

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 098 774

88

EC 070 537

TITLE Zoo Project for Handicapped Children: Language Development Through Animal Utilization. Final Project Report.

INSTITUTION California State Dept. of Education, Sacramento. Bureau of Program Planning and Development.; San Diego Unified School District, Calif.

SPONS AGENCY Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.

PUB DATE 21 Jun 73

NOTE 52p.; For related documents, see EC 070 536-538

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.75 HC-\$3.15 PLUS POSTAGE

DESCRIPTORS Demonstration Projects; Educational Facilities; Exceptional Child Education; *Information Dissemination; *Language Arts; *Learning Disabilities; *Mentally Handicapped; Program Evaluation; Recreational Facilities; *Zoos

IDENTIFIERS Elementary Secondary Education Act Title III; ESEA Title III

ABSTRACT

The report examines the 1972-73 dissemination program of San Diego's Zoo Project for Handicapped Children which was designed to stimulate language arts improvement in mentally or educationally handicapped students by using animals at the zoo site and in schools. The following program objectives are identified: to encourage and the adoption/adaptation of the zoo project in a minimum of 10 other California districts or schools; to create an awareness about the project among 100 school districts in the state; to operate a model demonstration program; to conduct staff training seminars; to provide technical assistance for implementation; and to evaluate the diffusion process for effectiveness. The report contains statistical data on such program features as staff development and project products; and a program narrative report which focuses on such elements as needs assessment procedures, personnel and organizational details, instructional equipment and materials, budget, and evaluation findings. The evaluation is said to show that project activities included 18 teacher training workshops for 552 people and visits from 185 people to the model demonstration program. (GW)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION
AT NO ADDITIONAL COST. OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRE-
SENT THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

FINAL PROJECT REPORT

**ZOO PROJECT FOR HANDICAPPED CHILDREN
(Language Development Through Animal Utilization)**

No. 37-68338-1193-0

San Diego Unified School District

June 21, 1973

Final Year Dissemination Project

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
<u>Component I - Statistical Data</u>	1
<u>Component II - Data for United States Office of Education</u>	
Cover Page	4
Part I - Staff Development	5
Part II - Extent of Adoption/Adaption	5
Title III - Areas of Influence	7
Part III - Extent of Participation	8
Part IV - Staff Participation/Higher Education Cooperation	12
Part V - Abstract	15
Part VI - Products of Project	16
<u>Component III - Program Narrative Report</u>	
Context	
The Locale	17
The School System	18
Needs Assessment	19
Historical Background	20
Program	
Scope of the Program	21
Personnel	22
Organizational Details	23
Activities or Services	24
Instructional Equipment and Materials	26
Parent Community Involvement	27
Budget	28
Special Factors	29
Dissemination	30
Evaluation	
Summary of Zoo Project Objectives and Findings 1972-73	34
1972-73 Adoption/Adaption Activities	35
Continuation and Expansion of the Local Program	36
Adapters Other Than Schools or School Districts	37
School Districts Outside California	38
Adapters Other Than Schools or School Districts Outside California	38
<u>Component IV - Financial Report</u>	
Expenditure Report)	To be submitted
Inventory of Equipment)	
Project Phases and Per Pupil Costs)	within 90 days
Claim for Reimbursement)	
<u>Appendix A - Addresses of Contact Persons</u>	



California State Department of Education
721 Capitol Mall
Sacramento, California 95814

Bureau of
Instructional
Program Planning
and Development

ESEA TITLE III STATISTICAL DATA
Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965
(P.L. 89-10 as amended by P.L. 90-247)

THIS SPACE FOR STATE USE ONLY →	County	District Code	Project #	Type

SECTION A - PROJECT INFORMATION

1. REASON FOR SUBMISSION OF THIS FORM (Check one)	2. IN ALL CASES EXCEPT INITIAL APPLICATION, GIVE ASSIGNED PROJECT NUMBER
a <input type="checkbox"/> INITIAL APPLICATION FOR TITLE III GRANT OR RESUBMISSION b <input type="checkbox"/> APPLICATION FOR CONTINUATION GRANT c <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project Report	37-68338-1193-0

3. MAJOR DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT (Check one only)	4. TYPE(S) OF ACTIVITY (Check one or more)
a <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> INNOVATIVE c <input type="checkbox"/> ADAPTIVE b <input type="checkbox"/> EXEMPLARY	A <input type="checkbox"/> PLANNING OF PROGRAM B <input type="checkbox"/> PLANNING OF CONSTRUCTION C <input type="checkbox"/> CONDUCTING PILOT ACTIVITIES D <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OPERATION OF PROGRAM E <input type="checkbox"/> CONSTRUCTING F <input type="checkbox"/> REMODELING

5. PROJECT TITLE (5 Words or Less)
ZOO PROJECT FOR HANDICAPPED CHILDREN (LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT THROUGH ANIMAL UTILIZATION)

6. BRIEFLY SUMMARIZE THE PURPOSE OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT AND GIVE THE ITEM NUMBER OF THE AREA OF MAJOR EMPHASIS AS LISTED IN SEC. 303, P.L. 89-10. (See instructions)

To encourage and promote the adoption or adaption of the ZOO PROJECT FOR HANDICAPPED CHILDREN in a minimum of ten other school settings (District or schools) in the State of California.

7. NAME OF APPLICANT (Local Education Agency)		8. ADDRESS (Number, Street, City, State, Zip Code)		ITEM NUMBER
San Diego Unified School District		4100 Normal Street San Diego, California 92103		
9. NAME OF COUNTY		10. CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT		
San Diego		35, 36, 37		
11. NAME OF PROJECT DIRECTOR	12. ADDRESS (Number, Street, City, State, Zip Code) (Bus.)	PHONE NUMBER (Bus.)		
Gerald F. Lamb	4100 Normal Street San Diego, California 92103	234-6194		
		AREA CODE 714		
13. Name of Authorized Agent	14. ADDRESS (Number, Street, City, State, Zip Code) (Bus.)	PHONE NUMBER (Bus.)		
Howard Crofts	4100 Normal Street San Diego, California 92103	298-4681		
		AREA CODE 714		
15. POSITION OR TITLE				
Deputy Superintendent for Administration				
Signature of Authorized Agent				DATE SUBMITTED

SECTION A - Continued

16. TITLE NUMBER OF EACH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT SERVED 35, 36, 37	17A. TOTAL NUMBER OF COUNTIES SERVED <u>1</u> A. TOTAL NUMBER OF LEA'S SERVED <u>5</u> C. TOTAL ESTIMATED POPULATION IN GEOGRAPHIC AREA SERVED <u>City of San Diego 730,000</u>	18. LATEST AVERAGE PER PUPIL AGED EXPENDITURE OF LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCIES SERVED \$ <u>897.33 (1971-72)</u>
--	---	--

SECTION B - TITLE III BUDGET SUMMARY FOR PROJECT (Include amount from item 2c below)

	PREVIOUS OF GRANT NUMBER	BEGINNING DATE (Month, Year)	ENDING DATE (Month, Year)	FUNDS REQUESTED
A. Initial Application or Resubmission				\$
B. Application for First Continuation Grant				\$
C. Application for Second Continuation Grant				\$
D. Total Title III Funds				\$
E. End of Budget Period Report				\$

2. Complete the following items only if this project includes construction, acquisition, remodeling, or leasing of facilities for which Title III funds are requested. Leave blank if not appropriate.

A. Type of function (Check applicable boxes)

1 REMODELING OF FACILITIES 2 LEASING OF FACILITIES 3 ACQUISITION OF FACILITIES

4 CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES 5 ACQUISITION OF BUILT-IN EQUIPMENT

N/A

B. 1. TOTAL SQUARE FEET IN THE PROPOSED FACILITY N/A	2. TOTAL SQUARE FEET IN THE FACILITY TO BE USED FOR TITLE III PROGRAMS N/A	C. AMOUNT OF TITLE III FUNDS REQUESTED FOR FACILITY \$ N/A
---	---	---

SECTION C - PROJECT CLASSIFICATION1. Project Subjects

- 1.1 - Language Arts (Development)
 1.2 - Fine Arts
 1.3 - Foreign Language
 1.4 - Mathematics
 1.5 - Science
 1.6 - Social Science, Humanities
 1.7 - P.E., Recreation, and Health
 1.8 - Vocational Education
 1.9 - Other

2. Handicapped Education

- 2.1 - Mentally Retarded
 2.2 - Hard of Hearing
 2.3 - Deaf
 2.4 - Speech Impaired
 2.5 - Visually Handicapped
 2.6 - Seriously Emotionally Disturbed
 2.7 - Crippled
 2.8 - Other Health Impaired

3. Guidance, Counseling, and Testing

- 3.1 - Counseling with Handicapped
 3.2 - Group Guidance Activities
 3.3 - Group Counseling
 3.4 - Career Guidance and Counseling
 3.5 - Counseling with Special Problems
 3.6 - Use of Paraprofessionals
 3.7 - Parent Conferences
 3.8 - Follow-up and Drop-out Studies
 3.9 - Inservice Training
 3.10 - Use of Community Resources
 3.11 - Curriculum Development
 3.12 - General Counseling
 3.13 - Consultation with Teachers
 3.14 - Program Evaluation and Development

4. Grade Levels

- 4.1 - Preschool (indicate ages 3 or 4) _____
 4.2 - Elementary (indicate grades K-6) _____
 4.3 - Secondary (indicate grades 7-12) _____
 4.4 - Junior College (indicate grades 13-14) _____
 4.5 - Adult

5. Is your project an adoption or adaptation of another Title III project? Yes

No

If yes, name the agency operating the project: _____

for Component II

Data for U. S. Office of Education

(To be completed for all projects active for any period between July 1972 - Through June 30, 1973. Agencies having more than one project must prepare a report for each project.)

Enter information for items 1 through 7.

1. 37-68338-1193-0 2. ZOO PROJECT FOR HANDICAPPED CHILDREN 3. San Diego Unified School District
Local Educational Agency
4100 Normal Street
San Diego, California 92103

Project Title

4. Dr. David Fish
Name of school official responsible for this report
(714) 298-4681 Ext. 516
Phone No.

5. Gerald F. Lamb
Name of Project Director
(714) 234-6194
Phone No.

6. The 1972-73 school year has been

6.1 The first year of operation.

6.2 The second year of operation.

6.3 The third year of operation.

7. Enter the following ending dates:

Ending date for first year June 30, 1973 - Extended to July 26, 1973

Ending date for second year _____

Ending date for third and final year _____

The report should describe project staff development activities that took place during the period July 1, 1972, through June 30, 1973. If no project staff development activities occurred, write NONE in the first column. Staff development activities are those inservice efforts designed to improve competencies of the staff working full or part-time on the project. Enter the figures in columns two and three.

STAFF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES OF ONE OR MORE DAYS DURATION 1972-73					
(1) Definition of Staff: (Staff includes all personnel assigned to work on the project full or part time, whether paid by the district or the project.)	(2) Total No. of participants (Unduplicated) in all activities.	(3) No. of workshops, conferences and seminars held by type of training			
		Dissemination to spread information about project	Evaluation to appraise progress	Combination of dissemination & evaluation	Other, such as in-service education. Specify (Use back of this page.)
Staff of 3 →	78 Direct 3027 Indirect	37			2 direct 16 indirect 12 demonstrations

PART II - EXTENT OF ADOPTION/ADAPTION

1972-1973

The purpose of this section is to find out how many projects are being continued to some extent by the grantees or by other school districts after federal funds have expired.

The report should be limited to projects for which federal funds expired during the period July 1, 1972 through June 30, 1973. If the grantee district expects to continue the project to some extent during the next fiscal year, this should be reported by marking the box. The estimated extent of adoption or adaption by the grantee district should be shown by circling the appropriate percentage figure in the scale.

1. The project is being continued by the grantee in some form after federal funds expired. Yes No
2. If the answer is YES, draw a circle around the one figure which best represents your estimate of the degree of adoption/adaption of the project in your school district.



3. Is the project being adopted or adapted by other school districts?

Yes No

4. If the answer is YES, list the school districts by name and address:

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>4.1 <u>Alhambra City Schools</u>
2121 West Main Street
Alhambra, California 91801</p> | <p>4.11 <u>Santee School District</u>
Santee, California</p> |
| <p>4.2 <u>Arcadia Unified Schools District</u>
234 Campus Drive
Arcadia, California 91006</p> | <p>4.12 <u>Victor School District</u>
16821 "A" Street
Victorville, California 92392</p> |
| <p>4.3 <u>Burlingame School District</u>
1560 Newlands
Burlingame, California</p> | <p>4.13 <u>Montessori Academy-Mt. Helix</u>
Spring Valley, California</p> |
| <p>4.4 <u>Chino Unified School District</u>
3130 Riverside
Chino, California 91710</p> | <p>4.14 _____</p> |
| <p>4.5 <u>Chula Vista City School District</u>
84 East J Street - P.O. Box 907
Chula Vista, California 92012</p> | <p>4.15 _____</p> |
| <p>4.6 <u>Garden Grove Unified School Dist</u>
10331 Stanford Avenue
Garden Grove, California 92640</p> | <p>4.16 _____</p> |
| <p>4.7 <u>Los Angeles School District</u>
Los Angeles, Calif 90007</p> | <p>4.17 _____</p> |
| <p>4.8 <u>Ocean View School District</u>
7972 Warner Avenue
Huntington Beach, California 92647</p> | <p>4.18 _____</p> |
| <p>4.9 <u>Riverside County Schools</u>
P.O. Box 868
Riverside, California 92502</p> | <p>4.19 _____</p> |
| <p>4.10 <u>Little Lake School District</u>
9400 Jersey Avenue
Santa Fe Springs, Calif 90670</p> | <p>4.20 _____</p> |

In addition: 27 teachers who participated in a workshop sponsored by LaVerne College responded indicating individual application of the Zoo Project approach using our materials. Other agencies have requested Zoo Project Materials and activities for use in their programs. These have included the San Francisco Zoo; the Taronga Zoo, Sydney, Australia; the Bronx Zoo; Mohawk Park Zoo, Tulsa, Oklahoma; Larue D. Carter Memorial Hospital, Indianapolis, Indiana.

As Project Director and/or after consultation with district or county personnel involved:

- 1. Name Gerald Lomb Title Project Director
- 2. Name _____ Title _____
- 3. Name _____ Title _____

Please rank the impact of this ESEA, Title III project on your local educational agency (LEA). Leave blank any items that do not apply and add other categories as desired. Rank items 1 to 7 (or more if you have made additions to the list). Give examples only on items ranked 1 and 2. Number 1 indicates that throughout the LEA the impact was greatest in developing skill areas or attitudinal changes in:

Rank**		Examples
	<u>Special project development</u> Needs assessment, goal setting, planning (writing), implementation, etc.	Use this space to give examples of items ranked 1 and 2. 1. Confidence and skill in handling appropriate classroom animals and using them to motivate work in the regular curriculum. 2. High use of project materials and approaches. Frequent requests from all over the state for additional copies of the handbook. 3. Excellent example of a school district and a local community agency working together to meet a known educational need.
1	<u>Staff training</u> Resulting in added skills or attitudinal change	
	<u>Parental involvement in the schools</u> Bringing parents into more direct contact with school activities	
3	<u>Community involvement</u> Instances of community participation other than parents	
	<u>Evaluation competencies and use of evaluation information</u>	
2	<u>Products developed</u> Have the products developed by the project, i.e., <u>Materials</u> : curriculum guides, AV materials, etc. <u>Methods</u> : individualized instructions, use of aides, etc.: been put to use beyond project requirement? List under examples.	
	<u>Management and accounting procedures</u> Have the project activities resulted in increased accountability in other learning situations? List under examples.	
	<u>Other - Please explain</u>	

* As a result of participation in ESEA, Title III endeavors
 ** Information derived will indicate areas of greatest impact - Number 1 most impact Number 7 (or more) least impact.



1972-1973

The purpose of this part of the report is to find out the actual direct or indirect participation of public and private school pupils and adults in the project during the 1972-73 operational period.

Any participation should be reported only once. The count should be based on actual participation during the 1972-73 school year. The numbers are almost certain to be different from those anticipated in the project application.

The United States Office of Education definitions should be applied:

Direct Participation - Enter the number of different persons participating in activities involving face-to-face interaction of pupils and teachers designed to produce learning, in a classroom, a center or mobile unit; or receiving other special services.

Indirect Participation - Enter the number of different persons visiting or viewing exhibits, demonstrations, museum displays; using materials or equipment developed or purchased by the project; attending performances of plays, symphonies, etc.; viewing television instruction in a school, a center, or home; or participating in other similar activities. Carefully prepared estimates are acceptable.

Elementary - For reporting purposes only, consider elementary as being Prekindergarten through Grade 6.

Secondary - For reporting purposes only, consider secondary as being Grades 7 through 12.

Please supply the information requested for the project.

Table A

Number of Public and Nonpublic School Teachers, and Counselors Participating								
Schools (a)	Staff whose students were direct participants				Staff whose students were indirect participants			
	Teachers		Counselors		Teachers		Counselors	
	Elementary (b)	Secondary (c)	Elementary (d)	Secondary (e)	Elementary (f)	Secondary (g)	Elementary (h)	Secondary (i)
Public	71				2,335	13		
Nonpublic	5				25	5		

The totals in the following 4 tables must agree one with the other. Also, do not use duplicated figures in the first 4 tables. The target population must be represented by the figures when direct participants are reported. See definitions for direct and indirect in Part III.

Table I

a. Program	b. Check (✓) pro- gram area(s) covered	c. No. of public school students directly participating	d. Amount granted this past year
Select the program of your project. Use "other" category if none apply.			
Reading			
Environment/Ecology			
Equal Educational Opportunity			
Model Cities (Urban, Inner-City)			
Gifted			
Handicapped	X	1,045	\$ 38,500
Guidance and Counseling			
Drug Education			
Early Childhood Education (Kindergarten and below)			
Other Programs			
	Total	1,045	

Table II

Provide unduplicated counts of students by grade levels. See instructions below:

	a. School Enrollment		b. Direct Project Participants		c. Indirect Project Participants		d.	e.
	Public	Nonpublic	Public	Nonpublic	Public	Nonpublic		
Pre K		*						
K	8,689							
1	9,117							
2	9,441							
3	9,948							
4	10,126							
5	9,946							
6	10,081							
7	10,007							
8	9,584							
9	9,409							
10	9,688							
11	8,855							
12	7,772							
Ungraded	3,056							
TOTALS	125,719*		944	101			1,576	1,635*

*Ungraded
Special Education
Classes - Total
1,045 Direct
student participants*

*Information
not reported
to us*

* Includes LEA San Diego Unified only

Column a. Include the total enrollment in the local educational agency.

Column b. Include only the target population.

Column b. & c. See definitions of direct and indirect for both columns.

Column d. Include an estimate of the number of target population students who have been in the project since its inception. A cumulative total of all years is requested. Provide an unduplicated count; therefore, do not count any student more than once.

Column e. Include an estimate of the number of students within the local educational agency who have not been directly serviced by the project, but would benefit fit the des of the

Table III

Rural/Urban Distribution of Public School, Direct Participants Served by Project - Enter Number of Each Category. See definitions at bottom of page.

Rural		Metropolitan			Total of all Categories
Farm	Non Farm	Low Socio-Economic	Other	Other Urban	
0	19	117	777	132	1,045

Table IV

Distribution of Public School, Direct Participants by Project - Enter Number of Each Group.

Negro	American Indian	Spanish Surname	Oriental	White	Other Nonwhite	Total of all groups
189	4	213	13	626		1,045

Recap of Totals for Tables I, II, III and IV.

Total of Column c., Table I	1,045	
Total of Column b. (Public School), Table II	944	+ 101 non public = 1,045
Total of All Categories, Table III	1,045	
Total of All Groups, Table IV	1,045	

The totals on each line above should agree one with the other.

Definitions:

Rural means an outlying area of less than 2,500 inhabitants.

Low socio-economic means an area of low socio-economic level within a city of 50,000 inhabitants or more.

Other means areas in cities of 50,000 or more inhabitants which are other than low socio-economic areas.

Other Urban means areas (including suburbs) with less than 50,000 but more than 2,500 inhabitants.

TABLE 10: NUMBER OF SCHOOLS IN THE PROJECT.

Direct participation

	Public	Nonpublic
Elementary	50	5
Secondary	2	

TABLE 11: STUDENTS SERVED DIRECTLY BY UNIQUE TARGET POPULATIONS (Figures may be duplicated)

Grade	Migrant	Disadvantaged	Handicapped	Gifted	Other "Target" Populations
(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f) (see note below)
Elementary			10		1,035

NOTE: All unique target populations included in the number entered above.

Includes students from non-English speaking environments.

Includes students with dependent children.

7 _____ 299 _____ E.M.R. _____

(Total: 112 TMR, 598 E.H., Gifted E.H. 10, 9 Visually Handicapped)

PART II STAFF PARTICIPATION/HIGHER EDUCATION COOPERATION

... below ... Compute full time equivalent (F.T.E.) according to instructions under the table.

... district personnel who receive remuneration from Title III funds ... district personnel who do not receive remuneration from Title III ... service to the project ... included in Other category.

Category of Personnel	Number of Personnel Assigned to Project (F.T.E.)	
Principal or supervisor		
Assistant principal		
Elementary 1-5		
Elementary 6-12	1	
Other specialists		
Paraprofessionals		
Full personnel workers		
Administrative personnel		
Program and evaluators		
Program developers		
Instructional		
Other personnel		
Other educational aides, etc.	1	
Other professional	1	

... full-time equivalent (F.T.E.), add the total number of hours worked ... personnel and divide by the number of hours in your regular ... for example, if each of four staff members works 20 hours ... staff members works ten hours per week, and each of ... time assume 40 hours for this example, the total ... 20 plus 20 plus 40, or 500 hours. This total of 500 hours divided ... F.T.E. figure of 12.5

... Title III funds 0 ... Title III funds 0

TABLE 14

Complete as directed for the 1972-73 term.

Number of public school professional staff who attended
Title III Inservice:

Estimate Carefully
Title III Funds
Spent on Training

Number of workshops in regular term of one to four weeks' duration	358 Indirect	\$ 1,679
Number of workshops in regular term over four weeks' duration		\$
Number of workshops in summer 1972 one to four weeks' duration		\$
Number of workshops in summer 1972 over four weeks' duration	21 Direct 49 Indirect	No additional cost \$ 593
Number of credit courses - regular term	113 Direct est.	\$ 580
Number of credit courses - summer term	12 Direct	\$ 344

Number of aides (nonprofessional staff) who attended
Title III Inservice:

Number of aides in regular term of one to four weeks' duration		
Number of aides in regular term over four weeks' duration		
Number of aides in summer 1972 one to four weeks' duration		
Number of aides in summer 1972 over four weeks' duration		
Number of credit courses - regular term		
Number of credit courses - summer term		

no separate inservice for
aides - some informally attended
above

1972-73

City or county directed.

Number of unpublic school professional staff involved in Title III inservice in the 1972-73 term 5.

Table 3A

Number of teachers, aides, and students involved in a Title III, 1972, summer project involving direct instruction to students.

NONE

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Teachers												
Aides												
Students												

Number of your Project staff may have worked with higher education in the 1972-73 project year (last year). We are interested in the type of help, and the extent (cost and hours) of any cooperation. Formal refers to activities performed with remuneration. Informal participation without remuneration. Please estimate the cost and number of man-days for the following:

- (1) help in developing desirable content or instructional procedure (or program development). None
 cost; (2) number of man-days: _____ formal and _____ informal
- (3) help, i.e., for instruments or procedures to be used in the project. None
 cost; (2) number of man-days: _____ formal and _____ informal
- (4) in-service staff development programs (in-service training, etc.). None
 cost; (2) number of man-days: _____ formal and _____ informal
- (5) other participation. None

GRANTEE: SAN DIEGO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

PROJECT ABSTRACTS (FSPAL Title III)	STATE	TOTAL PROJECT PERIOD	FROM (Month and year)	TO (Month and year)	PROJECT NO.
	California		7-72	6-73	

NOTE: If project involves handicapped children and/or personnel working with handicapped children who are paid from Title III funds, complete the information on the back of this form.

TITLE OF PROJECT	GRANTEE
ZOO PROJECT FOR HANDICAPPED CHILDREN (Language Development Through Animal Utilization)	San Diego Unified School District

PROJECT FUNDING LEVEL FOR FISCAL YEAR 19__	19__	19__	19__	19__	19__	19__
\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$

TARGET POPULATION: Indirect: School Districts and/or schools, pre-school throughout the state of California; Direct: Elementary handicapped children in public & private schools in San Diego

DESCRIPTION: Presentations were made to interested parties. A staff training program, teacher workshop, technical assistance were available from the project. In the demonstration program the Zoo Project provided an extended educational program for target students using the facilities of the San Diego Zoo. It provided an innovative approach to the problem of motivating learning and behavior in these children through the use of animals. The program includes 1) a teacher training program enabling teachers to take full use of the zoo experience; 2) conducting the in-zoo program which utilized the zoo setting and animals; 3) conducting the in-school program in which the project director took animals to the classroom to be used in various learning activities; and 4) a comprehensive evaluation to determine the effectiveness of the program.

OBJECTIVES: Encourage and promote the adoption/adaptation of the Zoo Project for Handicapped children in a minimum of ten other school settings (districts or schools) in the state of California. (1) Create an awareness about the Zoo Project among 100 school districts in the state; (2) Operate a model demonstration program capable of accommodating 25 visitors per week and demonstrate to potential adopters from 25 school and/or Zoo settings; (3) Select 10 districts or schools interested in adopting or adapting according to established criteria and note program components; (4) Conduct 10 staff training seminars for potential adopters or adapters from 25 school and/or Zoo settings; (5) provide technical assistance for implementation to AA AO schools and/or Zoos; (6) Evaluate the diffusion process for effectiveness

- TECHNIQUES:
- 1. Provide initial and secondary awareness activities for interested school representatives
 - 2. Conduct a model demonstration program at the San Diego Zoo including
 - a. Staff training
 - b. In-Zoo and In-School programs
 - 3. Provide inservice training for potential adopters or adapters.
 - 4. Provide technical assistance to interested schools and/or districts.

EVALUATION: Tallying of attendance and evaluation questionnaire at awareness
Questionnaire of potential adopters/adapters making use of project

RESULTS: The Zoo Project approach and materials are being used in over 16 districts and district encouragement and sponsorship. Teachers in over 20 classes in 12 additional districts are using Zoo Project materials and methods. Other institutions such as Zoos, humane societies, humane societies are using Zoo Project materials and methods. All objectives to achieve objectives listed above were surpassed - See evaluation report

REPORT OF PARTICIPATION - 1954-1955

BASED AS REPORTED CHILDREN SERVED, PERSONNEL PAID AND IN-SERVICE TRAINING RECEIVED BY AREA PARTICIPATING

CATEGORIES OF CHILDREN SERVED	NUMBER OF CHILDREN SERVED				TOTAL	FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT OF PROJECT PERSONNEL PAID				PERSONNEL RECEIVING IN-SERVICE TRAINING			
	1954-55	1953-54	1952-53	1951-52		TEACHERS	TEACHER AIDES	OTHER	TOTAL	TEACHERS	TEACHER AIDES	OTHER	TOTAL
Direct Services Only	19	62	31		112								
		265	34		299								
			9		9								
			10		10								
TOTAL	19	266	65		1,045								440

NUMBER OF CHILDREN SERVED WHO ATTEND NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS

101

DISTRIBUTION BY ETHNIC GROUPS

POPULATION	MEXICAN	INDIAN	TOTAL	SPANISH SURNAME	Other than Spanish surname	TOTAL
(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)
CHILDREN	189	4	13	213	626	1,045

CHILDREN RECEIVING SERVICES - DISTRIBUTION BY DEMOGRAPHIC AREA

CATEGORY	NUMBER
...	894
...	19
...	132
TOTAL	1045

INSTRUCTIONS

1. This report is to be prepared by the participating agency... (b) work was not performed by the staff... (c) children served... (d) non-public schools... (e) distribution by ethnic groups... (f) instructions regarding data collection and reporting procedures.



	Date	Description
<p>1. _____</p> <p>2. _____</p> <p>3. _____</p> <p>4. _____</p> <p>5. _____</p> <p>6. _____</p> <p>7. _____</p> <p>8. _____</p> <p>9. _____</p> <p>10. _____</p> <p>11. _____</p> <p>12. _____</p> <p>13. _____</p> <p>14. _____</p> <p>15. _____</p> <p>16. _____</p> <p>17. _____</p> <p>18. _____</p> <p>19. _____</p> <p>20. _____</p> <p>21. _____</p> <p>22. _____</p> <p>23. _____</p> <p>24. _____</p> <p>25. _____</p> <p>26. _____</p> <p>27. _____</p> <p>28. _____</p> <p>29. _____</p> <p>30. _____</p> <p>31. _____</p> <p>32. _____</p> <p>33. _____</p> <p>34. _____</p> <p>35. _____</p> <p>36. _____</p> <p>37. _____</p> <p>38. _____</p> <p>39. _____</p> <p>40. _____</p> <p>41. _____</p> <p>42. _____</p> <p>43. _____</p> <p>44. _____</p> <p>45. _____</p> <p>46. _____</p> <p>47. _____</p> <p>48. _____</p> <p>49. _____</p> <p>50. _____</p> <p>51. _____</p> <p>52. _____</p> <p>53. _____</p> <p>54. _____</p> <p>55. _____</p> <p>56. _____</p> <p>57. _____</p> <p>58. _____</p> <p>59. _____</p> <p>60. _____</p> <p>61. _____</p> <p>62. _____</p> <p>63. _____</p> <p>64. _____</p> <p>65. _____</p> <p>66. _____</p> <p>67. _____</p> <p>68. _____</p> <p>69. _____</p> <p>70. _____</p> <p>71. _____</p> <p>72. _____</p> <p>73. _____</p> <p>74. _____</p> <p>75. _____</p> <p>76. _____</p> <p>77. _____</p> <p>78. _____</p> <p>79. _____</p> <p>80. _____</p> <p>81. _____</p> <p>82. _____</p> <p>83. _____</p> <p>84. _____</p> <p>85. _____</p> <p>86. _____</p> <p>87. _____</p> <p>88. _____</p> <p>89. _____</p> <p>90. _____</p> <p>91. _____</p> <p>92. _____</p> <p>93. _____</p> <p>94. _____</p> <p>95. _____</p> <p>96. _____</p> <p>97. _____</p> <p>98. _____</p> <p>99. _____</p> <p>100. _____</p>	<p>8/72</p> <p>9/72</p> <p>9/72</p>	<p>(See also 1972 Products: Using Animals as Teaching Tools Project No. 0197 Special Education Elementary Teacher's Handbook</p> <p>Looseleaf handbook of teaching suggestions, activities and materials teachers may select from in using animals as motivation for work in the regular school curriculum. Includes master pages for thermal copying.)</p> <p><u>How Can Animals Help Your Children?</u> Project No. 1193 Elementary Brochure Brochure - describes Zoo Project approach as of 1973 Dissemination Services available to schools and/or districts</p> <p><u>Language Development Through Animal Utilization</u> Project No. 1193 Elementary Slide/Tape Slide/tape - Describes Zoo Project approach for using animals for motivation for work in regular school curriculum. Lists evaluation results..</p>

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FINAL REPORT

ESMA, TITLE II

COMMITTEE

FRANCIS H. HARRIS

CONTEXT

The Locale

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

1. What is the locale of the program?
2. What is the density of the population?
3. What are the population trends?
4. What are the major occupations of people in the locale?
5. What is the unemployment rate or trend?
6. What proportion of families in the locale are receiving welfare assistance?

1. The program operated from the Otto Education Center of the San Diego Zoo. The program covered Elementary Educationally Handicapped and Mentally Retarded Children in the cities of San Diego, La Mesa, Spring Valley, Chula Vista and El Cajon. In addition there was some coverage in other small districts in San Diego County.

2. The population for the City of San Diego is 762,800 with an average density of 2.78/unit (city wide) or 2.78/unit.

3. Population trends indicate growth upward.

April 1, 1970 population was listed at 697,027 and in January 1972 was reported as 740,000

Population predictions are as follows:

April 1975	787,000
April 1980	857,000
April 1985	931,000
April 1990	996,000

Manufacturing is the major occupation in the San Diego Metropolitan area.

4. The unemployment rate is 4.8.

5. Not available.

6. The scope of the indirect dissemination program covered the entire state of California. Constant use of project services were made in Southern California. Information covering the above questions for the state of California not available to this office.

The School System

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

1. What grade levels do the schools serve?
2. How many pupils are there in the school system? How many schools?
3. Are there any significant trends in the school system in enrollment, withdrawal, or transfer?
4. What is the per pupil cost of education in the school system?
5. What is the recent financial history of the school system?

1. The school districts involved in the Zoo Project are either Unified K-12 districts or Elementary K-8 districts.

2. In October 1972 the school district enrollment figures were:

K-6	68,853
7-9	29,433
10- 12	26,612
Cont./Adj.	<u>321</u>

125,719 There were 160 schools.

3. Enrollment trend is down.
4. The 1971-72 per pupil cost of education in the school system was \$897.33.
5. Expenses have been increasing more rapidly than income. This has necessitated program cutbacks.

Answers to above questions are for the direct demonstration program only, as such figures for the entire state are not available to this office.

Districts using the services of the project generally were interested in help at the elementary level, however, a number of junior high and one senior high teacher took the workshop.

A number of districts were interested in the Zoo Project approach for help with the deaf and hearing handicapped because of the language motivation provided by the approach.

Needs Assessment

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

1. What was the starting point for needs assessment?
2. How were the specific needs of the pupils identified?
3. What were these specific needs? Which were selected for the program?

Needs for this particular statewide dissemination program were determined by the State Department of Education before selection of the nine projects included in the 1972-73 "California Plan." The needs of the various districts and/or pupils were balanced against the available successfully tested projects and appropriate exemplary and innovative projects were then selected for dissemination through a state administered program of dissemination and diffusion.

Each adoptor district or school will have identified the problems which cause their needs, and will adapt the project's solution to fit their own local resources and needs.

Needs of the local "producer" district for a program were determined in the following manner: At the time of the inception of this program, in 1969, there were close to four thousand children enrolled in programs for Educationally Handicapped and Mentally Retarded in the project area. These children had been identified through test data and teacher judgment as being in need of special attention. These children very commonly have their greatest difficulty in communication skills. As language, reading and verbal skills are the heart of the educational process, there is a need to stimulate this group in these areas.

A review of the literature and experience of local teachers revealed that certain learning needs common to these children must be met in their learning activities. These needs included:

- The need for direct experience rather than abstractions.
- The need for approaches that appeal to all the senses.
- The need to relate school activities to meaningful situations thus enabling children to transfer what has been learned into meaningful behavior.
- The need for meaningful repetition without over stimulation.
- The need for motivational experiences in which children are vitally interested.
- The need for behavior modification both passive and aggressive.
- The need for opportunity for developing relationships.

It was felt by the planning committee that a program using animals as a motivating force could take advantage of the fascination all humans have for living things and meet all the unique learning needs listed above.

WEST VIRGINIA STATE UNIVERSITY

Historical Background

1. Did the program exist prior to the time period covered in the present report?
2. Is the program a modification of a previously existing program?
3. How did the program originate?
4. If special problems were encountered in gaining acceptance of the program by parents and the community, how were these solved so that the program could be introduced?
5. Provide a brief history of planning. Indicate which planning efforts were successful or were not successful. Describe how non-profit private schools and other agencies were involved in the planning.

The 1972-73 phase of the ZOO PROJECT program was a "diffusion" year of the project in which we took the successes and experience of the previous three years and shared them with interested districts and/or schools throughout the state. The program was modified in that the local program was continued as a demonstration program, and staff hours were increased for extra help when the project director was absent on dissemination activities. The origination and planning of the program were described under "Needs Assessment" above.

No special problems were encountered in gaining acceptance of the program by parents or community. We have been received with great enthusiasm and appreciation throughout the history of the project.

Scope of the Program

1. What numbers and kinds of participants were served by the program?
2. What were the specified objectives of the program?

All interested persons were invited to a series of eleven ACSA/EXPO presentations up and down the state during the fall of 1972. In addition, the Zoo Project contacted local Zoo and park staffs and nearby CANHC (California Association of Neurologically Handicapped Children) chapters. All who attended these presentations received information on the project. Those who expressed an interest were sent a package of materials further describing the program and outlining the services available.

Districts, Zoos, and groups then participated in several ways:

1. Secondary awareness level presentations to staffs.
2. Inservice workshops from two to sixteen hours in length depending on the needs of the district.
3. Demonstration lessons.
4. On site visits to the Zoo Project.
5. Utilization of Zoo Project materials (provided free to all districts providing workshops of four hours or more duration).
6. Technical advice and assistance when requested.
7. Initial awareness level presentations to schools, districts, groups not contacted in initial ACSA/EXPO presentations.

Eighteen workshops were presented to a total of 552 teachers and/or administrators, district staff, etc. This included training 33 teachers new to the local demonstration program at the San Diego Zoo. Counting all participants at the awareness level 3,105 participants were included in the program. The number of children is estimated over 4,000.

OBJECTIVES: Encourage and promote the adoption or adaption of the ZOO PROJECT FOR HANDICAPPED CHILDREN in a minimum of ten other school settings (districts or schools) in the state of California.

1. Create an awareness about the ZOO PROJECT among 100 school districts in the state.
2. Operate a model demonstration program capable of accommodating 25 visitors per week and demonstrate to potential adopters from 25 school and/or Zoo settings.
3. Select 10 districts or schools interested in adopting or adapting according to established criteria one or more program components.
4. Conduct 10 staff training seminars for potential adopter/adapters from 25 school and/or Zoo settings.
5. Provide technical assistance for implementation to Adoption/Adaption schools and/or Zoos.
6. Evaluate the diffusion process for effectiveness.

Personnel

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

1. What kinds and numbers of personnel were added by the program?
2. What were their most important duties and activities?
3. How much time did each type of personnel devote to these responsibilities?
4. What special qualifications suited personnel to the requirements of their jobs?
5. What special problems were dealt with in recruiting or maintaining staff?

The Zoo Project was able to operate with a staff of three:

The Project Director planned the master schedule for classes, buses, and animals both In-Zoo and In-School, instructed the inservice training workshops, assisted teachers in both programs, interpreted the program to visitors and to outside groups, acted as liaison between the Zoo, the district and other districts and private schools, initiated all records and reports about the Zoo Project, was responsible for project equipment and use of loaned Zoo facilities, and was responsible for keeping within the project budget. He conducted the major part of the dissemination activities listed in this report.

The Project Secretary served as general office manager and assistant to the Project Director; she assisted teachers, maintained schedules, prepared masters for reproduction, maintained records, acted as receptionist and performed other secretarial duties. She received visitors in the absence of the Project Director and assisted with the inservice training.

The Animal Attendant, formerly a Zoo employee, became a district employee under the 1972-73 project. She was responsible for the daily feeding and cleaning of animals, their daily handling and training, cleaning and maintaining the workroom and classrooms, maintained stock of animal supplies, assisted teachers in their use of animals, was available as a resource person, accompanied classes in the Zoo and conducted the In-School portion of the program during the absence of the Project Director, and performed other related duties.

These personnel devoted their full time to the operation of the Zoo Project.

Other than the normal qualifications for these jobs, the positions required willingness to handle ALL kinds of animals, a willingness and ability to work with children who sometimes may have bizarre physical or behavioral characteristics, the ability to make decisions concerning the appropriateness of an activity for a particular situation in regard to the safety of animals and children involved.

Although these positions very often require irregular lunch hours, and unreimbursed overtime, we have had no problem in recruiting or maintaining staff.

Organizational Details

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

1. What is the period of time covered by your report?
2. How much of the entire program does this cover?
3. Where were program activities located?
4. What special physical arrangements were used in these locations?
5. What provisions, if any, were made for periodic review of the program?
6. What important decisions were made on the basis of such reviews?
7. What provisions, if any, were made for inservice training?

1,2,3. This report covers only the 1972-73 dissemination grant period. This was the fourth operational year of the Zoo Project. Program activities were located throughout the state of California, wherever schools felt that the project approach met their needs. Local activities of the demonstration program was located in the San Diego Zoo and in the classrooms of 41 In-School classes throughout San Diego County.

4. Rather than make special arrangements for the program in each area, we worked to adapt the program to their local resources.

5,6. Review as conducted after each presentation to determine new needs, unexpected benefits, suggestions for change or improvement. Any need for change pointed out were incorporated into the program.

7. Inservice training was the heart of the program. It was the major request of participating districts. In many cases the district sponsored the training and then allowed teachers to develop their own programs with district approval.

1. What were the main activities (or services) in the program?
2. How were these activities (or services) related to specified program objectives?
3. What methods were used in carrying out each activity (or service)?
4. What was a typical day's or week's schedule of activities for the children (or others) who received the program?
5. How were pupils grouped for the various program activities?
6. What were teacher-pupil ratios (or aid-pupil, or adult-pupil, and so on) in each of these groupings?
7. How did pupils (or others) receive feedback on their individual daily progress?
8. How did parents receive feedback on their child's progress?
9. What amounts and kinds of practice, review, and quiz activities were provided for pupils (or others) in the program?
10. What special provisions were made for motivating pupils (or others)?
11. If a comparison group was used, what were important differences in the activities and methods used in this group and the activities and methods used with the program group?

1,2,3. The main function of the project staff was to provide the services which would enable teachers to adopt or adapt the Zoo Project approach. This was accomplished through providing awareness level presentations, teacher workshops, operating the demonstration program, and other assistance as requested. These were the objectives of the program. All services were available on request and were altered to meet the local needs and resources of the requesting school.

4. A typical workshop schedule covered three main areas:

- a) Animal handling to help the teacher feel confident in working with animals that might be available for her class.
- b) Background information on animal groups and specific information about particular animals.
- 3) Sharing and developing activities and materials that would meet the needs of her particular class.

The workshops were expanded or contracted from 2 hours to 16 hours depending upon the needs of the district. When applied to the classroom, a typical lesson would involve the teacher introducing an animal such as the snake; talking about it, pointing out and explaining any actions or movements that might tend to be startling; demonstrating how to hold it and listing some particular things to look for on it. By this time the children would be eager to touch and hold the animal. It would be passed to every child but nobody would be forced to touch it who did not want to. (Almost always, after the elaborate introduction every child will take the animal.) One or more children might have a polaroid picture taken with the animal. The group would then discuss the animal and summarize the items they had been directed to look for. An art lesson or written lesson might follow, or research for further information; or if in a zoo, study or related animals in the zoo. The polaroid picture could be used later for extending the experience, using it as the basis for a written story or oral language activities. In School the children would be responsible for reading directions and being responsible for the care of the animal. In most classes, after children became "expert" on an animal, they might be allowed to report on and "share" the animal in other classrooms.

Activities or Services (Cont'd)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

5-6. The project did no grouping of pupils for various program activities. Teacher-pupil ratios were those normally established in their various schools or districts for regular or special education classes. At the demonstration program, if the teacher wanted additional help, and members of the staff were available, they would accompany groups in the zoo. In addition, high school tutor guides from special education classes in one of the local high schools were available if the teacher chose to ask for them.

7-8-9. Feedback to parents or pupils was not an organized part of this program. It is dependent on the policy or practice of the particular school or district involved. As we were interested in motivation of pupils rather than accumulation of knowledge, practice review and quiz activities were not a part of this project, although individual teachers may have included them in their program.

10. Motivation is the major goal of the Zoo Project. We believe that living things present a special fascination for children, and that teachers can take advantage of this fascination to teach school subjects. Animals provide a multi-sensory stimulation not filled by the standard approach. We feel the animal experience breaks up the pattern of failure the child may have had from the standard school approach. It suddenly places the child in neutral non-school territory being stimulated by a completely different and unorthodox approach. Suddenly he finds a reason to do school type tasks; but they are his own realistic reasons, based on needs that he feels.

11. Comparison groups were not needed to meet the goals of this year's project.

1. Were special materials developed or adapted for the program? How and by whom?
2. What other major items of equipment and materials did the program require? In what amounts?
3. How were key aids and materials used in connection with the various program activities?
4. If a comparison is being made between program and nonprogram persons, were there important differences between these groups in kinds and amounts of materials provided, or in methods of use?

1. A slide/tape presentation was developed for use in the ACSA/EXPO initial awareness portion of the program as was a brochure entitled "How Can Animals Help Your Children?" These were produced by the Zoo Project staff with the aid of Mr. Don Kelly of the State Department of Education. The Zoo Project Handbook was reprinted for use in the workshops. Additional handout materials were produced as needed to fit local workshop needs.

2-3. A synchronized slide/tape projector was purchased for use in the ACSA/EXPO phase of the program and for use by the Zoo Project staff when making presentations in the absence of the project director.

Equipment, minor in cost, but major in importance are the cages and other animal equipment needed for the In-School program.

The slide camera and polaroid camera obtained during the first year of funding continued to be items of utmost importance. Every class received eight or more pictures of the children interacting with the animals for use in motivating language activities.

The project van lessed during the year provided the necessary transportation needed for the In-School portion of the program, and was used for hauling animals and materials to workshops within driving distance of San Diego.

4. There was no "outside" control group used in this project.

Parent-Community Involvement

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

1. What role, if any, did parents have in the program?
2. Were meetings held with parents? Why? How often?
3. What role, if any, did various community groups have in the program?
4. How was the community kept informed?
5. If problems with parents or the community affected the program, what steps, if any, were taken to remedy the situation?

1. No parents had a direct role in the program. In the local demonstration program, some parents accompanied classes to the Zoo at the request of the teacher. Several letters were received from parents. Some teachers distributed evaluation sheets to parents. All from whom we heard were very supportive of the program.

2-3. Some parent and community groups contacted the project for information or asked for a speaker. All such invitations were accepted.

4. The Zoo Project was described in two local newspaper articles, one local radio program and one local television program. An illustrated article was published in the San Diego Zoological Society's magazine ZOONOOZ. All invitations to speak to PTA's, service clubs, educational groups were accepted by the project staff.

5. No problems with parents or the community were encountered.

Budget

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

1. From what sources were program funds obtained?
2. What was the total cost of the program?
3. What period of time was covered by these funds?
4. What is the per pupil cost of the program? What was the formula for computing this figure?
5. How does the per pupil cost of the program compare with the normal per pupil cost of the schools in the program?
6. Where can the reader get more detailed budget information?
7. Of the total cost of the program, give rough dollar estimates of developmental costs, implementation costs and operational costs.
8. Give the costs for the entire project period by budget categories (i.e., professional salaries, contracted services, etc.).

Complete breakdowns of budget figures
have not been determined at this writing.
These figures will be provided as a part of the
financial report which will be forwarded to
Sacramento within 90 days.

For use of potential adopters of the program:

1. What modifications of the program are possible?
2. What are the suggested steps in adopting this program?
3. What are some things others should avoid in adopting this program?
4. Can the program be phased in, beginning on a small scale? How?
5. Can parts of the program be adopted without taking the whole program?
What parts?

1. This program need not be limited to localities having zoos nor need it be limited to Mentally Retarded and Educationally Handicapped classes.

The program could be operated on an In-Zoo or In-School basis only, or individual teachers could adapt after having attended the teacher training workshop. All animals in the In-School program have been obtained through donations. Cages are readily available and all other necessary materials could be found in practically all school systems at a minimum cost. The basic approach to the In-Zoo program could be adapted to any zoo, animal shelter, farm, park, aquarium, etc.

2. The teacher training is the key step in this program. The teacher must be secure in working with the animals. If she is afraid, the children will sense it, and the whole point of the program is lost. She needs background on the animals and needs to have selected activities and materials to use with the animals. Start with either In-Zoo or In-School for a year, then expand to include both programs.

3-4. Use only volunteers. Don't assign teachers to the program. Don't try to operate either program without teacher training. Make sure animals are handleable and safe before allowing children to use them. Don't allow substitute teachers to try to carry on in the teacher's place.

5. To replicate this project a school could easily begin with what it has at hand and build activities around small, less expensive animals available in most communities, as well as substituting media and "one-shot" visits for part of the program. A large city zoo is very helpful, but many of the project ideas are applicable whether a full scale zoo is available or not. Using animals as motivation can occur in many other settings.

6. Yes, see #1 above.

Dissemination

Discuss how project information was disseminated during the past budget period.

1. Provide an estimate of the number of unsolicited requests for information from both within and outside the project area.
2. List the number of visitors from outside the project area.
3. Estimate the cost of dissemination during the last budget period.
4. Provide the total cost of dissemination including prior budget periods (if possible).

The whole focus of this year's program has been on dissemination of the Zoo Project approach.

Initial awareness presentations occurred as a part of a series of "ACSA/EXPO" meetings in eleven locations throughout the state of California. In these meetings, a brief description of the Zoo Project was given along with description of services available to teachers/schools/districts.

In addition to the teachers, administrators and other educators invited to these meetings through ACSA, the Zoo Project sent special invitations to local zoos, aquariums and animal parks and local CANHC chapters (California Association of Neurologically Handicapped Children), indicating where and when the closest ACSA/EXPO presentation would be.

Persons indicating an interest in the Zoo Project approach on ACSA/EXPO evaluation forms were sent a package of materials giving further information. These materials included

- an introductory letter
- a list of services available
- a description of the different kinds of Zoo Project workshops available
- a list of workshop objectives, goals, and outcomes
- a suggested workshop schedule

When deemed appropriate, additional materials were sent such as the brochure, copies of *Donnerstag* magazine, extracts from the Zoo Project handbook, and personal letters to answer particular questions.

Additional initial awareness contacts were made by mailings sent out through the Westcoast Prevocational Occupational Education program, through newspaper and magazine articles, through word of mouth and through displays.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Dissemination activities were considered to have two purposes for the Zoo Project. One was to promote the adoption or adaption of the Zoo Project approach in other areas. The second purpose was to encourage the continuation and expansion of the program locally after federal funding had ceased.

Districts, schools, or individuals who were interested in the Zoo Project approach then contacted us for one or more of the following services:

- 1) Secondary awareness level meetings in which a more complete presentation was provided of the material given in the ACSA/EXPO presentation. Such meetings were given to school staffs, departmental groups, professional organizations, college classes, parent groups, and service clubs.
- 2) Visitors were available for all visitors interested in seeing the project in action. A model demonstration program was available at the San Diego Zoo for an In-Zoo type program and In-School classes were available throughout the year as models for the In-School portion of our program. All teachers applying for inclusion in the program agreed to have visitors at any time during their participation.
- 3) Teacher training workshops were provided to all requesting schools or districts. Organization of the workshop varied according to the needs and resources of the school or district involved. Many districts were not interested in establishing a district wide program, but were interested in sponsoring a workshop that would expose their teachers to the Zoo Project approach and encourage teachers to adapt features of the program that met their own immediate needs.
- 4) Demonstrations. Two districts requested demonstration lessons in their own area with children from their own schools. The project director provided these lessons for them.
- 5) Idea Fairs-Displays. In addition to Western States Exp and CSBA participation, the Zoo Project was requested to provide a display and personal assistance for Professional "Idea fairs" swapshop meetings and conferences.
- 6) Technical Assistance. From time to time during the year the project was contacted for additional technical assistance by various agencies inside and outside the state of California. Such assistance was provided through correspondence.
- 7) In addition information about the project was disseminated in one local television program, a radio tape distributed to six local radio stations, 2 local newspaper articles and an article in the San Diego Zoological Society's publication "Zoonooz" which has world-wide distribution.

SUMMARY: The Zoo Project Staff directly participated in dissemination activities in the following ways:

	<u>Activity</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>No. of People</u>
11	ACSA/EXPO Activities	Fall 1972	385
	Information Packets	Fall 1972	355
7	<u>Secondary Awareness Presentations:</u> (potential adopters/adapters)		
	Orange Center School District	10/18	16
	San Diego School District	11/6	17
	San Diego Unified School District	1/11	19
	Burlingame Teacher Institute	1/26	54
	San Diego City Schools	2/5	43
	St. Helix Montessori Academy	3/29	31
	Ontario/Montclair Reading Council	3/3	42
15	<u>Secondary Awareness Presentations:</u> (local continuation and expansion of the program)		
	University of California Extension	7/19	27
	St. Kieran's School, El Cajon	10/27	50
	California State University, San Diego	11/7	45
	North Park Kiwanis	11/7	37
	San Diego CEC (Council for Exceptional Children)	11/16	92
	University of California Extension	11/28	46
	NSTA Convention	12/1	27
	Multi-Age Teachers	2/13	17
	University of California Extension	2/21	21
	Southwestern College Extension	3/14	33
	California State University, San Diego	3/27	45
	Southwestern College	4/4	52
	Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing Teachers	5/3	20
	Women's International Sorority	5/16	18
	Chula Vista Lions	6/7	57
6	<u>Demonstrations:</u>		
	Orange Center	10/18	6
	Burlingame	6/25)	
	" "	6/26)	56
	" "	6/27)	
	<u>Visits</u>		
	Local		127
	Other than local		58

SUMMARY (Cont'd)

	<u>Activity</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>No. of People</u>
4	<u>Displays, Idea Fairs, Conferences</u>		
	ACSA/CSBA	12/1 - 12/3	
	San Diego City and County CEC	2/21	
	Western States Expo	4/13 - 4/15	
	SDTA Teacher Fair	6/9	
	<u>Staff Training - (potential adopters/adapters)</u>		
	See detailed summary sheets		
	<u>Staff Training - (local continuation and expansion of program)</u>		
	Zoo Project summer workshop	Summer 1972	11
	" " fall workshop	Fall 1972	21
	California Lutheran College Extension	6/73	28 Est.
	San Diego City College	7/9/73	27 Est.
	" " " "	7/16/73	30 Est.
	" " " "	7/23/73	28 Est.
12	<u>Requests for Technical Assistance</u>		
	See detailed summary sheet		
	<u>Public Relations Activities</u>		
	National City Public Library - Animal display	11/3	100
	Mentally Retarded Arts and Crafts Group	5/8	27
	Fairhaven Pet Show	6/1	300
	Television Interview	11/3	
	Radio Interview (repeated 6 or more times)	10/73	
	Radioz Article (San Diego Zoological Society)	2/73	
	San Diego Union Newspaper articles	11/5 and 5/11	
	No. of Brochures	Fall 1972	Cost \$440.00 5,500 950 left
	No. of Handbooks		Cost \$1,513.00 575 None left (Final printing not accomplished at this date. All copies expected to be used in local program and in answering requests from outside area.)

Not for by other than Title III funds.

SUMMARY OF ZOO PROJECT OBJECTIVES AND FINDINGS

OBJECTIVE: Encourage and promote the adoption or adaptation of the ZOO PROJECT FOR LAMNATE CHILDREN in a minimum of ten other school districts (districts or schools) in the state of California.

The Zoo Project approach is being used in over 16 districts with district encouragement and sponsorship. In addition, teachers in over 20 classes in 12 additional districts are using Zoo Project materials and methods in their classrooms. Other institutions such as Zoos, Museums, Hospitals, Humane Societies are using Zoo Project materials and methods.

1. Create an awareness about the ZOO PROJECT among 100 school districts in the state.

Awareness presentations were made to 385 people through 40 presentations. 7 presentations were made out to individuals representing 109 districts. 7 outside awareness presentations were made to 222 people. 15 awareness presentations were made in San Diego County to 587 people. Zoo Project personnel participated in 10 other activities in which brochures and oral information were given. Brochures were made available to other dissemination activities throughout the state during the year.

2. Operate a model demonstration program capable of accommodating 25 visitors per week and demonstrate to potential adopters from 25 school and/or zoo settings.

The Zoo Project handled groups of visitors from as few as one to as many as 60 people. A total of 185 people visited the project during the 1972-73 school year for 171 groups.

3. Select 10 districts or schools interested in adopting or adapting, according to established criteria, one or more program components.

All districts requesting services received those services except for those requesting services during the 1973-74 school year. See above information and following information for details.

4. Conduct 10 staff training seminars for potential adopters/adapters from 25 school and/or zoo settings.

Teacher training workshops were held for 552 people. These represented teachers from 27 districts.

5. Provide technical assistance for implementation to Adapters/Adopters schools and/or Zoos.

Technical assistance was provided whenever requested whether to school districts, Zoos, parent groups or individual teachers. Such assistance was provided through personal contact, telephone conversation and by letter.

Evaluate the diffusion process for effectiveness.

An ongoing evaluation was carried on throughout the year, collecting data, organizing presentations, workshops, and the demonstration program. Adjustments were made based on results of such evaluation. This evaluation report is a result of this evaluation process.

1972-73 ADOPTION/ADAPTION ACTIVITIES:

LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT THROUGH ANIMAL UTILIZATION
(Zoo Project for Handicapped Children)

				1.0					2.0			
				INITIAL AWARENESS			SECONDARY AWARENESS		MATERIALS SENT: NO. OF DIFFERENT DOCUMENTS			
DISTRICT: (Schools and Contact Person)		ADOPTION = AO ADAPTION = AA UNCERTAIN = X NO = 0		ACSA/EXPO	DISTRICT MAILING	OTHER	DATE	A - Admtn. T - Teachers S - Students P - Parents	NUMBER OF PEOPLE	HANDBOOK	OTHERS	
NOTE: Addresses and telephone numbers for contact persons listed on these pages will be found in Appendix A.		0.0										
Component	In Zoo	In School										
1) Alhambra City Schools - Granada School - Mrs. Brenda Sorenson - Supvr. Aural Education		AA				X					30	
2) Arcadia Unified School District - Holly Avenue School - W. G. Smith, Principal) Longley Way School - Ross Browne, Principal)	AA	AA		X							3	
3) Burlingame School District - Mrs. Lois Watson - Curriculum Consultant McKinley Franklin Washington Pershing Roosevelt Mrs. A. M. Elario - Director, Summer Reading Clinic		AA AA AA AA AA AA AA		A			1/26	A - T	54		30	15
4) Chino Unified School District - Ed Reyes - Asst. Supt. -Instruction Los Serranos School) Glenmeade School)		AA				A					4	
5) Chula Vista City Schools - Mrs. Elizabeth Kay - General Supervisor		AA				X					16	12
6) Duarte Unified School District - Joe Davis - Title I Director (Maxwell School)		X		X			1/11	A - T	19		4	
7) Garden Grove Unified School District - Excelsior School - Leroy Morton, Principal Hill School - Robert Gresham - Principal		AA AA		X X							4 3	
8) Little Lake School District - Earla Snow - Consultant for the Deaf Fairford School Jersey Avenue School Lakeview School		AA AA AA				X X X					18	

NUMBER OF PEOPLE	MATERIALS SENT:		VISIT/DEMONSTRATION		STAFF TRAINING		TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR IMPLEMENTATION				PRODUCER SCHOOL				CONSUMER SCHOOL			
	HANDBOOK	OTHERS	DATE	NUMBER OF PEOPLE	DATE	NUMBER OF PEOPLE	MONITOR (Date)	No. K WITH: A - Admin T - Teachers S - Students P - Parents	NUMBER OF PEOPLE	DATE	PROFESSIONAL STAFF TIME (Hours)	TRAVEL TIME (Hours)	TRAVEL COST	TOTAL COST	FUNDS EXPENDED	NUMBER OF STAFF INVOLVED	NUMBER OF STUDENTS INVOLVED	
54	30	15			4/28	22				11	4	33.66	261.36	Budget'd	13	87	Adapting on Optional teacher basis particularly in hard-of-hearing and deaf programs with district sponsorship. Making use of loan program of local humane society.	
	3				1/9	57				7 1/2	2	12.28	112.49	\$10	22	600	No district funds expended; district sponsoring optional individual teacher adaptation; 1 staff member attended additional training at La Verne College	
	30	15			3/27	24				42	11	293.	889.		6	112	High interest. District sponsoring adaptation of program on optional individual teacher basis. Encouraging use of local Junior Museum animal loan program. Memberships paid for by district. Asked for special demonstration with their own children during summer reading clinic.	
							6/25 to 6/27	A T S	1 5 50	6/25 to 6/27				210	1	27		
	4				4/10	37				4	4	8.63	97.	0	33	1025	Adapting components of the program school wide; planning to expand next year; district planning to reproduce handbook materials for local distribution.	
	16	12			Feb-Mar.	15		Informal contacts with teacher planning animal lending library		19	16	5.00	388.	Budget'd	24	112+	District sponsoring adaptation of program on optional individual teacher basis. Will conduct own summer training program. Plans for district animal lending library and expansion of the program.	
19	4									6	4	17	114		no figures as yet		No response as yet to Evaluation Questionnaire	
	4				1/17	19				6	4	7	115		17	500	District sponsoring individual teacher adaptation of program. Teachers buying animals and cages with own money. Considering inaugurating a district wide program. Also making use of animal loans from local pet shop. Some teachers have purchased handbook on their own.	
	3				3/22	24				8	4	7	131		22	610		
	18				2/2-3	16				20	4	32	314	50 See note	3 6 1	16 35 3	All classes in deaf program are adapting the In-School component. Report high success in motivation of language. Have been fortunate in donations and gifts of animals and cages.	

1972-73 ADOPTION/ADAPTION ACTIVITIES:				1.0						2.0	
<u>LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT THROUGH ANIMAL UTILIZATION</u> (Zoo Project for Handicapped Children)				INITIAL AWARENESS			SECONDARY AWARENESS			MATERIALS SENT: NO. OF DIFFERENT DOCUMENTS	
DISTRICT: (Schools and Contact Person)	ADOPTION = AO ADAPTION = AA UNCERTAIN = X NO = 0			ACSA/EXPO	DISTRICT MAILING	OTHER	DATE	A - Admin. T - Teachers S - Students P - Parents	NUMBER OF PEOPLE	HANDBOOK	OTHERS
	Component	In Zoo	In School								
9) Los Angeles Unified School District - Salvin Elem. School - Rose Engel - Principal			AA	X							16
10) Modesto City Schools - Jerrold Frye			X	X			2/5	A - T	43		
11) Mt. Helix Montessori Academy - Barbara Hamilton - Secretary			AA			X	5/29	A-T-P	31		
12) Ocean View School District - Lark View TMR Facility - Mrs. Rose Ludwig - Principal			AA			X					25
13) Ontario-Montclair Reading Council - Mrs. Hazel Wilson			0			X	3/3	A-T	42		
14) Orange Center School District - Orange Center School - George Nagel, Dist. Supt.			0	X			10-18	A-T			
15) Riverside County Schools - Mrs. Eleanor Dunn - Director, Prolexia, Title III Collett (Alvord) Parkridge (Corona) Arnold Heights (Moreno) West Riverside (Jurupa)			AA AA AA AA AA	X							
16) Santee School District - Rio Seco School - Russ James Doug Kay - Teacher			AA AA			X X	11-6	A - T	17		2
17) Victor School District - Mrs. Beth Hill - Curriculum Coordinator Irwin School Del Rey School Parkview School			AA								3
18) Westminster School District - Rhonda Mahan - Lang. Dev. Specialist-Title VI Preschool		X	X	X							2
CONTINUATION AND EXPANSION OF THE LOCAL PROGRAM											
San Diego Unified School District											
See <u>SUMMARY</u> : Dissemination Activities pp. 32-33											

VISIT/DEM-ONSTRATION		STAFF TRAINING		TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR IMPLEMENTATION				PRODUCER SCHOOL				CONSUMER SCHOOL			
DATE	NUMBER OF PEOPLE	DATE	NUMBER OF PEOPLE	MONITOR (Date)	WORK WITH: A-Admin T - Teachers S - Students P - Parents	NUMBER OF PEOPLE	DATE	PROFESSIONAL STAFF TIME (Hours)	TRAVEL TIME (Hours)	TRAVEL COST	TOTAL COST	FUNDS EXPENDED	NUMBER OF STAFF INVOLVED	NUMBER OF STUDENTS INVOLVED	
		1-10	40	Request help		next year		9 1/2	2	20	175	0	9	100	Using Zoo Project approach; plan to continue next year on an individual optional choice basis. Hoping to expand to other classrooms. Teachers obtain own animals and cages. Request further assistance next year.
								1 1/2	4	63	117		no figures as yet		No response to Evaluation Questionnaire as yet.
				Have requested technical assistance next year.				1	1	7	27		no figures as yet		Planning animal collection; no response as yet to Evaluation Questionnaire.
		5/18-19	22					19	4	40	330	85	no figures as yet		Training occurred too late in year for full adaption this year. Planning active program next year with district providing animals, pens, cages, etc.
								3	6	0	0	10	no figures as yet		No response as yet to Evaluation Questionnaire. Produced Chino contact. Several participants attended La Verne College class - adapting in own districts on individual basis.
					T-S	6	10-14	2	1	0	29.00				
		2-15	52					10	4	7.00	143	5.00	4 2 4 3	120 60 120 90	Zoo Project approaches being used. Several participants attended the La Verne College workshop and now adapting the In School program in their own classrooms.
								3	1	7.00	46				Planning own animal lending library.
								6	5	11	127		6 4 2	300 100 LD-MR	Using Zoo Project approach; plan to continue next year on an individual teacher optional choice basis. District will provide cages, etc.
															Planning to use materials in Title VI language Project.

1972-73 ADOPTION/ADAPTION ACTIVITIES:				1.0						2.0	
<u>LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT THROUGH ANIMAL UTILIZATION</u> (Zoo Project for Handicapped Children)				INITIAL AWARENESS			SECONDARY AWARENESS			MATERIALS SENT: NO. OF DIFFERENT DOCUMENTS	
DISTRICT: (Schools and Contact Person)	ADOPTION = AO ADAPTION = AA UNCERTAIN = X NO = 0			ACSA/EXPO	DISTRICT MAILING	OTHER	DATE	A - Admin. T - Teachers S - Students P - Parents	NUMBER OF PEOPLE	HANDBOOK	OTHERS
	Component	In Zoo	In School								
ADAPTERS OTHER THAN SCHOOLS OR SCHOOL DISTRICTS:											
1) La Verne College - John Mainiero											
			AA			X					29
2) San Francisco Zoological Society - Beverly Rongren - Docent Coordinator Mrs. David Gibson - Junior League Mrs. Helen Lustig - Staff & Curriculum Development Spec. - San Francisco Unified Schools											
		X		X							3
		X			X						1
		X	X			X					3
3) San Mateo Junior Museum - Mary Ann Danielson											
		X	X				See Note				3
4) Mrs. Florence B. Clayton											
		X	X			X					1
											10

2.0 HARDBOOK MATERIALS SENT: NO. OF DIFFERENT DOCUMENTS	VISIT/DEM- ONSTRATION		STAFF TRAINING		TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR IMPLEMENTATION				PRODUCER SCHOOL				CONSUMER SCHOOL		
	DATE	NUMBER OF PEOPLE	DATE	NUMBER OF PEOPLE	MONITOR (Date)	WORK WITH: A - Admin T - Teachers S - Students P - Parents	NUMBER OF PEOPLE	DATE	PROFESSIONAL STAFF TIME (Hours)	TRAVEL TIME (Hours)	TRAVEL COST	TOTAL COST	FUNDS EXPENDED	NUMBER OF STAFF INVOLVED	NUMBER OF STUDENTS INVOLVED
29			3-29	27				25	5	41	331	(810)	23	885	
3	15				3/27	other		6	(Burlingame)	19					
3															
1	10	2/22		1											

23 teachers responded to questionnaire. As a result of the workshop, individual teacher adaptation reported in the following districts:
 Alvord - Terrace School - 2
 Collett School
 Arcadia - Longley Way
 Bonita - Raymon
 Chaffey Union High - Alta Loma
 Chino - Neuman
 G. Meade
 E. J. Marshall - 2
 Corona - Vicentia
 Hemet - Cottonwood
 Hueneme - Bard
 Jarupa - West Riverside
 Ontario-Montclair - West Riverside
 - Mariposa - 2
 Placentia - Orchard
 Riverside - Harrison
 Trona - Trona
 Valley Oaks - University
 Unassigned teachers - 2
 Materials shared by these teachers with 256 additional teachers.

Expressed strong interest. Change in Zoo administration caused abandonment of plans.
 Local Junior League group also interested in Zoo Project approach for Docent Training if cooperative plan can be worked out with the Zoo when new administration is established.
 San Francisco School Curriculum Specialist also exploring adapting both in Zoo and in School programs.

Attended Burlingame presentations. 3 staff members took training. Are making use of Zoo Project approach in the Museum and in their animal loan program.

Graduate student in Educational Psychology, Calif. State University Los Angeles. Is planning to develop a similar program and encourage adaptation of it in a variety of settings in the greater Los Angeles area. Has demonstrated Zoo Project approaches and materials in graduate classes. Sees potential for use in residential treatment facilities.

1972-73 ADOPTION/ADAPTION ACTIVITIES:				1.0						2.0		
<u>LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT THROUGH ANIMAL UTILIZATION</u> (Zoo Project for Handicapped Children)				INITIAL AWARENESS			SECONDARY AWARENESS			MATERIALS SENT:		
DISTRICT: (Schools and Contact Person)	ADOPTION = AO ADAPTION = AA UNCERTAIN = X NO = O			ACSA/EXPO	DISTRICT MAILING	OTHER	DATE	A - Admin. T - Teachers S - Students P - Parents	NUMBER OF PEOPLE	NO. OF DIFFERENT DOCUMENTS		
	0.0									HANDBOOK	OTHERS	
Component				In Zoo	In School							
ADAPTERS OTHER THAN SCHOOLS OR SCHOOL DISTRICTS (CONT'D)												
5) Lion Country Safari - Brenda Easley - Education				X	X	X					1	
6) San Diego Humane Society - Judy Immenschuh					AA			X			1	8
SCHOOL DISTRICTS OUTSIDE CALIFORNIA												
Anaconda City Schools - Anaconda, Montana Mrs. Madalen Burt W. K. Dwyer School				AA	AA			X			2	3
ADAPTERS OTHER THAN SCHOOLS OR SCHOOL DISTRICTS OUTSIDE CALIFORNIA												
1) Larue D. Carter Memorial Hospital - Indianapolis, Ind. Mrs. Susan Cooper -					X			X			1	10
2) New York Zoological Society - Bronx, New York Mr. Donald Fine - Education Dept. Mr. Robert A. Brown - Assoc. Curator for Early Childhood Education								X				10
3) Taronga Zoo - Sydney, Australia - Barry Foy - Acting Senior Education Officer				X				X			1	1-

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

HANDBOOK MATERIALS SENT: NO. OF DIFFERENT DOCUMENTS		VISIT/DEMONSTRATION		STAFF TRAINING		TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR IMPLEMENTATION			PRODUCER SCHOOL				CONSUMER SCHOOL		
OTHERS	DATE	NUMBER OF PEOPLE	DATE	NUMBER OF PEOPLE	MONITOR (Date)	WORK WITH: A-Admin T-Teachers S-Students P-Parents	NUMBER OF PEOPLE	DATE	PROFESSIONAL STAFF TIME (Hours)	TRAVEL TIME (Hours)	TRAVEL COST	TOTAL COST	FUNDS EXPENDED	NUMBER OF STAFF INVOLVED	NUMBER OF STUDENTS INVOLVED
1															Establishing education program, requested handbook.
1	8	9/19	1		Attended workshop.										Used Zoo Project as model in developing a program to teach humane values in a series of one time visits to schools throughout San Diego County using live animals. Adapted materials and ideas. Informal assistance from time to time as needed.
2	3	Also visited Project 71-72										100	4	150	Adapting Zoo Project approach and materials schoolwide on informal individual optional basis. Plan to expand the program next year. Using handbook as a model for developing own materials.
1	10														Adapting Zoo Project approaches to recreation therapy program of hospital in Indianapolis working with emotionally disturbed children. Making use of animals from local Zoo and humane society. Using Zoo Project approaches and materials; adapted Zoo Project application in requesting federal funds for Indianapolis local project.
	10														Emphasizing use of animals in teaching subjects other than science.
1	12														Are expanding education program. Seeking means of using animals in a variety of ways. As a result of receiving Zoo Project materials and information, they altered points of interest in their new program.



ADDRESSES OF CONTACT PERSONS

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ALHAMBRA CITY SCHOOLS

Mrs. Brenda S. Sorenson, Supvr
Aural Education
2121 W. Main Street
Alhambra, California 91801
(213) 289-5411

ARCADIA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

William G. Smith, Principal
Holly Avenue School
360 W. Duarte Road
Arcadia, California 91006
(213) 446-0131 Ext 207

Longley Way School
Ross Browne, Principal
2601 Longley Way
Arcadia, California 91006
(213) 446-0131 Ext 217

BURLINGAME SCHOOL DISTRICT

Mrs. Lois Watson
Curriculum Consultant
1560 Newlands
Burlingame, California 94010
(415) 344-1743

Mrs. Alice M. Elario
Director, Summer Reading Laboratory
McKinley School
701 Paloma Drive
Burlingame, California 94010
(415) 344-9313

CHINO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

Edward Reyes, Asst. Supt. of Instruction
5130 Riverside
Chino, California 91710
(714) 625-1201

CHULA VISTA CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT

Mrs. Elizabeth C. Kay
General Supervisor
84 East J Street - P.O. Box 907
Chula Vista, California 92012
(714) 422-8341

DUARTE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

Joe Davis
Director, Title I
1427 Buena Vista Avenue
Duarte, California 91010

GARDEN GROVE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

Leroy Morton, Principal
Excelsior School
10421 Woodbury
Garden Grove, California

Hill School
Robert P. Gresham, Principal
9681 Eleventh Street
Garden Grove, California 92640

LITTLE LAKE SCHOOL DISTRICT

Mrs. Earla Snow
Consultant for the Deaf
9400 Jersey Avenue
Santa Fe Springs, California
(213) 868-8241 Ext 87

LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

Mrs. Rose Engel, Principal
Salvin Elementary School
1925 Budlong Avenue
Los Angeles, California 90007
(213) 731-0703

MODESTO CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT

Jerrold Frye
426 Locust Street
Modesto, California 95351

MONTESSORI ACADEMY-Mt. Heli

Barbara Hamilton, Secretary
3327 Kenora Drive
Spring Valley, California 92077
(714) 461-6200

OCEAN VIEW SCHOOL DISTRICT

Mrs. Rose Ludwig, Principal
Lark View TMR Facility
7972 Warner Avenue
Huntington Beach, California 92647
(714) 847-2551

ONTARIO-MONTCLAIR READING COUNCIL

Mrs. Hazel Wilson
Lee High School
(714) 624-5697

ADDRESSES OF CONTACT PERSONS (CONT'D)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ORANGE CENTER SCHOOL DISTRICT

George Nagel, Dist. Superintendent
Orange Center School
3530 S. Cherry
Fresno, California

RIVERSIDE COUNTY SCHOOLS

Mrs. Eleanor Dunn
Title III Director, PROLEXIA
Riverside County Schools Office
P.O. Box 868
Riverside, California 92502
(714) 787-2585

SANTEE SCHOOL DISTRICT

Russ James
Rio Seco School
Santee, California 92071

VICTOR SCHOOL DISTRICT

Mrs. Beth Hill, Curriculum Coordinator
16821 "A" Street
Victorville, California 92392
(714) 245-3263

WESTMINSTER SCHOOL DISTRICT

Rhonda Mahan
Lang. Dev. Specialist-Title VI Preschool
Westminster, California

LA VERNE COLLEGE

John Mainiero
Asst. Professor of Education
Department of Education
La Verne, California 91750

SAN FRANCISCO ZOOLOGICAL GARDENS

Beverly Rongren - Docent Coordinator
Zoo Road and Skyline Blvd
San Francisco, California 94132

SAN MATEO COYOTE POINT JUNIOR MUSEUM

Maryann Danielson, Chief
Interpretive Division
Coyote Point
San Mateo, California 94401
(415) 573-2595

LION COUNTRY SAFARI

Brenda Easley - Education
Laguna Hills, California 92653

SAN DIEGO HUMANE SOCIETY

Judy Immenschuh
887 Sherman
San Diego, California
(714) 278-7004

ANACONDA CITY SCHOOLS

Mrs. Madalen Burt
Special Education
1200 West 3rd
Anaconda, Montana 59711

LARUE D. CARTER MEMORIAL HOSPITAL

Mrs. Susan Cooper
Recreational Therapist
Children's Service
1315 West 10th Street
Indianapolis, Indiana 46202

NEW YORK ZOOLOGICAL SOCIETY

Mr. Donald Fine - Education Dept.
Mr. Robert A. Brown - Assoc. Curator
for Early Childhood Education
New York Zoological Society
Bronx, New York 10460

TARONGA ZOO

Barry G. Foy
Acting Senior Education Officer
P.O. Box 20 Mosman NSW 2088
Australia