

A Comparison of the Regional Environmental Education Centers in Korea and Taiwan: Systems, Roles, and Practices

Yu-Long Chao¹, Heekyung Kim², Chankook Kim^{3*}

¹. *Assistant Professor, National Formosa University*

². *Advisory Expert, Policy Planning Bureau, Ministry of Environment, Korea*

³. *Associate Professor, Korea National University of Education*

Abstract

Based on the interviews with key members from the Gyeonggi-do Environmental Education Center (GEEC) in Korea and the Kao-Ping Environmental Education Regional Center (KPEERC) in Taiwan, this study compares their systems, roles, and practices. Korea has a national-regional-local EE center system and its EE Promotion Act supports the designation of EE centers while Taiwan's EE Act does not stipulate the establishment of EE centers. Setting up a database of EE organizations and creating an exchange platform for environmental educators are the most important achievements of GEEC and KPEERC, respectively. As for the roles of regional EE centers, the interviewees in both centers place more weight on "a supportive role for other organizations" than "an executive role to directly perform EE practices." The two centers face similar difficulties due to lacks of budget and manpower with EE expertise. The three-year contract-based operations may threaten stability or long-term planning of both centers. Nevertheless, they have similar achievements in initiating networks among EE partners and devising strategies to meet local EE needs. For future development, the GEEC members will put more effort in planning regional EE policies while KPEERC counterparts anticipate more active participation in regional sustainability.

Keywords: functional role, operation, regional environmental education center

投稿日期：2017年02月10日；接受日期：2017年09月25日

* 通訊作者

韓國與臺灣環境教育區域中心之比較：體系、角色與實務

趙育隆¹，金喜京²，金燦國^{3*}

¹ 國立虎尾科技大學通識教育中心助理教授

² 韓國環境部政策企劃官室專門委員

³ 韓國教員大學環境教育系副教授

摘要

根據對韓國京畿道環境教育中心 (Gyeonggi-do Environmental Education Center, GEEC) 與臺灣高屏區環境教育區域中心 (Kao-Ping Environmental Education Regional Center, KPEERC) 重要成員的訪談，本研究比較了其體系、角色與實務。韓國有一套包含國家-區域-地方的環教中心體系且其環教推廣法中訂有環教中心的指派程序，而臺灣的環教法並未規定環教中心的設置。建立環教組織的資料庫與創造環境教育者的交流平台分別是 GEEC 與 KPEERC 認為的最大成果。關於環教區域中心角色，兩中心受訪者皆較側重於是一種「對其他組織的支持性角色」勝過「直接實施環教實務的執行性角色」。兩中心皆面臨經費與環教專業人力不足的類似問題，每三年合約式的營運對兩中心的穩定性與長期規劃也可能都有影響。儘管如此，雙方在環教夥伴之間開始形成網絡與研擬能反映地方環教需求的策略等方面仍有相似的成果。關於未來發展，GEEC 成員建議能更致力於區域環教政策的規劃，KPEERC 成員則指出了更主動參與區域永續發展的方向。

關鍵字：環境教育區域中心、功能角色、營運