci class I teach
- varies by individual teachers
- While we have more funds, our programming has not changed. Hopefully the funds will provide more resources for others programs to change. Our programming is based on the administrative budget which has not changed and is in the \$50,001 - \$100,000 range. Inclusion of the grant funds in your survey of total dollars available may be problematic, because the recipient of the funds may indicate their funds have increased too - but do to a grant. If you repeat this survey in the future you may want to ask about "base funding" vs. "grant funding." Wish I had seen the draft of the survey. Oh well.

Those reporting EE program opportunities have increased:

- Current public programs are being expanded to include more programs based on registration demand.
- While project work remains somewhat stable, new funding shifts the focus from one area to another
- We have offered more programs to a wider range of audiences in the past couple of years
- We are still a new center. Each year more schools are taking advantage of our programs, particularly in part of transportation grants that have been available.
- We are currently re-designing most lesson plans and integrating new technology into hands-on programming through equipment and software.
- development of a school forest education plan is increasing accessibility of the school forest for all staff members
- as a result of the WEEB grants, a school forest education plan is being developed and utilization of the school forest site will be implemented
- summer of 2006 more library programs due to summer reading program theme
- my salary was increased last year allowing for more ee programming this year
- we now have a school forest education plan and teachers in the district are being made aware of opportunities available at our school forest site.
- starting to use school forest more
- we have improved our school forest accessibility through past grants and visibility has been increased by a nice sign done by boy scout eagle project
- as similar education movements gain recognitions, e.g. project-based education, place based education, education for sustainability, more opportunities exist for collaboration.

- liz roy, a retired teacher, works tirelessly as a volunteer continuing to expand programming opportunities. Otherwise, we'd be staying the same or even decreasing as awareness and staff development initiated by the weeb grants would fade over the years.
- the school forest committee is recruiting teachers to use the school forest in the environmental education courses
- school forest development has added additional course curriculum in both the elementary and 7-12 school offerings
- receipt of weeb grants has provided the impetus to develop more classroom opportunities.
- use of the school forest continues to increase each year. We attribute this to staff present and an increase in program options for teachers
- the reason for the increase in ee programming is because I, as a graduate student in ee, have implemented it into my curriculum
- education plan development
- we had an inservice last school year that brought more curriculum opportunities and knowledge to teaching staff
- lessons have been compiled by grade level to match standards; benchmarks
- more field trips to school forest are planned. More class involvement in related projects associated with school forest (safety, power point presentation to community leaders, signage development) as well as a new ee curriculum and ee supplemental curriculum
- integration of environmental education. Curriculum and staff development
- With increased student enrollment, we are offering more programs than ever before

Those reporting EE program opportunities have decreased:

- With decrease of funding for staff, supplies and basic support, education has been the first to be cut and has suffered in terms of hours allowed to do programming, dollars spent on educational supplies and resources devoted to education.
- classes cut
- due to the low numbers, ee classes at BHS were cancelled, therefore funding dropped to \$0
- decrease in student programming as a result in budget reductions associated with field trip expenses
- dropped a class because of a lack of money for teachers. They had to teach other classes vacated by lay-offs
- less participation
- decrease in programming due to less money in budget
- focus has been on testing....money goes for testing and trying to improve test scores
- We are freezing the homeschool programs while we find a way to make it monetarily feasible for us but still affordable for them. Scheduling a guaranteed amount of students to make it worth our time is sometimes a challenge.

**9. Please circle the statement below that reflects the staffing levels for fiscal year 2006-2007 compared to 2005-2006 at your place of employment.**

- There has been no change in staffing
- There has been an increase in staffing
- There has been a decrease in staffing

**If there has been an increase or decrease in staffing levels please describe the change.**

**Overall response**

There were 74 responses  
 53 (72%) were schools  
 12 (16%) were non-profits  
 8 (11%) were agencies  
 3 (4%) were "others"

**Breakdown by Status**

55 respondents (72%) indicated that there has been no change in staffing  
 Of these:

38 were schools  
9 were non-profits  
5 were agencies  
3 were "other"

6 respondents (8%) indicated that there has been an increase in staffing

Of these:

5 were schools  
1 was a non-profit

13 respondents (17%) indicated that there has been a decrease in staffing

Of these:

9 were schools  
2 were non-profits  
2 were agencies

### Comments

Those reporting there has been an increase in staffing:

- We have not had an ee coordinator for the past few years, although the budget has been allocated. This summer we were able to hire an ee coordinator, du to interest. It is a very part-time position, but can still provide direction and support.
- We've added a half-time admin staff person
- at risk coordinator position added
- encouraged by the grant funding obtained, district administration has hired an outdoor education coordinator
- a couple of interns replacing a retire teaching position
- special ed-none to ee

Those reporting there has been a decrease in staffing:

- We lost our director and another full time person switched departments, so we have openings, but are still looking for a qualified person to fill the director position. Interns are more plentiful, this year, which helps
- We have not seen an increase in staff that would be commensurate with the increase in student numbers and programs
- when people quit they are not being replaced, more part time help and fewer full time
- One staff person will probably be going from full time to 3/4 time.
- One teacher was not given a contract due to reduction in students
- declining enrollment has caused a decrease in staffing in music and guidance
- Eight years ago the property had one full time educator and two summer educators. By the six years ago both paid educator staff positions were cut and the full time educators time is now split between three properties which also lost summer educator staff. Full time staff has hired summer interns (who are volunteers) but they are limited to two days a week fro 11 weeks.
- reducing for budget reasons and declining enrollment
- a few teachers have retired and have not been replace.
- two of our elementary classes have merged into one classroom. One teaching position was eliminated
- a retirement was not replaced due to declining enrollment