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ABSTRACT

In the past three decades the field of cultural resources management (CRM) has seen a rise in literature and initiatives geared towards public outreach and community engagement. This is primarily because archaeologists have recognized that effective and meaningful communication with the public is an ethical obligation as well as a practical means of promoting the discipline’s values and building support for projects. While archaeologists have developed several approaches to outreach, this research focuses on combining aspects of archaeology education and community-based archaeology to address an uncommon scenario among outreach efforts: the local-level archaeology education program.

This study used a collaborative, responsive research model to work alongside community stakeholders in the city of Duarte, California, for the purpose of creating a CRM-themed local history toolkit for third grade teachers. Fourteen months of fieldwork yielded a set of materials that incorporated input from elementary school teachers, museum curators, city hall employees, librarians, university professors, archaeologists, and Gabrielino/Tongva cultural educators. This research also produced a project template that discusses successful strategies as well as some of the difficulties that archaeologists may face when coordinating a collaborative community-based project.

There are many issues that can make implementing a project such as this difficult for CRM professionals, including community members’ preconceived ideas of what constitutes archaeology, the difficulty of maintaining a genuine balance of authority, and the significant time investment required. Nevertheless, archaeology education projects that engage the public at the local level can be powerful outreach tools. Like other public archaeology efforts, they should be customized to fit available budgets, timeframes, and resources. This thesis provides one example of how this can be done, and hopefully it will prove useful to future researchers.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

In the past three decades the field of cultural resources management (CRM) has seen a rise in literature and initiatives geared towards public outreach and community engagement. According to John H. Jameson, Jr. and Sherene Baugher, this is the result of professional archaeologists realizing that they “cannot afford to be detached from mechanisms and programs that convey archaeological information to the public” (Jameson and Baugher 2008:3). In general, there are two justifications for this. First, that as stewards of the archaeological record we have an ethical obligation to communicate our findings to the public. Second, that encouraging public understanding of and interest in archaeology will result in greater political and financial support for future projects. Either way, there is a clear need for archaeologists to strive for effective and meaningful communication with the public.

Although there are several ways for archaeologists to conduct public outreach, this thesis will focus on two specific approaches: archaeology education and community-based archaeology. In the first, professionals in the field work with educators to produce archaeology-themed programs and teaching materials for classroom use. Most of these have been developed on the state or national level. In the second, CRM projects are designed to not just consult local stakeholder communities, but actively engage them in the management of their own cultural resources. On these projects, collaboration between archaeologists and community members directly shapes the goals and methods of the management process. After reviewing these approaches, I realized that combining
aspects of both would allow me to address a unique public outreach scenario: the collaborative, local-level archaeology education program.

While most practitioners of archaeology education advocate collaboration with teachers, they rarely discussed involving other groups such as local historians or descendant communities. Yet naming these groups as stakeholders in the project and including them in collaboration efforts could give communities a stronger investment in the process and enrich the narrative by including multiple perspectives. And although community-based archaeology has developed several collaborative, responsive research methods that account for stakeholder needs, any outreach materials produced are often tied to a specific project rather than being integrated into a community institution like the school system. Designing a project’s outreach materials for the specific use of local schools would help to make their usage more consistent and increase their relevance for the community.

Based on this reasoning, I decided to design a local-level outreach project in which I partnered with community stakeholders to create CRM-themed teaching materials that were grounded in local history and intended for ongoing use in elementary school classrooms. A combination of favorable conditions led me to choose the city of Duarte in southern California as the project location. I established a network of project partners within and around the Duarte community and proceeded to conduct ongoing collaborative meetings from January 2010 to April 2011.

Ultimately, this study had two goals. The first was to record the collaborative process by which my partners and I produced the teaching materials and use it to create a project template. This template would include a discussion of successful strategies as
well as problems or issues that arose during research, and was intended to guide other CRM professionals seeking to develop community-based archaeology education programs. The second goal was to develop a local history-themed toolkit for third grade teachers in the Duarte Unified School District that addressed social studies curriculum content standards and incorporated the perspectives of multiple community stakeholders.

This thesis documents the process by which I created and addressed these research goals, and is organized as follows. Chapter 2 examines the field of public archaeology and discusses the ethical and practical reasons that archaeologists engage with the public. I also explore archaeology education and community-based archaeology as separate but complementary approaches to public outreach, providing a summary of basic principles and a list of key examples for both. Finally, I propose a hybrid research model in which the methods of community-based archaeology are employed to achieve the goals of archaeology education.

Chapter 3 provides an account of my project design. I begin with the premise, setting, and goals of my research, which combine elements from archaeology education and community-based archaeology. I then describe my initial designs for the collaborative process and for the materials that it would produce. I also discuss why the city of Duarte was chosen for this project and provide readers with a brief overview of local history and current institutions.

The fourth chapter of this paper contains the project template described above. It begins with the basic principles that I used to guide my research, which like my project goals were drawn from the literature on archaeology education and community-based archaeology. Following this is a narrative of the strategies that I used to coordinate
collaboration with stakeholders, as well as a discussion of the adjustments I made in response to problems and issues that arose during the course of the project.

Chapter 5 includes a detailed description of the toolkit materials that were developed in partnership with project stakeholders. I discuss each of the four toolkit components: the Classroom Activity Sets, the Recommended Readings List, the Community Heritage Resources Guide, and the Guest Speaker Form. For each I provide a description of the format and content as well as an account of how they evolved in response to community input. Copies of the toolkit materials are available in the appendix of this thesis.

In the sixth and final chapter, I reflect on the research process by reviewing my goals and objectives and determining whether or not they were properly met. I also discuss some of the difficulties inherent in using a collaborative research model that archaeologists or other researchers should be aware of. Despite these issues, I recommend that archaeologists continue to design and participate in these types of projects, tailoring their efforts to accommodate the time and budget constraints of individual projects or outreach settings. To help with this, I conclude by suggesting several ways for future efforts at community-based archaeology education projects to expand or improve upon my research.
Chapter 2

Literature Review

The research design for this thesis project draws from the principles and literature of public archaeology, archaeology education, and community-based archaeology to construct a template for a specific outreach scenario: a collaborative archaeology education program executed on the local level. In this chapter I discuss why professional institutions and individual archaeologists have concluded that public outreach is our ethical obligation, one that also offers practical benefits for the field of CRM. Following this I examine archaeology education and community-based archaeology as two distinct yet complementary approaches to public outreach. After covering basic principles and notable examples, I suggest that combining aspects of both approaches will produce a research design that encourages CRM professionals to engage with local communities through collaborative, responsive research methods in order to produce archaeology-themed educational materials.

Public Archaeology

For archaeologists, public outreach opportunities come in a variety of forms. Professionals can volunteer to give tours of their research facilities, guide interested community members around an excavation site, or serve as guest speakers in classrooms. They can host workshops, speak with members of the media, and present their findings to people outside of the discipline, whether in a report for a city planner or a book written for a popular audience. They can also develop educational programs and materials or
collaborate with communities to design inclusive, responsive management plans.

Regardless of how they choose to engage the public, most professional organizations and individuals tend to cite two reasons for doing so.

The first reason is that public outreach is the ethical obligation of all professional archaeologists. In 1996 the Society for American Archaeology (SAA) adopted its *Principles of Archaeological Ethics*. According to Principle 4 of this document an archaeologist’s ethical obligations included enlisting public support for stewardship, explaining and promoting archaeological methods and concepts, and communicating professional interpretations of the past to the public (Society for American Archaeology 1996). The SAA further suggests that archaeologists who are unable to participate directly in these efforts “should encourage and support the efforts of others in these activities” (Society for American Archaeology 1996). Likewise, the Archaeological Institute of America (AIA) states in its *Code of Professional Standards* that “it is the responsibility of professional archaeologists to communicate with the general public about the nature of archaeological research and the importance of archaeological resources” (Archaeological Institute of America 1994). Among the archaeologist’s responsibilities to the public the AIA includes participating in educational initiatives, considering the impact of field work on local communities, inviting local participation in projects, and keeping the public informed of research findings (Archaeological Institute of America 1994).

This assertion that archaeologists have an ethical responsibility to communicate and engage with the public is grounded in the perception of archaeologists as both interpreters and stewards of the past. Because of our specialized knowledge and training,
we are granted a certain level of authority to interpret cultural resources and suggest management plans. However, this authority also places archaeologists in a reciprocal relationship with the communities associated with their project sites as well as the wider public audience. This is because the results of our research, such as interpretation and management plans, are for the most part directed at people outside of the discipline, people who despite their lack of formal training still have an interest in what is said about the past. Additionally, these same people can also claim a degree of investment in the resources that we are interpreting. The AIA Code of Professional Standards states that archaeologists have a responsibility to communicate with the general public because "the archaeological record represents the heritage of all people" (Archaeological Institute of America 1994). Larry Zimmerman echoes this sentiment by arguing that archaeologists who do not share their findings are stealing "from the public of whose heritage we say we are the stewards" (Zimmerman 2003:2).

The second reason that many archaeologists advocate public outreach is the practical desire to foster a public audience that is supportive of academic research and CRM projects. As Jeremy Sabloff points out, it is the public "that provides us with grants, or contracts, or jobs" (Sabloff 1998:873). To ensure that this support continues—or, preferably, increases—archaeologists must work to provide those outside the discipline with an understanding of what it is we do and why. Nancy Hawkins asserts that for most people "archaeology is synonymous with excavation" (Hawkins 2000:209). Yet archival research, laboratory processes, data analysis, publication and report-writing, curation, and outreach are all important aspects of the field as well. If archaeologists can
communicate this to the public it will contribute to a more nuanced, accurate public understanding of what responsible archaeology entails and how to fund it.

However, it is not enough to know what archaeologists do—we also have to explain why we do it. Public outreach programs can serve as opportunities to explain our goals of preservation and stewardship to non-archaeologists. They can also encourage critical discourse on how history is constructed and why interpretations of the past are relevant to both the present and future. Such discussions are not without controversy, since even among archaeologists opinions can differ. However, just posing the question allows archaeologists the opportunity to raise general awareness of the academic theories and ethical motivations behind their field. As Francis P. McManamon says, “a public that appreciates and understands archaeology and archaeological resources would be a public that abhorred site destruction and supported archaeological activities and preservation” (McManamon 2000:23). The first step towards receiving that type of support is effective and meaningful engagement with the public. Two different approaches to this step are archaeology education and community-based archaeology.

**Archaeology Education**

Archaeology education is an approach to public outreach that focuses on developing educational materials and programs for grades K-12 based on sites, artifacts, or other archaeology-based knowledge. It is also a way for archaeologists to take an active role in shaping what ideas children—the future public audience—form about the discipline. Many programs place emphasis on elementary and middle school students, particularly those in grades four through six. Incorporating archaeology into these grade
levels allows students to be exposed to methods and concepts at an early age, establishing a foundation for future interest and support. The most recent and comprehensive publication on the subject is Shelley J. Smith and Karolyn Smardz's *The Archaeology Education Handbook: Sharing the Past with Kids*. Bringing together 35 contributors and referencing the most successful programs of the last three decades, this volume covers a variety of topics, from aligning a message of stewardship to correspond with children's moral and cognitive developments to teaching archaeology to students with special needs.

**Basic Principles**

Overall, archaeology education programs are built around three principles: portraying archaeology as an interdisciplinary field, communicating the stewardship message, and collaborating with educators to produce useable and relevant teaching materials.

As Smith and Smardz note in their introduction, “archaeology is a superb teaching subject” because it is “interdisciplinary, participatory, and perfect for developing both cognitive and affective skills in children” (Smith and Smardz 2000:28). While the most obvious application may be to history lessons, cultural knowledge gained from archaeological research can contextualize and give depth to the subjects of art, music, and literature. Additionally, archaeological research methods can be used to teach measuring and graphing skills in math and well as plant and animal identification in the life sciences.

The field's inherent diversity also lends itself well to creating activities that appeal to a variety of learning styles. For example, Victor W. Geraci maintains that
archaeology-themed teaching materials fit naturally into the framework of Howard Gardner's multiple intelligences model. Based on how they process and retain information, Gardner divides learners into seven groups or “intelligences”: verbal/linguistic, logical/mathematical, visual/spatial, body/kinesthetic, musical/rhythmic, interpersonal, and intrapersonal (Geraci 2000:94, 96). Archaeology education materials can easily be designed to appeal to any of these intelligences. Exercises that involve descriptive report-writing, sketching objects, measuring and mapping artifacts, and simulated excavations are only a few of the many possibilities. In the hands of creative and dedicated program designers the potential for innovative applications of archaeology to classroom settings is far-reaching and encouraging.

Another key principle of archaeology education is promoting the stewardship of cultural resources. Jeanne M. Moe describes a classroom activity from the Project Archaeology program in which students discuss the spiritual significance of rock art, create their own pieces, and then come back from a break to find their creations defaced by “vandals.” According to Moe, this activity encourages teachers “to infuse ethics such as responsibility for our shared legacy” into lessons and to let students “discover the emotional impact of senseless vandalism” committed against the archaeological record (Moe 2000a:258). Having students engage with the destruction or defacement of cultural resources on a personal level makes it more likely that they will retain the memory of that lesson as they grow older. Hopefully, students will recognize that these resources are fragile and that those who destroy them thoughtlessly are depriving others of the knowledge and cultural significance that they provide. Just as archaeologists who perform public outreach believe that their efforts can lead to a more understanding and
supportive public, archaeology educators argue that “teaching children to value the past and archaeological resources today will reap enormous benefits in protection of resources in the future” (Wolyneć 2000:114).

The final principle of archaeology education emphasizes close collaboration between archaeologists and educators when developing programs and classroom materials. John H. Jameson, Jr., notes that “many past failures in the realm of public interpretation … have resulted from intrinsic differences in perspective between archaeologists and professional interpreters and educators” (Jameson 2000:296). While archaeologists primarily want to communicate accurate information and the message of stewardship, educators often use archaeology as a means of teaching a particular subject or educational standard. The most successful programs are those designed by a collaborative team of teachers and archaeologists working to address both party’s goals.

Although they involve archaeologists giving up a degree of control over content, partnerships with teachers should be seen as preferable, rather than just necessary. As educator George Brauer observes, teachers can offer “skills in planning, organization, and student management” that transform materials from well-intentioned but dreaded “extra work” to efficient and engaging resources. (Jeppson and Brauer 2008:244). While archaeologists provide the information and moral message, teacher input can translate that into a workable lesson plan that takes into account student learning styles, teachers’ time and budgetary constraints, and statewide educational standards. Patricia Wheat articulates the critical nature of this partnership, warning archaeologists that if they want materials to “actually reach the kids, not once but repeatedly over a teacher’s career, [they] must be useful in meeting existing and acknowledged needs” (Wheat 2000:118).
Some Examples

Over the past thirty years successful archaeology education programs have been implemented in the United States on national, state, and county levels. Two prominent national efforts are the Bureau of Land Management’s Project Archaeology, and Teaching With Historic Places, a program launched by the National Register of Historic Places. Project Archaeology was created in 1990 to teach elementary and middle school students about archaeological methods and conservation issues. Often referenced in archaeology education literature, Project Archaeology grew from a statewide initiative in Utah to a national program established in 23 states and currently being developed in 18 more (Project Archaeology 2009). Students are taught “the basic concepts and processes of archaeology” through a series of classroom activities designed to supplement a school's existing curriculum (Moe 2000b:279). As previously mentioned, lessons also have a strong stewardship message that aims to leave students “equipped to make wise decisions concerning the use and protection of archaeological sites” (Moe 2000b:279).

Teaching With Historic Places (TWHP) is a program created by the National Register of Historic Places in 1991 with the goal of “using historic sites to explore American history” (Teaching With Historic Places 2008). TWHP produces lesson plans designed around specific historic properties, but like Project Archaeology's they are designed to address topics that “in some way amplify or extend elements of the required curriculum” (Metcalf 2002:174). Created for middle school students, the program's activities are developed through the combined efforts of National Park Service
interpreters, preservation professionals, and teachers (Teaching With Historic Places 2008).

The majority of archaeology education programs have manifested on the state level. One notable example is Massachusetts’ ongoing “Big Dig” education program (Lewis 2008:300). In 1997 the Massachusetts Historical Commission (MHC) received several artifacts from archaeological work done on Boston’s Central Artery/Third Harbor Tunnel project, a federal undertaking subject to the section 106 process and known locally as the “Big Dig.” To publicize and utilize their new collections the MHC created a series of lesson plans for grades 5 through 8 that were distributed to schools throughout Massachusetts. Each lesson plan presented the results of excavation at a Big Dig site and introduced students to “a specialized aspect of archaeological study,” such as analyzing plant and insect remains or using historical documents to research glass bottle production (Lewis 2008:303). This attention to specialization emphasizes the multidisciplinary nature of archaeology and increases its chance to appeal to students with different interests.

Another example of a statewide program includes Louisiana’s 1981 archaeology education initiative spearheaded by the state archaeologist’s office. The program produced a series of posters and classroom activities designed to teach students about Louisiana prehistory, including an activity guide entitled Classroom Archaeology (Hawkins 2000: 214). The guide’s emphasis was on offering teachers short, self-contained activities that were tailored to their needs. Nancy Hawkins notes that “the best-received activities can stand alone (are nonsequential), inexpensive to implement, and usable even without previous background” (Hawkins 2000:214). In later years the
creators of *Classroom Archaeology* noticed that they were getting more and more requests for activities based on specific local sites, which they eventually provided.

As Louisiana teachers observed, it is much more difficult to find archaeology education programs focused on the local history of a specific city or county. A significant exception is Baltimore County School District's "archaeology-infused" curriculum, first launched in 1984 in Baltimore, Maryland (Jeppson and Brauer 2008:231). This program incorporates archaeology-themed materials into state-required curriculum for second grade literature, third grade social studies, and fourth grade local history. Special care is taken to communicate responsible messages through the materials, and students are taught that "archaeology is not a treasure seeking venture but rather a process for learning about the past" (Jeppson and Brauer 2008:241). Because it weaves archaeology into other subjects, the Baltimore County School District program is able to communicate the message of stewardship to a variety of age groups in multiple ways. Although its success is encouraging, there is definitely room in the field of archaeology education for more programs like Baltimore's that focus on giving students personal connections to archaeology through local history-themed lessons.

**Community-based Archaeology**

Like archaeology education, community-based archaeology is a form of outreach that seeks to promote stewardship of cultural resources through public engagement. However, where archaeology education focuses on providing materials for an audience of teachers and students, community-based archaeology actively brings stakeholder groups into the management process. Because the concept of a "community" is so fluid, these
stakeholder groups can range from local history enthusiasts to Native American tribal representatives or other descendant communities. And depending on who is involved, research models and goals of community-based projects can take on a variety of forms.

**Basic Principles**

Despite this variability most community-based archaeology projects share two main principles: ongoing and meaningful collaboration with community stakeholders, and a research model with goals that evolve in response to stakeholder input. While collaboration may seem to be an obvious part of a community-based project, it actually involves a renegotiation of the traditional power relations associated with CRM. As Emma Waterton puts it, “the idea of the ‘expert’ has created a gap between ‘heritage’, ‘management’ and ‘people’” (Waterton 2005:313). Because “experts” are usually affiliated with universities or institutions they are often perceived as the primary, if not only, authoritative sources of information. While the specialized knowledge and training that archaeologists possess should be recognized, an unfortunate result of this is the characterization of community knowledge as incidental or supplementary. This leads to the ingrained assumption on both sides that the processes of identifying and managing cultural resources should be left to the experts.

Community-based archaeology seeks to redistribute this imbalance of power by encouraging stakeholders to actively participate in the management process. Yvonne Marshall considers a key characteristic of community-based projects to be “that at every step in a project at least partial control remains with the community” (Marshall 2002:212). This means that archaeologists go beyond what Shelley Greer and her
colleagues refer to as "the reactive approach," where archaeologists develop research goals, carry out fieldwork, and draw conclusions with no local input, only allowing communities to "react" to what has already been done (Greer et al. 2002:268). For community-based projects to be successful their efforts at collaboration must be genuine. This means not only soliciting stakeholder participation at every stage of the project, but ensuring that stakeholders do not feel like lesser or incidental contributors. For Katherine M. Dowdall and Otis O. Parrish, mutual respect and "treating each other’s work as having legitimate social value" were critical components of the strategy employed during their collaborative project between the California Department of Transportation and the Kashaya Pomo tribe (Dowdall and Parrish 2003:110).

The second principle of community-based archaeology is a responsive research model whose goals serve stakeholder needs as well as those of archaeologists. This is an extension of the collaboration principle and usually involves having the project produce some kind of benefit for stakeholders or an acknowledgement of their values. For Dowdall and Parrish this translated into the concept of inclusivity, which they define as "devising a collaboration where goals and methods of both the Kashaya people and the archaeologists are given equal attention" (Dowdall and Parrish 2003:108). While discussing stakeholder involvement in the context of the National Register of Historic Places, Morgan et al. suggest that there “should be greater involvement of communities in determining which places on the landscape are important” (Morgan et al. 2006:710). In this scenario community members’ values would be acknowledged by having those locations which they deem significant receive official government recognition. Similarly, John P. McCarthy and his colleagues worked to provide the African-American
community of Philadelphia with tangible benefits for their collaboration during an ongoing excavation of historical African-American burial grounds. One of these involved archaeologists working with the local Afro-American Historical and Cultural Museum to develop on-site interpretive materials that helped engage the community with the excavation (McCarthy 2008:309).

Some Examples

As Marshall writes, "North America has a long and distinguished history of work in community archaeology" (Marshall 2002:212). In particular, the four projects described below exemplify close collaboration with stakeholders as well as a responsive research model that takes into account the goals and desires of the community.

The Caltrans Cypress Archaeology Project was a joint effort conducted by the California Department of Transportation and the Archaeological Studies Center at Sonoma State University. Located in West Oakland, archaeologists surveyed and excavated the site of a proposed freeway rebuilding project initiated in response to damage caused by the 1989 Loma Prieta earthquake. Janet Pape recalls that archaeologists produced several outreach materials for the Cypress project that were enhanced by community members contributing family photographs and oral histories significant to the project area (Pape 2008:379). One example was the traveling exhibit describing the local history of African-American sleeping car porters developed in partnership with the African-American Museum and Library at Oakland. Local families contributed photographs and personal effects to the exhibit, and one retired porter volunteered to speak at each exhibit location in order to share his memories with the
public (Pape 2008:383-384). Pape suggests that one of the reasons the Cypress project’s outreach products were so well-received was that they helped the community associate on a personal level with the research being conducted (Pape 2008:386).

John P. McCarthy’s CRM project in Philadelphia was briefly mentioned earlier, but deserves further attention here. While constructing a new expressway archaeologists uncovered a number of historical African-American cemeteries associated with the First African Baptist Church of Philadelphia (FABC). Once the connection became apparent McCarthy and his colleagues “sought positive engagement with the Philadelphia African American community” that would persist over the course of the project (McCarthy 2008:309). This included bringing local African-American historians and folklorists onto the project teams, designing the aforementioned interpretive materials alongside the Afro-American Historical and Cultural Museum, and collecting oral histories and other cultural information from the current FABC congregation (McCarthy 2008:310). As an example of research being conducted with the interests and goals of community stakeholders in mind, the congregation was continuously updated as to the project’s progress and ultimately participated in the ceremonial reburial of the remains following its conclusion.

Carol McDavid’s efforts to publically interpret the Levi Jordan Plantation site in Brazoria County, Texas, included what she refers to as a “both/and” approach by which she hoped to tell the stories of both the slaves and the plantation owners, “without doing either at the expense of the other” (McDavid 1997:118). Because several descendants of the plantation slaves and owners still live in the surrounding area, McDavid conducted several formal and informal interviews to determine what these descendants thought
about an “inclusive” approach to public interpretation, as well as how they perceived their own family histories (McDavid 1997:114). The purpose of this was to actively involve stakeholders in both the content and structure of the Levi Jordan Plantation’s public interpretation materials. McDavid characterized her approach to this community engagement as “reflective” and “proactive” (McDavid 1997:119). She tried to construct interviews as dialogues, rather than simple question and answer sessions, and worked to respond to concerns raised by stakeholders. One interviewee asked McDavid several pointed questions about her research, including what McDavid intended to do with the results of their interview, whether the community would have access to the data, and how the community would benefit from the project (McDavid 1997:121). Realizing that several of her interviewees must have been wondering the same thing, McDavid responded in detail about the project’s community-oriented emphasis and adjusted her interviewing strategies to account for this issue.

As previously mentioned, Katherine Dowdall and Otis Parrish were among several who collaborated on a CRM project initiated by the California Department of Transportation and located in traditional Kashaya Pomo territory. Dowdall and Parrish state that archaeologists and the Kashaya people had a shared goal of “combining the processes used to conduct archaeology with those used to maintain the Kashaya Pomo cultural landscape” (Dowdall and Parrish 2003:100). To this end the project members established four principles of collaboration. Efforts at inclusivity, mentioned in the previous section, manifested as project members giving equal weight to both archaeological research methods and Kashaya Pomo methods of preserving the cultural significance of a landscape, such as communicating dreams and enacting ceremonies
Reciprocity tied into a traditional Kashaya belief that "the giving of knowledge requires a sacrifice from those who are receiving it" (Dowdall and Parrish 2003: 108). Along with the principle of mutual respect, this encouraged project members to consider Kashaya Pomo traditional knowledge as legitimate sources of information that have social value and require sacrifice, often in the form of financial compensation, to receive. The final principle developed on the project was an equal emphasis on both process and product. According to Dowdall and Parrish, the project constantly sought to balance the Kashaya people’s desire to conduct the collaboration process in a mutually respectful way with the California Department of Transportation’s goal of successfully delivering the final report. Although the authors acknowledge that such balance can be difficult, they assure readers that “the collaborative process has never been circumvented for a deadline” (Dowdall and Parrish 2003:110).

**Proposing a Hybrid Research Model**

Archaeology education and community-based archaeology developed as separate responses to the question posed by public archaeology: how can professionals engage the public with archaeology in a way that encourages support for and interest in cultural resources? While both approaches have produced several successful projects, the wide range of classroom settings and community interests means that both are also constantly developing in response to new data and new situations. In the spirit of this development, I propose that each approach can be helpfully informed by the other’s experiences and skill sets.
The collaborative efforts of archaeologists and educators have yielded several useful strategies for reaching a crucial section of the public audience: precollegiate students. Yet most programs have been implemented on a statewide level, producing more general materials instead of focusing on the history and resources local to a particular city. Community-based archaeology has developed collaborative practices that challenge traditional power relations as well as responsive research models that adjust themselves to stakeholder input. Yet as we have seen in the literature these efforts are often tied to a single project, a structure that runs the risk of community engagement dwindling after the initial project is completed.

Combining aspects of both approaches can help address these issues. Archaeology education would benefit from the local-level focus exhibited by community-based archaeology projects. The demand for local-themed materials witnessed by Hawkins could be met with programs that focus on the history of a school’s surrounding neighborhood and engage students with the legacy of local historical figures. Collaboration with educators could be expanded to include stakeholder groups, providing a broader base of community support for archaeology education programs. Similarly, educational materials could be designed to actively reference and engage local institutions such as museums and libraries, placing their goals alongside those of teachers and archaeologists. Finally, the responsive and collaborative methods of community-based archaeology could be directed towards a more permanent end goal: providing materials that will be used by teachers in classrooms year after year. By doing this researchers could apply the best of both approaches to an uncommon outreach scenario:
the local-level archaeology education project. As will be discussed in the following chapter, designing and implementing this type of project is the premise of my research.
Chapter 3

Project Description

Community-based Methods, Educational Goals

After examining the literature on archaeology education and community-based archaeology I decided to design an outreach project that combined aspects of both. Using the collaborative, responsive methods of community-based archaeology I would establish partnerships with various stakeholder groups in a relatively small-scale community. The purpose of these partnerships would be to generate local history-themed education materials that also communicated key CRM concepts and were designed for use in local schools.

Following Greer and her colleagues' advice to avoid "reactive" research, I intended to include stakeholders at every stage of the process, allowing their input and needs to dictate the general direction of research. Similarly, the concept of the teaching materials as a tangible product of research intended for community use came from McCarthy and colleagues' development of outreach materials for the FABC project in Philadelphia. The intent of the materials themselves were—as with most other archaeology education products—to display archaeology's versatility through a variety of activities, to communicate the stewardship message, and to account for the needs and constraints faced by classroom teachers.

The general trends of archaeology education also influenced which age group the materials would be designed for, as well as how archaeology would be portrayed in the associated activities. As mentioned in the previous chapter, most programs focus on
upper elementary and middle school audiences with an emphasis on fourth, fifth, and sixth grade. It is likely because these grades introduce students to the study of state, national, and global history, respectively, and archaeologists feel they are natural points at which to start discussing how one can learn about the past through material culture. My project materials were originally intended for fourth grade since I had planned to use local history and resources to provide students with a more personal context for the wider themes of California history. Yet shortly after the project began I was advised by Wendy Wright, the assistant superintendent for the Duarte school district, that third grade would be a better fit since it is the year that students are expected to learn about the history of their local community. While archaeology education materials designed for younger students are rare, third grade proved to be a perfect match for the way I had decided to incorporate CRM into the project’s teaching materials.

Although most archaeology education programs tend to create materials centered on fieldwork skills like mapping and excavation, I chose instead to focus on communicating what I considered to be foundational CRM concepts. As many teachers and archaeologists have come to realize, activities designed to engage children through the active, multidisciplinary tasks associated with fieldwork are valuable teaching tools. Yet I felt that having children understand why archaeologists study the past was just as important as having them know how. While creating dynamic activities was still a priority, I intended the focus of the project materials to be on teaching students new ways of thinking about the past and promoting responsible behavior towards cultural resources. This approach is particularly relevant for younger audiences; having children’s first exposure to archaeology be ideas about preservation and stewardship rather than exotic
adventures or novel activities could help to nurture the idea of CRM as an important means of interpreting, preserving, and protecting the past.

**Defining the Community**

After establishing that I was going to design a community-based archaeology education program that would produce CRM-themed teaching materials for elementary school classrooms, I had to consider where such a project could be successfully implemented. Although "community" is a complex term and can be defined by many factors, for the purposes of this project I decided that it would refer to the people living and working within a single city, preferably with a school district containing no more than six elementary schools. Cities with active programs, groups, or policies related to local history or preservation would likely produce more stakeholders willing to volunteer their time and knowledge to the project. However, no city would be disregarded due to a lack of formally-recognized cultural resources.

I decided to work with a smaller city because of the logistical benefits that it would provide for a project based heavily on active and ongoing collaboration with multiple stakeholder groups. First, the smaller size of the project area would help set a reasonable limit to the number of stakeholders. Secondly, a smaller project area and fewer stakeholder groups would also make coordinating meetings easier since there would be fewer schedules to match up and less distance for people to cover. Finally, a smaller setting for the project would increase the likelihood of stakeholders being familiar with each other and with the local resources in their area, making it easier to initiate dialogue and collaboration.
In addition to a city of a manageable size, I also wanted to locate the project in one that had some displayed interest in the management of their local history. This could include an active historical society, museums or historic properties, or a recurring history-themed event put on by the city or other interested groups. The reason for this was primarily so that I could base my efforts around some pre-existing interest of the community, but I also took into account that this kind of local interest might also indicate how willing community members would be to volunteer time to my project.

While I did take into consideration the presence of local interest in history, I decided not to limit potential project sites to cities that had active digs, local CRM firms, or other obvious indicators of a strong archaeological presence. Although I wanted my record of the collaborative process to serve as a template for others in the field of CRM, the reality is that small cities with an active CRM presence are rare. Rather than set my project in an ideal setting I remained open to the possibility of piloting this kind of program in a city where the archaeological resources were not as obvious or accessible.

**Goals and Objectives**

The premise for this research was created by combining two separate approaches to public archaeology. This led to the development of two research goals, each inspired by a different approach. From community-based archaeology came the goal of documenting the collaborative, responsive strategies employed during research and using them to create a project template for future local-level archaeology education efforts. This was intended to serve as a reference for other CRM professionals looking to design similar outreach projects. The template would discuss basic research principles and
successful strategies as well as any problems or issues that arose with implementing a community-based outreach project. The second research goal, inspired by archaeology education, was to produce a set of local history-themed teaching materials that reflected the perspectives of multiple stakeholders, addressed the needs of classroom teachers, and communicated basic CRM concepts. While the materials would be designed primarily for use by community members, CRM professionals might also use them as a starting point for designing outreach products of their own.

To achieve these goals I set four objectives for myself. The first was to form partnerships with community stakeholders for the purpose of sustaining ongoing collaboration. Community members were to be engaged at every step of the research process, and their input was meant to guide not just the content of the teaching materials, but the structure of the collaborative process as well. The narrative record of how I established and maintained these partnerships would be the basis for the project template. This objective was created to ensure that my interactions with stakeholders were conducted according to the community-based archaeology principles of genuine collaboration and responsiveness. It served as the backbone of my research and became the guide for all of my interactions with community stakeholders.

My second objective was to use the teaching materials as a way to publicize and utilize local cultural resources as well as any resources in the community that were related to local history. Because I created these objectives before selecting a location for the project, this one was designed to respond to the needs of general community groups that might be interested in promoting and protecting the local history of their city. Possible examples included historical societies, museums, libraries, or local government.
Drawing again from community-based archaeology, this objective attempts to have the research process acknowledge the values of community stakeholders by increasing awareness of the resources that they find meaningful.

My third objective was to ensure that the creation of the project's teaching materials took into account the needs and constraints of local elementary school teachers. As discussed in the previous chapter, archaeology education literature frequently stresses the importance of collaboration between archaeologists and educators when creating classroom materials, primarily because the goals and expectations of each party are so different. Designing materials with teachers in mind increases the likelihood that they will actually be used in the classroom. Examples of doing this include familiarizing oneself with curriculum content standards for the target grade and subject and taking into account limited time or budgets when designing activities. This objective brings in an important principle of archaeology education and speaks directly to the goal of creating project materials that are relevant to teachers.

Finally, my fourth objective was to conduct the project in a way that allowed for the inclusion and discussion of basic CRM concepts. As mentioned earlier, I decided to have the project materials focus on teaching students how to think about the past and interact responsibly with cultural resources. Fortunately, this approach worked whether or not my stakeholders and I had access to active sites, large collections of artifacts, or formally-recorded historic properties. Regardless of the available resources, I planned to bring these concepts into the collaborative meetings with stakeholders. This would ensure that these concepts were not just influencing the final teaching materials, but were also being introduced to and discussed by teachers and other community members. The
point of this objective was to create an awareness of the goals of CRM in students, teachers, and community members, speaking to the basic function of this project as a CRM outreach effort.

Project Design: Process and Product

My project was designed in two sections: the collaborative research process which would be reflected in the template, and the teaching materials that it would produce. I began my fieldwork with a basic idea of how each would be organized. Still, I kept in mind the flexible, responsive research practices of community-based archaeology and fully expected both the process and the product to evolve in response to stakeholder input. To accommodate this I kept my original project design as open and flexible as possible, while making sure that each aspect was geared towards achieving my objectives. More information on how my approach to the collaborative process changed over time will be provided in Chapter 4. Chapter 5 will detail how the teaching materials, hereafter referred to as the teacher's toolkit or toolkit, also evolved over the course of the project.

Community Collaboration

The first section of my project design dealt with the collaborative process involving myself and community stakeholders. My plan was to identify the main groups in the community who might have a stake in a local history-themed project and initiate contact, explaining my research proposal to them and asking if they would like to be involved. After this first exchange I would maintain contact with those groups who had
agreed to participate through a series of phone calls, emails, and face-to-face meetings during which we would brainstorm ideas about the content and structure of the toolkit. I also planned to organize meetings between stakeholder groups to encourage members of the community to share their knowledge of local history resources with each other directly. This section was designed to help me achieve my first objective, which was to form collaborative partnerships with community stakeholders.

**Classroom Activity Sets**

The first piece of the toolkit was originally conceived as a five-part lesson plan designed to be taught over one week. It would cover a single topic or period of local history with each of the five pieces highlighting a different relevant cultural resource. This design was revised after input from stakeholders made it clear that a more flexible, piecemeal approach was favorable over a holistic, sequential set of materials. Based on this input the lesson plan was divided into two sets of three classroom activities, with each activity set addressing a different period of history.

Changing the lesson plan into two distinctive activity sets accomplished two things. First, it allowed more topics to be covered in self-contained segments. Instead of having five activities geared towards a single topic, teachers could choose between two differently-themed sets. This increases the likelihood that a teacher will find use for it at some point in his or her instruction. Secondly, changing the structure made the material shorter and easier for teachers to fit into an already busy schedule. Instead of putting aside a whole week’s worth of instruction time, they only need to fit in three half-hour
increments. Ultimately I felt that this design change served to make the material more flexible and responsive to teacher needs.

The classroom activities were designed to address three of my objectives. In accordance with my second objective each activity was to showcase a particular local cultural resource. Regarding the third objective, the content and structure of each activity would be built around social studies curriculum content standards while also taking into account different student learning styles. This would keep the activities relevant to teacher needs. Finally, my fourth objective would be served by having each activity have a different guiding theme derived from a basic CRM concept.

**Recommended Readings List**

Shortly after the project began I decided that a consolidated list of local history-themed books would be helpful to teachers. The Recommended Readings List is a list of available books and other reference materials available at the local library for teachers to either use in their classrooms or direct their students towards for outside research. Books on the Recommended Readings List are related to the two periods of local history covered in the Classroom Activity Sets. They can be fiction or nonfiction, at either an adult or children’s reading level. Teachers may use books on the list to supplement classroom activities, assign extra credit book reports, or use as content references for creating new activities.

While the list was not designed until after the project began, it still worked to achieve two of my project objectives. It publicized and utilized the local library as a resource for teachers as intended by the second objective. Also, it accounted for teacher
needs as mentioned in objective three by providing them with a quick and relevant guide to a local resource.

*Community Heritage Resources Guide*

The Community Heritage Resources Guide was originally planned to be an annotated list of cultural resources in the local area that teachers could use to supplement their classroom instruction. Initially the guide was going to be accompanied by a separate list of Community Contacts, individual members of the community who were willing to act as resources and contact points for teachers. However, over the course of the project the guide was expanded to include many kinds of local history-themed resources. It quickly became clear that all of the individuals on the Community Contacts list were also affiliated with institutions or groups listed in the guide. To avoid redundancy the contacts list was merged with the guide.

The Guide was designed to include historic properties, culturally significant locations for field trips, local institutions such as libraries and museums, and contact information for local CRM professionals willing to serve as guest speakers or contact points for future outreach projects. For each location, institution, or community group the Guide would have an entry with contact information and a summary of the services it offered to teachers.

The Community Heritage Resources Guide ended up being one of the most popular pieces of the toolkit, which is understandable since it was designed with all four objectives in mind. Because the purpose of the Guide was to pool community members' knowledge of local history-related resources, every stakeholder group had something to
contribute. This makes it relevant to my first objective regarding collaboration, since an ongoing dialogue with a community group is easier to maintain when they see that their input is being actively shaped into a product. As for my second and fourth objectives, the Guide is designed to increase the visibility and accessibility of local resources for community members, something that both CRM professionals and local history-minded community groups can appreciate. Finally, the efficient format plays to my third objective of keeping the toolkit materials relevant to teachers who can use the Guide as a quick and easy reference for supplementing their social studies lessons.

**Guest Speaker Form**

A major principle of archaeology education is effective communication between archaeologists and teachers. Several authors mention that one of the common difficulties in designing or implementing archaeology education programs is the difference in goals and expectations of archaeologists and educators. To help address this issue as well as expand on the collaborative theme of this thesis project I designed for the toolkit what I initially referred to as the Teacher/Archaeologist Interface Form. After it became evident that the form was flexible enough to be used in several situations, I changed the name to the Guest Speaker Form.

This piece of the toolkit was intended to be a form that a teacher could send electronically or through the mail to a local archaeologist who had expressed interest in being a guest speaker in his or her classroom. The form would provide the archaeologist with basic information about the event, from logistical factors such as the number of students to content issues such as what time period or themes the teacher would like to
see covered. On the other hand, an archaeologist could send the form to a teacher in order to get more information about what the teacher expected from the presentation. It could also be used for other guest speakers, such as tribal spokespersons or members of the local historical society.

The Guest Speaker Form was meant to address three of my objectives. Because it would be designed with input from both teachers and local CRM professionals, it addressed the first objective dealing with collaboration. Also, since both teachers and archaeologists were partners in creating the form, the goal was to make sure that the needs and values of both parties were represented, tying the form into objectives three and four.

**The City of Duarte**

After I had established my goals and objectives and designed a project to address them, the next step was to select a location for the project. I chose the city of Duarte, which is located in southern California at the foot of the San Gabriel Mountains, approximately 20 miles northeast of Los Angeles. Its boundaries are marked by the cities of Bradbury to the north, Monrovia to the west, Baldwin Park to the south, and Azusa to the east. A 2009 report by the Southern California Association of Governments recorded Duarte’s population at 22,953 (Southern California Association of Governments 2009:1). According to the report, 48.2 percent of Duarte’s population identified themselves as Hispanic/Latino, 26.8 percent as non-Hispanic white, 13.3 percent as Asian, 8.6 percent as African-American, 0.5 percent as Native American, and 2.6 percent as “other” (Southern California Association of Governments 2009:1).
Duarte was chosen as the site of this project based on the fact that it offered many favorable conditions as well as a few potential challenges. First, it fit my previously established criterion of a small city with a school district of a manageable size. Duarte Unified School District contains five elementary schools with about three third grade teachers each. I felt that this created a teacher stakeholder group that was small enough to be easily gathered but diverse enough to account for several different classroom settings and experiences.

Duarte also met my criterion for being a city with an expressed interest in local history. The Duarte General Plan for 2005-2020 had an entire chapter dedicated to Historic Preservation with a list of concrete goals, objectives, and policies. Among these the document states that the city of Duarte had a specific goal to “create an educational program which focuses on providing information to allow residents and decision-makers to make informed decisions and supportable conclusions about the protection of historic resources” (Duarte General Plan 2007:2). As a related policy the City also resolved to “encourage public outreach and access to historical information” (Duarte General Plan 2007:2). The Plan also proposed establishing “a database which identifies resources for obtaining information on Duarte’s historic resources” as well as “inventorying existing publications such as books, relating to Duarte’s history” (Duarte General Plan 2007:11).

Besides local government interest in history, Duarte also has an active historical society which acts in partnership with the Duarte Historical Museum. In 2007 the historical society completed their project to have a bronze statue of Andres Duarte, the Mexican ranch owner from whom Duarte takes its name, placed across the street from

Finally, there were two additional factors that I felt would make running a collaborative project in Duarte both intuitive and effective. First, Duarte is located only twenty minutes from where I grew up and attended school. Not only would I be able to relate to the school system, I would also have a basic familiarity with the local historical context and sequence of events. Secondly, my mother has taught kindergarten in the Duarte Unified School District for the past 37 years and I have been volunteering in her classroom since I was a teenager. Because of this, I have a personal connection to the teachers in Duarte public schools as well as a strong understanding of Duarte's district administration and educational policies. For a project in which building partnerships with community stakeholders was key, I felt that having knowledge of the historical context as well as a personal familiarity with the school system could only help me in the collaboration process.

While all of these conditions made Duarte a favorable setting for this project, choosing Duarte also presented some challenges. A preliminary search revealed no legally-recognized historic properties within the city limits and very few intact historic structures. There were no active excavations and no CRM firms located within Duarte itself. The museum offered a collection of texts, photographs, maps, and artifacts dating from the mid-1800s, but there was no formally organized guide to cultural or history-themed resources available to Duarte community members. Yet as I mentioned earlier I had decided that finding a city with abundant and accessible cultural resources or some other kind of strong archaeology presence would be unlikely. I ultimately chose Duarte
as the site of this project because conditions indicated that the community would be receptive and willing to collaborate, and also because it was an opportunity to pilot a local-level archaeology education outreach program in a setting where the cultural resources are still in the process of being uncovered and managed.

_Duarte History_

Because local history is the focus of this project, this section is designed to provide a brief account of Duarte's history. The resources used to create this account were compiled based on independent research as well as the recommendation of local teachers, Duarte City Hall employees, Duarte Historical Museum staff, Gabrielino/Tongva tribal members, and the American Indian Studies Center at UCLA.

Duarte history tends to be divided into four general periods: the Gabrielino/Tongva Period, the Spanish Period, the Mexican Period, and the American Period. While the materials of the toolkit focused on the Gabrielino/Tongva and the Mexican ranching days, all four periods will be discussed below.

_Gabrielino/Tongva Period_

Archaeological and linguistic findings suggest that the cultural group referred to today as the Gabrielino/Tongva, or simply “Tongva,” first arrived in the Los Angeles basin around 500 B.C. The Tongva spoke a language in the Takic family, which is a branch of the larger Uto-Aztecan linguistic group (Bean and Smith 1978:538). When they arrived in the basin from the southwest and slowly displaced the native inhabitants this created a visible “wedge” whereupon the linguistically-distinctive Tongva were
flanked to the north and south by indigenous Hokan-speakers (Bean and Smith 1978:540).

Before contact with Europeans the Tongva were semi-nomadic hunter-gatherers whose territory encompassed the Los Angeles basin, portions of the Santa Monica and Santa Ana mountain ranges, and the islands of San Nicolas, Santa Catalina and San Clemente. Settlements were situated near water sources and included both continuously-occupied subsistence villages and seasonally-occupied gathering camps (Bean and Smith 1978:539). For Tongva living in the area that is now Duarte dietary staples included acorns, plants, and game animals like rabbits, deer, and squirrels (Bean and Smith 1978:538; Moore and Watson 1976:1).

Pre-contact Tongva did not have a single name for themselves. Rather, they identified as members of politically autonomous villages. Within these villages families were organized and socially ranked by lineages: groups of families that shared a common ancestor as traced through male relatives (Jurmain and McCawley 2009:141). Usually a village’s political leader was the head of its most dominant lineage group. Outside of lineages, Tongva society was divided into three hereditary social classes: the chiefs and shamans, the bureaucrats and skilled craftsmen, and the rest of the population (Jurmain and McCawley 2009:11).

The Tongva were also part of a barter trade network extending as far east as central Arizona. Tongva in the Duarte area would have primarily traded acorns, seeds, obsidian and deerskins, though other popular exchange items included woven baskets, raw or carved steatite from Santa Catalina Island, and olivella shell bead currency (Bean and Smith 1978:547).
**Spanish Period**

The Tongva first encountered Spanish explorers in 1542 when an expedition led by Juan Rodriguez Cabrillo landed on their shores. Another meeting occurred in 1602 with Sebastián Viscaino, in which the Tongva reportedly received him with hospitality (Bean and Smith 1978:540). However, in response to competitive pressure from other nations Spanish began formal and permanent attempts to colonize California lands, beginning in 1769 with the construction of presidios, pueblos, and missions (Moore and Watson 1976:3).

Founded in 1771 by Spanish missionaries, Mission San Gabriel Arcángel was moved to its current location in 1775 due to the original site’s tendency to flood (Moore and Watson 1976:6). The land that would become the city of Duarte was owned by the mission and used primarily for cattle grazing. The practical goals of the missions were to help establish a permanent Spanish presence in California, as well as provide food and other goods to the soldiers at the presidios. However, missionaries were also expected to convert the indigenous population to Christianity and teach them European-style farming and trade skills.

In the Los Angeles basin, large numbers of Tongva converted and became the primary labor force on mission lands—frequently by force. Because of their proximity to the mission they were called *Gabrieleños* by the Spanish and those that came after (Bean and Smith 1978:538). Beginning in this period the Tongva population and use of the language proceeded to decline. Many Tongva died from foreign diseases and violent clashes with the Spanish colonists. Although they were defeated each time, Tongva
living both inside and outside of San Gabriel Mission staged five major revolts against the missionaries between 1771 and 1810 (Jurmain and McCawley 2009:16).

**Mexican Period**

In 1821 the colony of Mexico won independence from Spain while retaining control over the California territories. One of the first actions of the new government was to secularize the missions and distribute former mission lands through a land grant program. One of the citizens who applied for such a grant was Andres Avelino Duarte. Born in California and baptized on November 30, 1805 at Mission San Juan, Duarte joined the newly-formed Mexican army at age sixteen and eventually advanced to the rank of corporal (Margiloff and Earle 2009:10). Andres Duarte served as *mayor domo* at Mission San Gabriel and spent most of his time monitoring the lands along the Río Azusa, now called the San Gabriel River (Moore and Watson 1976:16; Margiloff and Earle 2009:10). He was honorably discharged from the army at age 36 and applied for a land grant that would give him ownership of a small piece of former mission lands west of the river for grazing his cattle and horses.

Duarte’s grant was approved in 1841 by Governor Juan B. Alvarado, and he named his land the Rancho Azusa de Duarte (Margiloff and Earle 2009:11). Referring to the *diseño*, or sketch map, that accompanied Duarte’s application, a local history book describes the parameters of the rancho as being bordered by the San Gabriel Mountains to the north and the San Gabriel River to the east (Moore and Watson 1976: 18). To the west was Hugo Reid’s Rancho Santa Anita, which today encompasses the cities of Arcadia, Monrovia, Sierra Madre, Pasadena, and San Marino. Duarte’s southern
neighbor was Henry Dalton and his Rancho San Francisquito, which today would cover the cities of El Monte, Irwindale, and Temple City.

The land grant required Duarte to build and occupy a dwelling on the rancho, the remains of which have been incorporated into a late-Victorian frame house that is still located on Tocino Drive in the city of Duarte (Margiloff and Earle 2009:14). In 1843 Andres Duarte registered his own personal cattle brand, a stylized lowercase “d” which today is a well-recognized symbol of the City of Duarte (Margiloff and Earle 2009:14).

The American Period

Established in the aftermath of the Mexican-American War, the 1848 Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo transferred ownership of California from Mexico to the United States of America. As a result of the change in government the land grants issued by Mexico were reviewed for legitimacy by American courts. Although his claim was ultimately found to be valid, the prolonged court proceedings dragged out until after Duarte’s death. In the meantime, Duarte had much land but little cash, and began selling off land to pay debts and court fees starting in 1855 (Margiloff and Earle 2009:16). Portions of the rancho were eventually granted to prominent Duarte settlers such as Michael Whistler, Nehemiah Beardslee, and William Wolfskill (Margiloff and Earle 2009:16-17). These new owners subdivided and sold their pieces of the rancho as new settlers came into the area and the land that would become the city of Duarte grew more populated. Ultimately Duarte lost his rancho in 1862 and died a year later.

The years between the dissolution of the rancho and the turn of the century in Duarte were characterized by a rapid influx of immigrants which was aided by railroad
construction as well as Duarte's own brief gold rush in 1866 (Moore and Watson 1976:23). This was also a time of horticultural experimentation, which combined with Duarte's "practically frost-free zone" and favorable soil conditions led to Duarte making significant contributions to the growing citrus industry of California (Moore and Watson 1976:45). During the first half of the 1900s commercial horticulture had taken hold of Duarte with the help of the Southern California Fruit Exchange, and Duarte oranges won several state and national honors (Schrode 1948:109, Moore and Watson 1976:47).

There were several packing houses located in Duarte, and the local museum has a display of the 28 brands under which Duarte fruit was sold (Margiloff and Earle 2009:45).

After World War II Florida had established dominance in the citrus industry and many of Duarte's orange groves "were rapidly giving in to the subdivider's axe" (Moore and Watson 1976:141). However, residents had other concerns as neighboring cities made increasingly frequent efforts to annex Duarte lands. In June of 1956 the city of Azusa voted to annex 1,335 acres of land west of the San Gabriel River which had until that point been considered Duarte land (Moore and Watson 1976:145). This led to a prolonged debate between the two cities regarding the location of their official boundaries with Duarte insisting that the river was the boundary and Azusa countering that the actual border lay further west. Ultimately, Duarte filed for and was granted incorporation as a city with the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors in 1957.

Current Duarte Institutions

Once Duarte was chosen as the site of this project my first goal was to identify the major community groups who were involved in teaching and preserving local history.
The first three groups that I identified were the Duarte Unified School District, the Duarte Historical Museum, and Duarte City Hall's Community Development Department.

The Duarte Unified School District encompasses one high school, one middle school, and five elementary schools. During my research and project design I had cast classroom teachers as a primary stakeholder group. However, before I could approach any individual teachers about participating in my project I had to first present my idea to the school district. My contact in the district was Assistant Superintendent Wendy Wright. Through her I was granted access to the elementary school principals, and through the principals I was able to arrange meetings with the third grade teachers.

As the parent institution of the Duarte Historical Society, the Duarte Historical Museum became a very important collaborative partner as well as a source of information regarding Duarte's past. In addition to artifacts and historical documents, the museum also housed copies of the three primary texts published on Duarte history. My contact for the museum was Irwin Margiloff, the museum's curator and co-author of the previously mentioned *Images of America* volume on Duarte history.

After reading the chapter on Historic Preservation in the city's *General Plan* I decided to approach city hall and ask if they would like to be involved in the project. The Plan cited the Community Development Department as the specific branch of city hall responsible for implementing many of the policies mentioned in the document, so I contacted city planner Irma Hernandez to explain the project and ask further questions about other documents cited in the Plan. City hall's involvement lessened as the toolkit began to focus on pre-American Period content, yet Irma remained an important contact who provided early support and momentum for the project.
While my network of community stakeholders expanded as the project progressed, these three Duarte institutions provided input and direction from the very beginning. My interactions with these first project partners set the collaborative tone for the rest of the process, detailed in the next chapter.
Chapter 4

Methods

As mentioned in the last chapter, one of the goals of this research was to produce a template for a local-level outreach program that combines research methods from community-based archaeology with the goals of archaeology education. I planned to create this project template by recording the collaborative process by which my partners and I produced the toolkit materials, a process which eventually came to be called the Duarte Heritage Toolkit Project.

What follows is an account of this project, beginning with a discussion of the basic principles I used to guide my research process. This is followed by a narrative of the strategies I employed over the course of the project. Finally, I conclude by discussing the issues and difficulties that compelled me to adjust my methods. Hopefully other researchers will find the step-by-step process of coordinating the Duarte Heritage Toolkit Project to be helpful in designing future CRM outreach programs.

Guiding Principles of Research

I drew two key principles from the literature on archaeology education and community-based archaeology. The first is the importance of ongoing, responsive collaboration with community stakeholder groups. Rather than seeking input once at the beginning or end of a project, community-based archaeology practitioners advocate an active, continuous effort to engage stakeholders at all stages of the management process. Additionally, Waterton argues that “the role of the stakeholder must be expanded and
This suggests that archaeologists should not only solicit community input more frequently, but give said input greater weight in the design and implementation of management plans. Such actions will encourage stakeholders to be considered, by both archaeologists and themselves, as actual collaborative partners instead of formalities or afterthoughts.

The second principle is the necessity of designing educational materials with the needs and constraints of teachers in mind. Smith and Smardz assert that successful archaeology education products “are user friendly, well designed, relevant, and accessible,” assuring “that teachers will return to them again and again” (Smith and Smardz 2000:29). While designing such products may seem like no small task, there are actually several ways for archaeologists to create teacher-friendly materials. Time and budget restrictions can be addressed by limiting the length of activities and keeping the list of required items down to what teachers can reasonably access. Keeping professional jargon light and minimizing the amount of necessary background information will keep materials accessible. Finally, placing materials in the context of state curriculum content standards as well as designing them to appeal to different learning styles will make them more relevant to teachers’ professional and practical needs.

**Step 1: Identify Stakeholders and Establish a Network**

With these principles in mind I began work on the Duarte Heritage Toolkit Project. My first step was to identify the groups or institutions within Duarte that were most significantly involved in teaching and promoting local history. As mentioned in the
previous chapter, my initial project partners were the Duarte Unified School District (DUSD), Duarte City Hall, and the Duarte Historical Museum. After these partnerships were established the project network expanded to include individual teachers, professors, archaeologists, and Gabrielino/Tongva scholars and tribal members.

I established contact with representatives from DUSD and city hall as early as January 2010, although my fieldwork was not scheduled to begin until that summer. Word of mouth advice from teachers I knew in the district suggested that Wendy Wright was the appropriate person to contact regarding my project. As the assistant superintendent of DUSD, her role is to oversee “all areas related to curriculum and instruction,” and to work with the administration of every school “to help each and every student meet or exceed the academic content standards for their grade level” (Duarte Unified School District 2011). This fit perfectly with my project, since I intended to produce materials that would address content standards and be used to supplement existing curriculum. At our first meeting we discussed the project and Wendy offered support as well as helpful feedback, including the suggestion that I shift the project’s target grade level from fourth to third. She also recommended that I formally present my proposal at the June 2010 principals’ meeting. Over the course of the project she proved to be an invaluable coordinator of my interactions with DUSD administrators and faculty, and also agreed to serve as a member of my thesis committee.

Shortly after my meeting with Wendy I arranged to visit city hall and speak with Irma Hernandez, a city planner in the Community Development department. The department had been cited several times in Duarte’s General Plan as the responsible agency for many historic preservation policies, and I hoped to present my project to her
as being compatible with those policies. Irma was very interested in the project, requesting a copy of the finished product and offering me access to the resources available in her department. Since part of their responsibilities include issuing building permits and reviewing construction plans, the department has several photographs on file depicting the changes in Duarte's built environment as rural areas were populated and structures were built, torn down, and rebuilt in new styles. Although toolkit materials eventually focused on the Gabrielino/Tongva and Mexican periods, the Community Development department was cited as a useful resource for teachers presenting lessons on American period Duarte history. Irma herself proved to be a very engaged and helpful contact, requesting project updates and arranging to include a brief article on the project in the spring edition of Duarte's community newsletter.

After my project proposal had been approved by Duarte's elementary school principals at their meeting in June, I contacted the Duarte Historical Museum to see if they would be interested in collaborating on the project. My hope was that museum staff could serve a dual purpose by providing information on Duarte's past and dispensing advice about what resources—such as objects, documents, and photographs—would be best to include or reference in the toolkit. Irwin Margiloff, my primary contact at the museum, served both purposes excellently. As co-author of the most recent text on Duarte's history he has a detailed knowledge of the city's past, while as curator he is very familiar with the museum's inventories and worked with me to identify which items the museum could lend out or make copies of for the toolkit. Additionally, Irwin has experience as a docent leading tours of the museum for third grade students and offered advice on how best to engage a young audience. He and I were in regular contact for the
duration of the project, during which he was an important source of information and ideas.

Once I had established relationships with these three Duarte institutions, I began a second round of searches for collaborative partners based on either the recommendations of my current partners or the desire to fill in any gaps I perceived in our stakeholder network. This sometimes led to other groups or people within the Duarte community. However, another result of this second round search was the inclusion of several individuals who did not live or work in Duarte, but nevertheless had important knowledge to contribute or could be considered invested stakeholders in the toolkit materials that we were developing.

In her capacity as assistant superintendent Wendy Wright provided me direct access to the principals of the five elementary schools in Duarte. She arranged for me to speak at their meeting in June, during which I was able to formally present my project proposal and solicit feedback regarding the content and structure. During this meeting the principals recommended that I speak with two third grade teachers, Debbie Ogden and Barbara Hogan, before they left for summer break. Wendy provided me with their contact information, and I set up meetings with each of them in late June and early July. Thanks to this chain of access I was able to work one-on-one with two of Duarte’s teachers far sooner than an official group meeting could be arranged. That being said, Wendy and the principals also arranged for me to speak at two grade level meetings—called “cadre meetings”—in October 2010 and February 2011. This gave me the opportunity to speak to all third grade teachers at once and establish a dialogue about the
toolkit materials not just between myself and the teachers, but amongst the teachers themselves.

Irwin Margiloff provided me access to another project partner, Professor Ana Maria Whitaker of California State Polytechnic University, Pomona. Irwin informed me that Ana Maria was the professor in charge of a historic resources survey conducted for the city of Duarte by students from Cal Poly Pomona in 2003. This survey had been cited in Duarte’s General Plan, and a copy of the materials it produced were kept available in the Community Development department at city hall. Irwin suggested that I email her with any further questions about the survey, which I did. After a series of emails we had a phone conversation in November 2010 about referencing her students’ work in the toolkit as a resource for Duarte teachers.

As my project partners and I brainstormed and exchanged ideas the toolkit materials began to take on more concrete forms, and perspectives that were missing from the project became more apparent. By July 2010 I had decided to include in the materials a Recommended Readings List of books that teachers could use to supplement the activities included in the toolkit. Although I had been asking my current partners to suggest books for the list, I realized that this would still require teachers to search for and purchase the books themselves. It would be much more useful for teachers to have a list of relevant books that were available at the local public library. Once I had decided this I contacted Kay Pearlman, the children’s services librarian at the Duarte Public Library, and arranged a meeting to discuss the library’s potential involvement in the project. Kay was very interested, and over the course of other meetings and email exchanges helped me to identify books on local history for both teachers and students.
Another perspective that I worked to include in the project was that of CRM professionals. While I planned to contribute my own understandings of archaeology values and concepts to the toolkit materials, I also searched Duarte and the surrounding cities for CRM firms that were willing to collaborate on the project. I felt that professional archaeologists would be able to contribute valuable insights regarding how they wanted archaeology represented to students and what they were looking for in their interactions with the public. After several phone calls and emails to different southern California firms I heard back from two individuals: Beth Padon of Discovery Works, Inc., and Sherri Gust of Cogstone. In December 2010 I arranged meetings with each of them at their offices, during which they offered suggestions on toolkit materials and pointed me towards other resources at their disposal. These included information on Beth’s California Archaeological Site Stewardship Program, Sherri’s project report for a Tongva site located in Duarte’s neighboring city of Azusa, and the contact information for Karen Mingle, the Azusa librarian who had collaborated with Sherri to create outreach materials for said project.

During the June meeting Duarte principals had suggested that the toolkit include activities and information related to the Gabrielino/Tongva period of Duarte’s history. After my initial meeting with Sherri her coworker Desiree Martinez put me in touch with Craig Torres, a Gabrielino/Tongva tribal member who conducts school tours and designs educational programs at the Rancho los Alamitos historic property in the city of Long Beach. However, Gabrielino/Tongva perspectives within Duarte were difficult to find. While DUSD teachers Debbie Ogden and Barbara Hogan had both mentioned a tribal outreach specialist that used to visit their classrooms and give presentations, they had not
been in touch with her for some time and believed that she may have retired. After asking around Duarte produced no results, I spoke to Arturo E. Romo-Santillano, a Los Angeles-area artist who had recently completed a Tongva-themed mural project for Benjamin Franklin Senior High School. He recommended that I contact Julia Bogany, the cultural affairs chair of the Gabrielino/Tongva Tribal Council of San Gabriel with whom he had collaborated on the mural project. I discovered that Julia had taken over for the outreach specialist that Debbie and Barbara had previously worked with and had a lot of experience in presenting to schoolchildren and running community workshops. Arturo also put me in touch with Don Newton, a scholar of Tongva history and the author of a Tongva-themed children's book. I arranged my first meetings with Julia and Don in October 2010 and continued to exchange ideas with them in person and over email throughout the course of the project. Coincidentally, Arturo’s father, Arturo R. Romo, is a third grade teacher at Belvedere Elementary School in Los Angeles. I decided to show him the toolkit materials, and he offered several key pieces of feedback that contributed to their final forms.

**Step 2: Conduct Ongoing Collaboration with the Community**

After initiating contact and establishing a network of project partners, my second step was to maintain that network through consistent collaborative efforts. As can be seen above, the process of discovering stakeholders and arranging meetings was very organic. This was partially due to the way project needs developed in response to stakeholder input. However, it was also due to the logistics of working with a wide variety of schedules. For example, Duarte teachers were only reachable after around
three o’clock, while city planners like Irma were available from nine in the morning until
five in the evening. Meetings with Irwin had to take into account that the museum was
staffed by volunteers and thus open only on certain days for a limited amount of time.
Archaeologists were often in the field and had unpredictable schedules, as did professors
like Ana Maria. In many cases the gap between my initial phone call or email and an
actual face-to-face meeting with a partner was one or two months.

So while I wanted to maintain ongoing collaboration that cast stakeholders as
equal contributors in the research process, I also had to be ready to meet project partners
whenever it was most convenient for their schedules. To this end, I kept my means of
collaboration as flexible and informal as possible, while at the same time adhering to an
internal structure of consistency. What follows are the methods I used to communicate
with my partners and keep them up to date about the project’s progress: emails, phone
calls, face-to-face meetings, and the construction of a project website.

Aside from meetings, my primary form of communication with project partners
was email exchanges. Every stakeholder had access to an email account, and it was
frequently my initial means of contact with them. I also used it to follow up on face-to-
face meetings, thanking individuals for volunteering their time and sending or requesting
additional information that we had discussed. Email was also helpful for keeping
partners updated on the project’s development. My goal was to communicate with each
stakeholder at least once a month, both to assure them that the project was making
progress and to foster a sense of ongoing connection between us. Particularly for
partners with difficult schedules that only allowed one or two meetings, I wanted to avoid
a situation where they were left wondering what had happened to the project we
discussed and if they were ever going to see the results of our collaboration. With this in mind, I sent frequent emails to individuals describing changes to the toolkit materials or shifts in the focus of content. I also sent two major project update emails to all of my project partners, one on December 17, 2010 when the project website was activated, and the other on February 22, 2011 at the end of my formal data-gathering phase.

For the most part, email was the preferred method of communication among my project partners. It was less disruptive than a phone call and more flexible than a physical meeting. Still, there were a small number of partners who either did not have regular internet access or who simply preferred to speak rather than write to me. For these people phone calls were a more personal and immediate way of getting in touch with me. To make sure that I communicated with each stakeholder in the way that made him or her most comfortable, I made an effort to remember who preferred email and who preferred telephone calls.

However they chose to communicate with me, all partners preferred to have face-to-face meetings when possible. Depending on the setting, these fell into one of two categories: informal collaboration sessions or semiformal presentations. The majority of my meetings were informal sessions conducted in public spaces like coffee shops or at my partners’ workplaces. Recalling the methods of collaboration cited in community-based archaeology literature, I tried to structure these meetings to reflect the equal roles that my partners and I had in the research process. Rather than cast myself as the outside “researcher” who was drawing data from my “subject,” I worked to present myself as one partner engaging in constructive dialogue with another. I tried to keep the tone conversational, offering information about myself and my academic background, as well
as my own ideas for what the toolkit should contain. At the same time, I was careful not
to dominate our exchanges. While I often had questions or a checklist of discussion
points prepared ahead of time, I allowed my partners to guide the discourse and focus on
what their personal or professional experiences could contribute to the project. I felt that
this casual, less-structured format was much more reflective of what these meetings
really were: brainstorming sessions between two collaborative partners.

While this was my preferred method of conducting meetings, certain situations
required a more formal structure. I gave three presentations over the course of this
project, one for Duarte principals in June 2010, and two for third grade teacher cadre
meetings in October 2010 and February 2011. It was no coincidence that all three
presentations were for the school district partners. DUSD faculty and administration
were my largest stakeholder group, and also had some of the most difficult schedules to
coordinate. Not only did they have every day commitments like teaching or attending
meetings, there were also specific events such as standardized testing or report card
preparation that limited the amount of time DUSD employees had available to meet.
While I was able to arrange individual meetings with teachers like Debbie Ogden,
Barbara Hogan, and Arturo R. Romo, this was primarily because they had expressed a
special interest in the project and were willing to set aside time. Most teachers and
administrators were simply too busy, and the most efficient way to collaborate with them
was to be included in their established schedule of meetings. Here Wendy Wright was a
great help, arranging for me to speak at the principals’ meeting and later working with the
principals themselves to include me in two teacher cadre meetings.
Having a limited amount of time to explain entirely new content to a large group is very different from speaking to a single person at a coffee shop, and so naturally I had to change my strategy for these meetings. For the principals’ meeting in June I stuck to a fairly brief PowerPoint presentation that explained who I was and how my project was designed to benefit Duarte teachers. Because the point of the meeting was to gain the principals’ approval and cooperation, I described my past experiences in designing archaeology education materials, focused on how the project’s materials would incorporate curriculum content standards, and detailed the level of commitment I would require of their teachers. My goal for the presentation was to convince the principals that I had theoretical knowledge and practical experience in producing archaeology-themed outreach materials for children, and that I had a detailed plan for collaborating with their teachers to create materials specifically designed for their needs.

The success of the principals’ meeting led to my presentation at the third grade teacher cadre meeting in October. For this meeting I shifted my focus from justifying the project to emphasizing its collaborative nature, while also trying to catch teachers up to the progress that other project members and I had made over the summer. To this end I attempted to make the presentation more interactive and engaging. I kept my lecture and PowerPoint short, but added a small set of color-coded handouts, allowing myself to convey information through a variety of mediums. I also reserved half of my allotted time for a group discussion period, preparing hand-written posters for recording suggestions and feedback. Although we could not cover all of the toolkit materials due to starting late, I considered the meeting to be a success because the teachers felt comfortable enough with the information to begin offering feedback immediately. More
importantly, teachers instantly grasped the concept of the toolkit as a place to combine all of their individual experiences and knowledge for the benefit of the group, and began swapping activity ideas and sharing information about teaching resources.

By the next cadre meeting in February I had decided that this communication amongst teachers should be the focal point of our gathering. I shortened my PowerPoint even more and increased the discussion period to two-thirds of my allotted time. I still had a lot of new information to present to them, but I restricted most of it to professionally printed posters and more colored handouts. This allowed me to spend less time explaining it during the presentation while also giving teachers a visual reference to refer to at any point in the meeting. Once again, I measured the effectiveness of these strategies by how quickly teachers engaged with the toolkit materials as well as the depth of their feedback. I was pleased to observe that they began offering both approving comments as well as critiques with very little prompting. Even better was when the teachers once again began to carry the discussion themselves, with only the occasional comment or explanation from myself. One example of this was when Tina Frausto, a teacher from Andres Duarte Elementary School, raised a problem with the instructions for a classroom activity. The instructions had teachers discuss the concept of myths as traditional cultural stories that people use to explain ideas or natural phenomena, and suggested that students volunteer and compare stories from their own cultures. Tina explained that in her experience most third graders did not yet understand that some traditions or stories were specific to certain cultures, and so they may be hard-pressed to come up with examples (Frausto 2011). She recommended that this step include more background information to prepare students. Several teachers voiced their agreement,
and Jennifer O’Donnell from Beardslee Elementary School suggested that the activity could be done around Christmas or another holiday in order to give students a context for cultural stories that explain special events (O’Donnell 2011). In this exchange, teachers identified problems with the materials and suggested solutions based on their classroom experiences, while my role was to essentially coordinate their discourse.

After the first cadre meeting in October I felt that I had gathered enough information to construct an official project website. This strategy had been suggested by Professor Nancy Case-Rico, a member of Sonoma State University’s Education department and my thesis committee. Professor Case-Rico felt that the concept of a website where stakeholders could gather to exchange ideas and provide feedback on toolkit materials worked well with the collaborative nature of my research process (Case-Rico 2010). I created a website using the free software Wordpress and posted information about the project’s premise and design. I also created separate discussion pages for each component of the toolkit. The goal of the website was for me to once again assume the role of coordinator, providing enough detailed information for stakeholders to comment on but having their input be the driving force behind the toolkit’s formation. Once I had completed enough pages I sent a link to each of my project partners and encouraged them to share their thoughts by commenting on the site. Response to the website was ultimately limited, which I believe was largely due to timing. Although my fieldwork officially began in June 2010 the website did not launch until early November. This was because I was reluctant to develop classroom materials without first getting feedback from teachers, whom I felt were a significant stakeholder group. However, I was unable to meet with teachers until the cadre meeting in late
October. As a result the website launched at the beginning of the holiday season, when all of my stakeholders were less available, and towards the end of the school semester in Duarte, when teachers in particular were busy preparing report cards and getting ready for winter break. Regardless, I kept updating the site and including the link in my emails to project partners. Irwin Margiloff suggested that the website be kept up indefinitely to provide teachers and other community members with a forum for discussing future additions or updates to the toolkit (Margiloff 2010b). I agreed, feeling that such an action would be well in line with the principles of my research that sought to encourage community stakeholders' active engagement with and management of their local history-themed resources.

**Step 3: Coordinate Stakeholder Input**

The third step in my research process was to coordinate the input of my project partners and shape it into the materials that would comprise the teacher's toolkit. To achieve this, I focused on maintaining a narrow scope and vision for content while simultaneously incorporating the ideas and critiques of my partners into every piece of the toolkit.

While Duarte is a comparatively small city, there are nevertheless several topics that fall under the broad category of "local history." As mentioned in the previous chapter, Duarte history is commonly divided into four eras: the Gabrielino/Tongva period, the Spanish period, the Mexican period, and the American period. At our meeting in June I asked the principals what topics they would like to see covered in a local history-themed toolkit, and they suggested that I focus on the Gabrielino/Tongva as well
as on the life of Andres Duarte. Yet many of my project partners had expertise and
access to resources related to Duarte’s American past, such as the historical photographs
in city hall’s Community Development department, Ana Maria Whitaker’s knowledge of
Duarte’s prominent role in California’s pre-World War II citrus industry, and the
majority of photographs and artifacts in the Duarte Historical Museum. Although any of
these could have been used to design engaging teaching materials, they were outside the
content scope of the project.

However, even when the topics of the toolkit were firmly established I found
myself sorting through an impressive amount of information and resources collected from
stakeholder input. For example, Julia Bogany has several educational Tongva games and
exercises designed for children that she has used in classroom presentations and teacher
workshops. Initially I planned to choose one or two to include in the toolkit’s Tongva-
themed classroom activity set. Yet after much debate I decided to use none of them,
instead designing an entirely new activity based on the ideas that Julia and I discussed in
our meetings as well as input from other stakeholders. I included Julia’s activities in the
toolkit as part of the Community Heritage Resources Guide, because I felt that they were
a valuable resource and that teachers would appreciate them. But I decided that the
original content of the toolkit should be exactly that—new content generated from
stakeholders that was unique to the Duarte Heritage Toolkit Project.

To that end, I worked to shape every aspect of the toolkit in response to the ideas
and critiques of my project partners. Although Chapter 5 will provide a more detailed
account of how each component was formed, I will list here two key examples of how I
implemented this strategy. First, the decision to change the format of the project
materials from a single lesson plan to a more piecemeal toolkit resulted from conversations with DUSD teachers Debbie Ogden and Barbara Hogan. During my first meetings with each of them Debbie and Barbara showed me the collections of books, objects, and activity sheets that they currently used to teach local history lessons. In response to my repeated questions of how they came across these items, both replied that they had simply picked them up in different places over the years (Ogden 2010; Hogan 2010a). It occurred to me that Debbie and Barbara’s customized teaching kits were the results of careful decisions informed by their experiences in the classrooms, and that most teachers probably had a similar practice. I decided then that the materials produced by my project should be designed with teachers like Debbie and Barbara in mind, with several standalone components that could be easily taken and modified to fit different classroom settings. This decision was validated months later when Arturo R. Romo confirmed that he had put together his teaching kit the same way, as well as during the February cadre meeting when Tina Frausto praised the classroom activities for being “self-contained” (Romo 2011; Frausto 2011).

The second example of how project partner input shaped the formation of toolkit materials was the creation of the Guest Speaker Form. Initially called the Teacher/Archaeologist Interface Form, it was designed to facilitate a clear communication of goals between educators and archaeologists that they invited to speak to their students. Due to the difficulty I experienced in establishing communication with CRM firms during the project, the first drafts of the form were heavily influenced by a teacher’s perspective. For that reason it focused mainly on logistical issues: the number of students in the class, the amount of time available for the presentation, and whether or
not any students had special needs that might affect their participation in activities. In my meeting with Beth and Chris Padon of Discovery Works, Inc., I asked them what they would add to such a form. Beth replied that she would like to know how far along the teacher was in his or her curriculum so that she would have a general idea of what the students could and could not be expected to know (B. Padon 2010). I added a context statement to the form and, building from Beth’s idea, suggested that a general subject prompt for the speaker might be useful as well. Beth also recommended that the form include where the archaeologist’s appointment fell in the context of students’ overall schedules, since that might dictate how tired or distracted an audience they may be (B. Padon 2010). Knowing this in advance could help a potential speaker prepare certain kinds of props or activities to hold students’ attention. Overall, Beth’s contributions to the form ensured that perspectives from both parties were represented, giving it a greater chance to facilitate clear communication between the two.

**Difficulties, Issues, and Adjustment Strategies**

In addition to the strategies described above I also developed two in response to issues that arose during the research process. The first issue was that the professional terminology I was using in conversation with my partners proved to be either inapplicable or sending the wrong message. The other was that a new goal for the project materials had evolved in response to the structural shift from lesson plan to toolkit.

At the beginning of my project I took care to explain to my partners that I was an archaeologist earning a degree in CRM. I did this because I felt that the process of creating a teacher’s toolkit using cultural resources fell squarely under the category of
management. However, outside of the discipline the term is still somewhat obscure, and
I eventually used “archaeology” as convenient shorthand. Yet that proved to be a
problem in and of itself. Like most of the public audience, many of my stakeholders had
been taught to associate archaeology with active excavations and field skills. Because
Duarte had no active sites, many initially wondered where I planned to find the resources
to create an archaeology-themed teacher’s toolkit. Although I explained that I was trying
to focus on the reasons why archaeologists studied the past rather than the methods they
used to do so, many stakeholders continued to express doubt that I would find what I
needed to make the toolkit. For a project in which collaboration and understanding are
key, confusing professional terms are barriers to progress. Therefore, after several weeks
of meeting with stakeholders I decided to use the word “heritage” to describe my project.
Because it is a less specific term than either “archaeology” or “CRM” it allowed me to
define my own approach, one that was more inclusive and accessible to non-
archaeologists.

Another necessary shift in terminology came after I completed a records search at
the South Central Coast Information Center located on campus at California State
University, Fullerton. According to the information center, there are currently no
properties in Duarte that are listed on or considered eligible for either the National
Register of Historic Places or the California Register of Historical Resources. Although I
was comfortable referring to artifacts from the Duarte Historical Museum as cultural
resources, by that point there were many items and institutions listed in the toolkit’s
resources guide to whom the legal connotations of the term did not apply. Consequently,
I decided to refer to the contents of the guide as “community heritage resources,” which I
defined to my stakeholders as any object, structure, landscape, or knowledge that can relate information about Duarte’s history. Examples include the Duarte Public Library, classroom materials developed by teachers or Tongva outreach specialists like Julia Bogany, supply stores where teachers can purchase samples of native plants or obsidian, and the artifacts and texts available at the museum.

The second issue that required me to change my research approach was the development of a new, organic aspect to the toolkit. With the introduction of the website came the idea that the project materials could continue to adapt to teachers’ needs beyond the conclusion of the Duarte Heritage Toolkit Project. This seemed to be a natural progression of the toolkit model, in which teachers were able to pick and choose which resources and activities fit their needs best. Now, the toolkit would be able to grow organically in response to stakeholder input, and the momentum of the project could shift permanently to the community. Although such a thing is hard to guarantee or sustain, I decided to encourage it on a practical level by giving all of the interested project partners electronic copies of the toolkit in addition to physical ones, as well as suggesting to stakeholders that they continue to amend the toolkit as new activities, services, and resources appear or old ones are updated. While this will most likely result in several individualized versions of the original materials, I feel that the action remains true to the concepts of responsive collaboration and stakeholder-based materials that inspired this research.
Chapter 5

Toolkit

Ultimately, this research process yielded two products. The first is the project template detailed in the previous chapter, which was created by documenting the collaborative process. The second is the teacher's toolkit, which was the end goal of that process. The toolkit was created to provide Duarte educators and community members with teaching materials that drew meaningful connections between basic CRM concepts and Duarte's local history in a format that was relevant to teacher needs. In this chapter I will discuss the four component pieces of the toolkit that my partners and I developed over the course of the project: the Classroom Activity Sets, the Recommended Readings List, the Community Heritage Resources Guide, and the Guest Speaker Form. For each I will provide a description of the form and content, followed by a discussion of how they developed in response to input from project partners.

Classroom Activity Sets

Criteria and format

The Classroom Activity Sets were intended to provide Duarte teachers with materials that were relevant to local history, the field of CRM, and the teachers' own classroom experiences. To ensure this, my project partners and I designed each activity to incorporate four criteria.

First, each activity had to include one of three "heritage themes" which I had created based on my own research into archaeology education literature. These were
intended to distill important CRM concepts into basic, foundational ideas of how to think about and interact with the past. The first theme is “change over time,” which discusses what objects, structures, landscapes, or traditional knowledge can tell us about the past, and how that past is different from the present. The second theme is “preservation,” in which students brainstorm different ways to protect the resources that inform us about the past. Finally, the third theme is “stewardship,” which encourages students to explore why protecting the past is important and how they can contribute to this in small, localized ways.

Each activity also had to be designed to account for the California State Board of Education’s curriculum content standards for third grade social studies. As faculty of public schools in California, teachers in Duarte are compelled to cover the official curriculum established by the state. Although the general theme of third grade social studies content standards—local history—fits well with the project, connecting each activity to specific content standards solidified their relevancy to Duarte teachers’ curriculum.

The third criterion for activities was that each had to address multiple learning styles. This was to ensure that the materials would be effective with a wide variety of students, and thus would be more useful to teachers. As mentioned in Chapter 2, Victor W. Geraci has already explored how archaeology education materials fit well with Howard Gardner’s multiple intelligences model (Geraci 2000). I decided to use this model for the project after confirming with Wendy Wright that most Duarte teachers had a basic familiarity with it (Wright 2010). Ultimately, each activity addressed at least two out of Gardner’s seven original intelligences.
Finally, each activity was also designed to spotlight one or two of the local history-themed resources available to Duarte teachers. The purpose of this was to help students contextualize the abstract concepts of heritage themes and content standards with items and knowledge related to Duarte’s past. Listed on the toolkit’s Community Heritage Resources Guide, these could be anything from artifacts in the museum to books at the Duarte Public Library. Depending on the portability of the heritage resource, they were either photocopied and included in an appendix to the activity set or merely referenced with directions for teachers on how to obtain them.

The toolkit includes six total activities, three that draw from Gabrielino/Tongva culture and three that are based on the life of Andres Duarte. These are respectively referred to as the “Tongva” activity set and the “rancho” activity set. All of the six activities follow the same format. The top of each page lists the heritage theme, content standards, intelligences, and heritage resources covered in the activity. This is followed by the title of the activity, a description of student objectives, a list of necessary background information and required materials, and step-by-step instructions for performing the activity. Copies of all activities are included in the appendix of this thesis.

*Tongva Activity Set*

The first Tongva activity in the toolkit is titled “A Day in the Life of a Tongva Child.” In it students compare the routines and objects of their daily lives with that of a Tongva child living in California before the arrival of Europeans. To demonstrate their newly acquired knowledge, students work in groups to create short performance skits that
narrate a scene from daily Tongva life. Props for the skits can include student-drawn
pictures of Tongva items or items purchased by the teacher at supply stores or pow wows.

This activity was designed to address the heritage theme of change over time,
with students focusing on the differences and similarities between themselves and
Tongva children. The instructions suggest that teachers use prompting questions such as
“What do you use to boil water in?” and “What kinds of toys do you play with?” to
highlight differences in common objects. Relevant content standards include 3.2.1,
which requires third grade students to describe the customs of American Indian nations
indigenous to their local region, and 3.2.2, in which students must be able to discuss how
local Indian nations drew from their environment to produce items such as food, clothing,
and tools (California Department of Education 1998:9). The activity also utilized three of
Gardner’s intelligences. Writing the skits allows students to draw on their
verbal/linguistic intelligence, while performing it appeals to bodily/kinesthetic learners.
The teamwork aspect of both addresses the interpersonal intelligence, in which students
process and retain information through cooperative interactions with others. Finally, the
heritage resources spotlighted in this activity are books on Tongva culture available from
the Duarte Public Library.

“A Day in the Life of a Tongva Child” was created by combining the experiences
and input of several stakeholders. Craig Torres, a docent at Rancho los Alamitos, told me
that when discussing Tongva culture with schoolchildren he always tried to “bring it into
the present” (Torres 2010). He reminded students that Tongva at the time did not have
places like grocery and department stores, and so the processes of obtaining food and
clothing were very different. This thought is expanded upon in the activity by having
students brainstorm a list of everyday items in their house and then match them up with traditional Tongva equivalents. While this highlights the material differences in items, the emphasis in the activity is on the fact that human needs—such as making clothing, brushing hair, and playing with toys—have remained the same over centuries. This angle was contributed by Beth Padon, who noted that while archaeology was a useful tool for discussing cultural diversity in the classroom, it can also teach students that "there are basic needs that people share" (B. Padon 2010). I proposed the idea of having students create skits in order to demonstrate the knowledge they had acquired in the previous part of the activity. DUSD teacher Tina Frausto agreed, but suggested that the activity instructions recommend explicit prompts to help students begin writing and that performances should be kept fairly short (Frausto 2011). Arturo R. Romo added another dimension to the skits, suggesting that the performing students occasionally "freeze" in the middle of an action while the teacher calls on students in the audience to explain what has just happened or is about to happen (Romo 2011).

The second Tongva activity in the toolkit is titled "Make Your Own Myth." In it students read a Tongva story describing the creation of California, after which they discuss how traditional stories and legends are often told to explain natural phenomena. Students are then assigned to write their own explanatory myth for a particular plant, animal, or geographical feature native to the Duarte area. Finally, students discuss the problems of preserving non-physical resources like stories and brainstorm ideas for saving their own stories.

"Make Your Own Myth" was designed to address the heritage theme of preservation on two levels. First, students are introduced to the idea that information
about the past can be learned from—or preserved in—stories and memories as well as objects. Second, they are encouraged to think of ways to protect this information by saving these non-physical resources from destruction or decay. Relevant content standards include 3.1.1, which requires students to be able to identify the geographical features of their local region, and 3.2.1, in which they must describe the folklore traditions of the American Indian nations in their area (California Department of Education 1998:9). Verbal/linguistic intelligence is addressed by having students read the Tongva story and write their own, while the cooperative brainstorming session utilizes students’ interpersonal intelligence. The heritage resource incorporated in this activity is the traditional Tongva creation story called “How California Was Made,” recommended by Julia Bogany. A copy of this story is available to teachers through the Bowers Museum of Cultural Art website, which is listed in the Community Heritage Resources Guide.

The decision to focus this activity on the preservation of stories rather than artifacts came from conversations with both Craig Torres and Julia Bogany. Craig told tour groups that “I would ask my mom where we came from,” and “the way I learned about my history was from my aunties,” emphasizing the role of family memories and storytelling in preserving and maintaining Tongva cultural identity (Torres 2010). Julia also stressed the importance of stories, saying that in contrast to the older accounts of Tongva culture written by outsiders, “we can write for ourselves now” and record not just traditional stories, but new ones created for current and future generations of Tongva (Bogany 2011). Beth Padon suggested giving students a personal connection to the abstract concept of preservation, asking them, “If something you like is going to
disappear, how could you save it?” (B. Padon 2010). This manifested in the activity as the brainstorming session in which students come up with ways to preserve the stories they had just written. Finally, as mentioned in the last chapter, DUSD teachers Tina Frausto and Jennifer O’Donnell reviewed this activity and suggested that teachers present it to students around a holiday to give them an immediate context for explanatory myths and traditional stories.

The toolkit’s third and final Tongva activity is titled “Design a Tongva Community Center.” Students begin by reading aloud passages from a recently published book of interviews with Tongva community leaders that describe problems of cultural preservation. Students are asked to empathize with Tongva today and think about why they would consider these losses to be so upsetting. They are then divided into three research groups: one assigned to learn about traditional use of native plants, one to learn about folklore and religious beliefs, and one to learn about tools and crafted items. Teachers can subdivide these groups or include additional ones as they see fit. These groups will use the information they learn through research to collaboratively design a Tongva community center—possibly depicted in a mural or on a large, gridded map—where cultural knowledge can be maintained, built upon, and shared with others.

This activity was designed to address the heritage theme of stewardship. Students are made aware of the fragile nature of resources and asked to come up with active solutions that will both preserve them and share them with the public. For example, a student assigned to research plant use may decide to include a garden in the community center, while a student assigned to study traditional stories may create a library for books or a theater for dramatic performances. Relevant content standards are 3.2.1, wherein
students are asked to describe the religious beliefs, customs, and folklore traditions of the Indian Nations in their area, and 3.2.2, in which they must discuss how local tribes created food, clothing, and tools from the natural resources available to them (California Department of Education 1998:9). Like the previous two activities, this one has students utilize both their verbal/linguistic and interpersonal intelligences through research and cooperative teamwork, respectively. It also allows students to explore their visual/spatial intelligence by designing the layout of the community center, either in a formal map or a more free-flowing art project. The heritage resources used in this activity are the excerpts from the book *O My Ancestor: Recognition and Renewal for the Gabrielino-Tongva People of the Los Angeles Area* by Claudia K. Jurmain and William McCawley, which are provided in the toolkit. A copy of the entire book is available at the Duarte Public Library.

The idea for an activity that encourages students to generate active, community-oriented solutions in response to issues of cultural preservation came from the CRM concept of stewardship, as well as from conversations with Don Newton. In addition to being a scholar of Tongva culture, Don is also an activist involved in many Los Angeles-area community projects. As we discussed the toolkit and my inclusive perspective on what constituted a local history-themed resource, Don suggested that a possible theme for the toolkit materials could be the inclusion and discussion of resources that provided alternative narratives to officially-sanctioned history textbooks. As Don said, “though [third grade students] are very young kids, they’re right in the middle of this,” being taught one version of history in school while possibly having personal or cultural associations with another (Newton 2010). Although Don was speaking in particular
about the experiences of immigrant children, this concept inspired the format of this third activity in which students take a non-dominant cultural perspective and brainstorm ways of re-introducing it into the dominant cultural arena. While I came up with the idea of designing a community center, the format of having several rotating student groups working on a single large art project came from Barbara Hogan, who had done something similar for a mural project that depicted how the landscape of Duarte changed through different historical periods (Hogan 2010b).

Rancho Activity Set

The first activity in the rancho set is the “Rancho Azusa de Duarte Trade Game.” After handling two rancho-period artifacts from the Duarte museum, students discuss which natural or trade resources were available to California rancheros in the early and mid-1800s, and which they had to import from other nations. Students are then divided into two groups: rancheros from Azusa de Duarte and American traders. Each group is given a list of items that they would have available to trade as well as a “shopping list” of items they need to obtain from the other group. The two groups then act out a trade session, trying to procure all of the items on their shopping lists while staying above a set minimum of resources. The teacher may pose as Andres Duarte, the captain of a trading ship, or a time traveler and ask students to justify their purchases by explaining the relative worth of the item they are buying or selling. For instance, a ranchero student may be trading a lot of cattle hides to buy a piano, but would justify it by saying that pianos were rare in California and that it would serve as a status symbol.
Like the first Tongva activity, this was designed to address the heritage theme of change over time by examining how the objects of daily life for people in the past are different from the items available to modern students. Students participating in the trade game may have never seen a dried cattle hide or a bag of tallow, but in order to win the game they have to adapt to a system in which these items serve as valuable currency. Content standards addressed by the trade game are 3.1.2, in which students learn how people in their region have historically used the natural resources available to them, and 3.3.2, in which students describe the economies established by the settlers of their region (California Department of Education 1998:9). The activity is designed to appeal to logical/mathematical learners through the economic rules of the trade game as well as interpersonal learners through the use of cooperative teams. The heritage resources used are an oil lamp and branding iron replica from the Duarte Historical Museum’s collection, which Irwin agreed to lend out to teachers.

This is the only activity in the toolkit that uses physical objects besides books and worksheets as the spotlighted heritage resource. While it was difficult to find relevant materials that the museum was willing to keep on-call for use in classrooms, the need for activities that allowed students to interact with tangible objects was expressed by several project partners. Sherri Gust in particular noted that I should include concrete examples of change over time in order to catch and hold the attention of younger audiences (Gust 2010). To achieve this, I decided to use the branding iron replica and the oil lamp as a launching point for a discussion about available resources and the everyday use items that were and were not available to families like Andres Duarte’s. I also tried to extend the tactile experience into the trade game itself by suggesting to teachers that simple
household objects could be used to represent trade items. For instance, tea candles could be used to represent bags of tallow, since tallow was often used to make candles. This was first recommended to me by Arturo R. Romo, who mentioned that he used crinkled brown paper bags to simulate dried cattle hides (Romo 2011).

The second activity in this set is called “Mapping the Rancho.” Students are shown the diseño, or sketch map, that Andres Duarte submitted as part of his 1841 land grant proposal and discuss the concepts of landmarks and geographical features, as well as the basic elements of a map such as a scale, legend, and north arrow. Students are then divided into teams of three, with two serving as measurers and one as a recorder, and assigned to map a small section of the schoolyard or a nearby park. Teachers can create a dynamic surface for mapping by placing classroom chairs, boxes, balls, or other items across the landscape. Each group should explain their completed map to another group, discussing why they chose to map the items that they did. After this, students should discuss maps as a means of preserving information. The teacher can ask questions such as “what will I remember about today by looking at your map?” and “if your map was found fifty years from now, what could it tell a person about this school?” Students should discuss how maps are similar or different from other sources of information about the past such as books, photographs, or a person’s memories.

This activity was designed to address the heritage theme of preservation by exploring maps as a resource of information about the past. This is done first by having students examine Andres Duarte’s map of his rancho and try to determine whether they can recognize any of the landmarks he included. It is done again when students create their own maps and speculate on what they will communicate to future readers. Relevant
content standards include 3.1, in which students learn to use—among other materials—
maps to organize information in a spatial context, and 3.3.3, in which students use
primary documents such as maps to understand how their community has changed over
time (California Department of Education 1998:9). “Mapping the Rancho” allows
students to exercise their visual/spatial intelligence when drawing the map, as well as
their bodily/kinesthetic intelligence when performing the routine motions of measuring
and their interpersonal intelligence by acting in a team context. The heritage resource
included in this activity is the diseño from Andres Duarte’s land grant. A photocopy is
included with the toolkit, and additional copies are available through the Duarte
Historical Museum.

In a conversation with Beth and Chris Padon, Chris mentioned the common
misconception among students of all ages that “archaeology is only digging” (C. Padon
2010). Because of my desire to emphasize the motivations of archaeologists over their
methods, I had not specifically designed any activities to teach archaeological field skills.
Yet when Irwin Margiloff showed me Andres Duarte’s diseño, describing its creation and
comparing it to other more recent maps of Duarte, I realized that I could incorporate
useful field skills into the toolkit’s activities without sacrificing a deeper discussion of
values. Irwin and I considered the idea of having students create maps of Duarte “as they
understood it,” but for the sake of keeping the scope of activities manageable for teachers
as well as the chance to provide students with concrete mapping experience I decided to
shrink the scale to a park or schoolyard (Margiloff 2010a). After feedback from Tina
Frausto at the cadre meeting in February, I added instructions that had students discuss
the key elements of a map (Frausto 2011).
The final rancho activity is titled "History Puzzle, My Story Puzzle." In it students are presented with photocopies of three historical documents that, when placed in the proper sequence, provide the basic narrative of Andres Duarte’s life. Students discuss how things like photographs, documents, and artifacts are like puzzle pieces that tell a story when put in the right order. Each student then fills out a "History Puzzle" handout, in which they draw five pictures that represent important events in their lives or aspects of their personality into interlocking puzzle pieces. Students then cut out the puzzle pieces—after writing their initials on the back of each piece—and jumble their order. At this point the teacher collects each student’s puzzle and mixes it with the puzzle of another student, removing three pieces from the pile at random. These combined puzzles are given to a group of three other students, who are then assigned to piece the puzzle together. Afterwards students discuss what they found easy or difficult about the assignment and draw comparisons between their assignment and the work of historians and archaeologists, with artifacts and other resources taking the place of puzzle pieces. The activity should end with students brainstorming ideas for protecting resources from becoming damaged or lost.

"History Puzzle, My Story Puzzle" was designed to address the heritage theme of stewardship. Students are encouraged to draw parallels between the damage or destruction of sites and the difficulties of putting together a puzzle when some of the pieces are missing. They are also encouraged to make a personal connection by viewing the work of archaeologists as piecing together life stories. The relevant content standard for this activity is 3.3, in which students are expected to sequence historical events by referring to historical and community resources (California Department of Education
1998:9). It also addresses the visual/spatial intelligence by having students draw out images symbolic of important events in their lives, as well as intrapersonal intelligence by providing a solitary, reflective exercise for students. Finally, the interpersonal intelligence is addressed by working in groups to complete the jumbled puzzles. The heritage resources spotlighted by this activity are the various documents associated with Andres Duarte’s life: his baptismal record, the rancho’s diseño, and a court document recording the sale of part of his rancho to Michael Whistler. Photocopies of each document are provided as part of the toolkit, and additional copies can be obtained through the Duarte Historical Museum.

This activity was created in response to input from both Sherri Gust and Beth Padon. While discussing the three heritage themes that I had developed, Sherri agreed that one of the most important messages for students to receive was that stewardship was about responsibility (Gust 2010). This meant that students had to see the destruction of resources as not just a loss of information, but an irresponsible act. At our meeting Beth recalled the Project Archaeology exercise mentioned in Chapter 2, in which students create rock art and come back from a break to find it vandalized (B. Padon 2010). By designing the concept of the history puzzle worksheet, I tried to achieve that same sense of personal connection to and understanding of the destruction or loss of resources.

**Recommended Readings List**

The Recommended Readings List was originally designed to provide teachers with a list of books on the subjects of Gabrielino/Tongva culture and the life of Andres Duarte that they could use to supplement their preexisting local history curriculum.
materials. Eventually it expanded to include adult nonfiction books and reference materials. Along with the resources guide, it was an attempt to bring several scattered resources together in a single, convenient reference document.

The current readings list is divided into three categories: books available at the Duarte Public Library—which are further divided into children’s and adult’s titles—books available at the Duarte Historical Museum, and books available at other Los Angeles-area libraries. Each entry lists the title and author, as well as the year of publication and whether it is fiction or nonfiction. The children’s books provide teachers with materials that they can use to either enhance current activities or construct entirely new ones. Examples could include using fiction texts for book reports, classroom discussion or journal-writing responses to specific passages, illustrations or skits of important scenes, or using nonfiction references as outside research resources.

Meanwhile, teachers can use adult-level books to provide background information for a new project or activity, or simply to increase their personal familiarity with Duarte’s past.

Many project partners recommended titles for the readings list, and there were many instances in which the same book was suggested multiple times. Sherri Gust suggested several texts on Gabrielino/Tongva culture that she keeps available in the Cogstone offices. Both Karen Mingle and Don Newton recommended the same account written by Hugo Reid, a Scottish neighbor of Andres Duarte who owned the nearby Rancho Santa Anita and married a Tongva woman. Irwin Margiloff provided access to the three texts written on Duarte history, all of which can be found in the Duarte Historical Museum. Julia Bogany recommended three books on Gabrielino/Tongva culture written for children, two of which happened to already be in the Duarte library.
The third was added to the library's collection by Kay Pearlman after I conveyed Julia's suggestions to her. Kay was also instrumental in identifying the many titles that the library already had available. As a result of these contributions the readings list ended up favoring Gabrielino/Tongva materials, as well as having a greater emphasis on adult reading level books.

I would have liked to see more books about Andres Duarte or California ranchos in general, but most project partners had a stronger familiarity with Gabrielino/Tongva subject matter. However, I feel that the large number of adult-level books will be helpful to teachers using this toolkit. In an early conversation with Barbara Hogan she had expressed interest in my project as a source of information about local history. Like many teachers, Barbara designs a lot of her own classroom activities based on information she gathers from workshops, personal experiences, and other teachers. But she was receptive to the idea of a toolkit that brought several information resources together in one place, saying “I’m not a researcher, so I don’t know where to go” (Hogan 2010a). Hopefully the readings list will provide Barbara and other teachers with enough background information on Duarte’s history to help create new and engaging activities for their students.

**Community Heritage Resources Guide**

The Community Heritage Resources Guide is possibly the toolkit piece most anticipated by Duarte teachers. Originally called the Community Cultural Resources Guide, it was intended to be a comprehensive list of all cultural resources available to teachers in Duarte. However, it soon became clear that Duarte did not yet have any
legally recognized cultural resources, so I changed my terminology to reflect a more inclusive approach to the guide. Its purpose was to create a list of local history-themed resources available for Duarte teachers’ use inside or outside of the classroom.

Formatted similar to an annotated bibliography, each entry in the guide is comprised of five parts. The first is the name of the resource. The second is the location, followed by a summary of the services it offers and a list of fees. Finally, each entry includes contact information for the resource: telephone number, website or email address, and hours of operation when applicable. Entries in the guide are separated into three sections: institutions, classroom services and materials, and other archaeology-themed resources. Within those sections individual entries are listed in order of their proximity to Duarte, with the closest resources being listed first. This format was chosen in order to make the guide as user-friendly as possible. Teachers can see at a glance what resources are available to them, how close they are, and how much they cost.

This guide reflects the efforts and input of many project partners. Sherri Gust suggested that we incorporate the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles into the guide, citing its Classroom Collections artifact lending program. Beth and Chris Padon volunteered the California Archaeological Site Stewardship Program and the Pacific Coast Archaeological Society for teachers or community members with a personal interest in archaeology. I submitted links to the SAA’s online Resources for Educators and the Society for California Archaeology’s list of classroom resources, as well as the Bowers Museum of Cultural Art’s elementary school curriculum guides. Craig Torres and his school tours are included in an entry on Rancho los Alamitos, as are Julia Bogany’s classroom visits and workshops. Duarte teachers shared several resources with
each other during the cadre meetings which are now included in the guide, including the Tongva-themed programs at Rancho Santa Ana Botanic Gardens, the Santa Fe Dam Nature Center, and the Los Angeles County Arboretum and Botanic Gardens. Also included are two native plants and stones supply stores recommended by Barbara Hogan, and a Gabrielino-themed unit developed by Duarte teachers and used by Debbie Ogden in her classroom. Although teaching in a different city, Arturo R. Romo was able to suggest several accessible resources for Duarte teachers, such as the American Indian Resources Center in Huntington Park, the Autry National Center in Los Angeles, and Calicanto Associates’ activity guidebook, *They Came Singing: Songs from California’s History*. Thanks to Kay Pearlman the books and other services offered by the Duarte Public Library are included in the guide. Irwin Margiloff provided information for the entry on the Duarte Historical Museum, citing its many artifacts and research texts. Also included are the local history-themed resources accessible through Irma Hernandez and Duarte City Hall’s Community Development department.

**Guest Speaker Form**

As previously mentioned, the Guest Speaker Form was originally designed as a communication tool for teachers and archaeologists interacting in outreach settings, particularly when an archaeologist has been invited to speak in the classroom. The goals were to make sure that each party was aware of the other’s expectations for the event and to cover basic logistical information, such as the age and number of students in the class. Later it became clear that there were several kinds of history-themed speakers that teachers could invite into their classrooms who would also benefit from this type of form.
The current version of the Guest Speaker Form includes two areas of information to be filled in by teachers. The first area conveys general information, such as the name and address of the school, the teacher’s name and room number, and the grade level of the class. The second area deals with the details of the presentation. Teachers tell the speaker how many students will be in attendance and what time the presentation will take place. They may then indicate whether any students have special needs or physical conditions that may dictate their ability to participate in certain activities or influence the speaker to present their information in a particular way. After this teachers can provide additional notes for the speaker, such as whether they teach a class that combines multiple grade levels or whether the presentation occurs at any special time of day for students—for example, right after lunch or P.E. class.

Once they have provided the logistical information, teachers have the option to fill out a context statement, which is the first of two ways that teachers can choose to give their speaker some direction for his or her presentation. The context statement—which could be either in paragraph or bullet point form—gives the speaker a general idea of where the students are in their curriculum as it pertains to history or archaeology. An example of a context statement could be a teacher mentioning that the class had just recently visited a museum, or had a Native American speaker come to visit, or will be covering map-making skills the day after the speaker’s visit. Any of these statements could help a speaker decide what the topic or format of the presentation should be, allowing him or her to start from what the students know and work towards what they will be covering later.
If they prefer to be more direct, teachers can provide speakers with a prompt. This is a space where the teacher has the option of suggesting a specific topic or theme for the speaker to focus on. If the speaker is an archaeologist, examples could include how math is involved in archaeology, or what types of children’s toys the speaker has found on sites. While the intent is to provide speakers with a direction for their presentation, teachers should avoid being overly specific as guest speakers may not have the background or experience to address an extremely narrow topic.

Up until the very end of my official data-gathering period in February 2011 I had considered this piece of the toolkit to be a teacher/archaeologist interface form. As such, I consulted two stakeholder groups on its development: Duarte teachers and CRM professionals. Unfortunately, my feedback from teachers was extremely limited. I was only able to meet with them as a group at the cadre meetings in October 2010 and February 2011. At the first meeting we ran out of time before I could present what I had on the form, and when I presented an updated version in February the teachers responded with universal approval. Prior to this I had developed the form based on my reading of the archaeology education literature. As discussed in Chapter 2, collaboration between archaeologists and teachers is one of the key principles of archaeology education. I felt that encouraging such collaboration was largely a matter of promoting clear communication of goals between parties, so I attempted to include in the form basic information that I thought archaeologists would like to know.

However, when I met with Beth and Chris Padon in December 2010 I realized that I had been approaching the form from a teacher’s perspective. I had included the number of students, the amount of time available to the speaker, and whether or not any
students had special needs. It was a logistics-centric form with an underlying assumption that the guest speaker would generate their own content. Of course, this is a natural assumption for teachers to make when inviting some type of professional or expert to speak in their classrooms. But Beth immediately raised the issue of content, saying that she would like to know where the students were in their curriculum before speaking to the class (B. Padon 2010). For Beth, the content of her theoretical presentation was not purely self-generated, but instead responsive to the environment of the classroom. Her statement led directly to the inclusion of the context statement and prompt in the form. I felt this helped to balance perspectives by casting both the setting and the content of the presentation as matters that require dialogue between teacher and guest speaker.
Chapter 6

Reflections and Recommendations

By combining aspects of archaeology education and community-based archaeology, this research developed a project in which collaborative partnerships with stakeholders were used to create a local history-themed toolkit for third grade teachers in Duarte. Over the course of fourteen months I worked alongside several stakeholders to generate the toolkit materials, keeping in regular contact with them and altering my research design in response to their input. The results of this fieldwork were the project template and the Duarte Heritage Toolkit, both of which I hope will serve as guides for future researchers designing community-based archaeology education programs.

As will be discussed shortly, I feel that the goals and objectives of the Duarte Heritage Toolkit Project generally met with success. Yet there is always room for improvement. Issues that arose during research included stakeholders’ preconceived associations with archaeology, the nature of my role as project coordinator, and the significant time investment required by community-based collaborative projects. But rather than discouraging CRM professionals from initiating or joining such projects, I hope that discussing these issues will help lead to solutions. There are many ways that community-based archaeology education programs can be expanded and improved upon, both by addressing the issues I discuss and by exploring new directions for research.
Review of Project Goals and Objectives

Template and Toolkit

This project's goals were to create a template for conducting a local-level archaeology education outreach program and to produce teaching materials for the use of the Duarte community. In order to create the template I reviewed email correspondence, notes from stakeholder meetings, and my own observations of the process as it occurred. I pieced these together to form the narrative of strategies described in Chapter 4, which includes the basic guiding principles of my research, the step-by-step process I followed to conduct the project, and my responses to various difficulties or developments encountered during the research process. The template is designed to guide potential researchers and inform them of the difficulties they may encounter—and solutions they may apply—while implementing this type of program.

Similar to the template, the teaching materials were constructed by coordinating the input I received from ongoing meetings with my project partners. As was seen in Chapter 5, their ideas and critiques directly shaped the components of the toolkit. The final product consists of four pieces, all of which are specifically designed for use by members of the Duarte community. The Classroom Activity Sets provide teachers with material that is tailored to local history, while the Recommended Readings List and Community Heritage Resources Guide can be used to enhance their preexisting curriculum. Meanwhile, the Guest Speaker Form is designed to facilitate easy communication between teachers and outside subject experts like archaeologists or local historians. The toolkit was designed primarily for teachers, and every third grade DUSD teacher will receive both physical and electronic copies of the materials upon their
completion. However, other project partners and the general Duarte community will have access to the toolkit as well, either through individual copies or master copies stored at the public library, the museum, and city hall.

Objectives

To help achieve these goals I had created four objectives for my research, which I feel have also been addressed during the course of this project. The first objective was to form partnerships and conduct ongoing collaboration with community stakeholders. I did this by establishing a network of project partners and keeping up a regular correspondence with them through emails, phone calls, and face-to-face meetings. I approached these exchanges as genuine collaboration between equal partners in the research process, and as previously mentioned the format and content of the toolkit were directly shaped by project partner input. As an extension of this objective I also designed the toolkit to have an organic structure. Stakeholders will be provided with electronic copies of the materials that they may alter or update at their convenience. They may also visit the project website at any point beyond the formal conclusion of this research to exchange ideas with other stakeholders about new ideas or resources for the toolkit.

The second objective was to publicize and utilize the local-history themed resources of Duarte. I did this by referencing resources in the classroom activities of the toolkits as well as by gathering entries for the Community Heritage Resources Guide. For the classroom activities, copies of objects and documents related to the life of Andres Duarte were directly spotlighted in the rancho activity set, while cultural knowledge gathered by Julia Bogany was used to supplement the Tongva activity set. For the
resources guide, I included information on individuals, institutions, services, objects, and field trip locations that could help teachers provide students with a more nuanced account of local Duarte history. Both of these toolkit components were designed to increase student, teacher, and community member awareness of the local history resources available in and around Duarte.

My third objective was to make sure that both the process and product accounted for the needs and constraints of local teachers. To ensure that an educator’s perspective was included in the research process I consulted with Wendy Wright and the five elementary school principals of DUSD, as well as worked alongside third grade teachers in the district to directly design the toolkit materials. The classroom activities were designed to be self-contained, with a limit on time and necessary materials. They were also planned to align with third grade curriculum content standards and appeal to several types of student learners by incorporating various combinations of Howard Gardner’s multiple intelligences. The other toolkit materials were intended to be either easy reference guides to books or other resources for classroom use, or a means of promoting communication between teachers and potential classroom visitors. Ultimately the purpose of these efforts was to provide teachers with materials that were convenient to use, effective in the classroom, and relevant to the state-established curriculum.

The fourth and final objective of my research was to ensure that the materials produced reflected CRM perspectives and concepts. Besides incorporating my own knowledge and experience into the design of the toolkit, I also sought input from Sherri Gust, Beth Padon, and Chris Padon. Sherri contributed titles to the Recommended Readings List, and offered suggestions for the resources guide alongside Beth and Chris.
All three of them gave valuable feedback on the Guest Speaker Form by providing an archaeologist's view on what information should be shared before a classroom visit. Sherri, Beth, and Chris also contributed to the development of my heritage themes. As mentioned in the previous chapter, these themes were used to incorporate the concepts of change over time, preservation, and stewardship into the instructions and objectives of the classroom activities. The purpose of this was to encourage both students and teachers to view their local history from the perspective of an archaeologist. Namely, as a collection of resources that can convey exciting and relevant information, but are also vulnerable to damage and should be protected for future generations.

**Difficulties Associated with the Collaborative Model**

Although I fulfilled my research goals and objectives, three issues arose during the course of the project that I was unable to fully address. The first of these was the common association of archaeology with field skills and prehistory. As I discussed in Chapter 4, there was initial confusion among many stakeholders as to how I would make an archaeology-themed toolkit without using field skills or referring to an active excavation. This led to my decision to use the terms "heritage" and "community heritage resource" when directly describing the themes and contents of the toolkit, although I still referred to my larger project as an archaeology or CRM outreach program. While this change made communication with stakeholders easier and also represented my approach more accurately, switching terms instead of taking time to explore a more nuanced representation of archaeology could be seen as avoiding the root problem.
I also felt that the idea of archaeologists primarily working with prehistoric materials influenced the research process. While books, resources, and classroom activities were intended to include both the Gabrielino/Tongva and Andres Duarte topics, the completed toolkit demonstrates a bias towards Native American materials. It is true that Andres Duarte's status as a figure of local significance meant that there were fewer resources associated with him to begin with. It is also true that project partners' contributions were also influenced by their personal expertise. For instance, Julia Bogany and Craig Torres provided a lot of information on the Gabrielino/Tongva, while Irwin Margiloff and Irma Hernandez had knowledge of more recent Duarte past. However, the majority of books and resources contributed by project partners with no specific affiliation—such as teachers and archaeologists—still focused on Gabrielino/Tongva subjects. This led to the toolkit materials feeling somewhat imbalanced.

The second issue that I felt was not properly resolved was the nature of my role as a coordinator in the context of a community-based project. When designing my research methods and interacting with stakeholders I attempted to challenge traditional power relations by acknowledging them as equal partners in the research process. Stakeholders were consulted and updated at every stage of the project, which continued to evolve in response to their input. However, I was still the one who initiated correspondence, led the more formal meetings, designed the project website, and made the final call as to what would be included in the toolkit. Furthermore, due to conflicting schedules I was never able to successfully arrange a meeting between different stakeholder groups. This resulted in a disappointing lack of discourse between project partners and placed me once
again in a central position of authority on the project. I tried to partially alleviate this situation by introducing the organic aspects of the toolkit: the project website, where stakeholders could continue to brainstorm, critique, and develop Duarte history-themed materials even after the project had ended, and the electronic copies of the toolkit that would allow stakeholders to edit and produce new copies of the toolkit with ease.

While I would have liked the project to have been steered by a committee of stakeholders rather than a single coordinator, my role was a result of practical limitations. All of my project partners had jobs, families, and schedules to work around. What time they could volunteer to the project was greatly appreciated, and it would have been both difficult and potentially damaging to the partnerships we had established to demand more. It made logistical sense to have a single person devoted to organizing meetings, compiling ideas, and physically creating the toolkit materials. The role of coordinator fell to me because I was the project partner with the biggest investment in seeing the project completed in a timely fashion, given that I had initiated it and that it was intrinsically bound to my thesis research. I still feel that this project was a collaborative success in which the voices of stakeholders were given significant weight, but I would have liked to see the authority of managing the project spread out between multiple individuals.

Related to this, the final issue that I encountered in this project is the significant time investment required by community-based projects. The gradual development of the stakeholder network through circumstance and recommendations meant that I was meeting some project partners for the first time as late as January 2011. Scheduling meetings around stakeholder availability was necessary, but led to a somewhat uneven
project schedule punctuated with both lulls and rushes in action. Outside of meetings I spent time familiarizing myself with the personal history of Andres Duarte, third grade curriculum content standards, recently published books on Gabrielino/Tongva history and culture, and the various resources recommended for the toolkit by stakeholders. I found that meetings with stakeholders who had limited time went smoother when I was prepared with background information on topics relevant to their expertise. In addition to this I was also taking input from my project partners and shaping it into the components of the toolkit.

Realistically speaking, not everyone in the field of CRM has time to devote to coordinating meetings and synthesizing stakeholder input. Likewise, the budgets and timeframes of many projects do not factor in formal outreach efforts. That being said, public outreach and engagement with the community are integral to the future of CRM and should be pursued in whatever form is feasible. My research is intended to aid archaeologists in their outreach efforts by providing a template with which to approach future efforts at community-based archaeology education programs. Just as Duarte teachers will pick and choose the toolkit materials that fit best with their individual classrooms, archaeologists can select from this research the strategies and materials that work best with individual project settings. While public outreach will always require an investment of time and effort, hopefully the template and toolkit produced by this research will give other CRM professionals a good starting point for launching their own efforts.
Recommendations for Future Research

Along this line of thinking, there are several ways in which the approach to community-based archaeology education reflected in this thesis can be expanded or improved upon. For instance, future research could devote special effort towards arranging more collaborative meetings between stakeholders. This could take the form of smaller crossover meetings between different groups, or a set goal of having a certain number of large meetings where all stakeholders attend and exchange input. While coordinating schedules will always present difficulties, including mechanisms such as an official project emailing list or website might help to compare schedules and determine availability.

Another way to expand on this research is to incorporate curriculum content standards from other subjects into teaching materials. As I mentioned in Chapter 2, archaeology educators frequently cite the interdisciplinary nature of archaeology as a major draw for teachers. Although my project’s toolkit materials focused on social studies, content standards from mathematics, science, language arts, and visual and performing arts could be easily integrated into archaeology-based activities.

This research could also be altered to apply to specific sites or resources encountered during CRM projects. This project’s toolkit materials were designed to cover general periods of Duarte’s history, and few cultural resources were available to be included. It would be interesting to see outreach products such as a readings list, resources guide, or classroom activities that were more able to draw on properties, landscapes, oral histories, or collections of artifacts as a context for discussing concepts such as change over time, preservation, and stewardship.
Future researchers may also want to develop assessment strategies for the materials that they produce. The focus of this research was on the actual process of creating the toolkit, with an emphasis on assuring that it was genuinely collaborative and responsive to stakeholder input. As such, the content was reviewed several times by project partners and either approved or critiqued. However, formal assessment of the toolkit’s performance in classrooms was beyond the scope of this project. Individuals who wish to include assessment in their outreach efforts may find the SAA’s publication, “Archaeology in the Classroom: Guidelines for the Evaluation of Archaeology Education Materials” to be useful (Society for American Archaeology 1995). They might also devise their own criteria for evaluation by soliciting input from teachers and archaeologists.

Finally, I feel that it would be worthwhile to explore how future community-based archaeology education programs might expand upon the organic model represented by the website and electronic copies of the toolkit provide to stakeholders. Although they were developed later, these aspects of the project complemented the collaborative, responsive nature of the research process by giving stakeholders yet another way to engage meaningfully with the project materials. They also helped to conclude my research on a note that transferred project control from myself to the Duarte community, which fit well with my desire to challenge the traditional power relations associated with archaeologists’ interactions with the public. Although every outreach scenario is different and requires different strategies, incorporating such mechanisms into future projects would not only give communities a stronger sense of investment but allow archaeologists to work towards a primary goal of public archaeology. As mentioned earlier in this
thesis, Francis P. McManamon describes the ideal public audience as one “that abhor[s] site destruction and support[s] archaeological activities and preservation” (McManamon 2000:23). If the purpose of outreach is to instill the values of CRM into members of the public and encourage them to feel a sense of responsibility towards cultural resources, then finding ways to shift the momentum of these projects from archaeologists to the communities themselves would be a significant step in the right direction.
CLASSROOM ACTIVITIES

TONGVA SET
TONGVA ACTIVITY #1

HERITAGE THEME: CHANGE OVER TIME
CONTENT STANDARDS: 3.2.1, 3.2.2
MULTIPLE INTELLIGENCES: VERBAL/LINGUISTIC, BODILY/KINESTHETIC, INTERPERSONAL
HERITAGE RESOURCE: BOOKS on Tongva culture

"A Day In the Life of a Tongva Child"

Objectives:

- Students will compare the actions and objects of daily Tongva life with the actions and objects of their own modern lifestyle.
- Students will recognize that the Tongva used local natural resources to create the items they used in everyday life.
- Students will demonstrate knowledge of the above by performing a skit for their teacher and classmates.

Background Information:

- Descriptions of objects from daily Tongva life (see BOOKS at Duarte Library)

Materials:

- Poster paper or tagboard
- Markers, colored pencils, or crayons
- "A Day in the Life of a Tongva Child" handout
- OPTIONAL: items such as baskets, abalone shells, rabbit skins, tule dolls, acorns, etc.

---

11 Available at the Duarte Public Library. See Community Heritage Resources Guide entry #2.
STEPS:

1.) Using a piece of poster paper or the whiteboard brainstorm with students about everyday items they have in their houses. Using the “A Day in the Life of a Tongva Child” handout to direct your questions, ask questions such as “what do you use to boil water in?”, “what do you use when you have a cold?”, and “what kinds of toys do you play with?” Be sure to ask students if they know what these objects are made of.

2.) Once you have listed about 12 items ask students if they know what the Tongva equivalent of each item was before Europeans came to California. Go down the list and match up modern objects with traditional Tongva objects that fulfilled the same purpose.

3.) Divide the students into groups of 4-5. Tell each group to pick 6 items off the list and use them to write a short skit about a typical day in the life of a Tongva child. Props for the skit can be student-drawn pictures of the items or physical objects purchased at supply stores or pow-wows. Teachers may also write out specific one-line prompts for different groups, such as “your group has to prepare dinner” or “your group has to describe a person getting dressed for the day.”

4.) Have the students perform their skit for the class. At various points in the skit tell the performers to FREEZE and ask the students in the audience questions about the story. Ask questions such as “what is that cape made of?”, “what do we use today instead of that object?”, and “where could I find a basket like that today?”
## A DAY IN THE LIFE OF A TONGVA CHILD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM:</th>
<th>USE:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deerskin cape</td>
<td>Clothing – <em>for cold weather</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yucca root</td>
<td>Hygiene – <em>soap</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woven basket</td>
<td>Tool – <em>carrying items or boiling water</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steatite mortar and pestle</td>
<td>Tool – <em>grinding food</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obsidian knife</td>
<td>Tool – <em>cutting</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tule reed doll</td>
<td>Toy – <em>a child’s toy</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spear-and-hoop game</td>
<td>Toy – <em>used to practice throwing skills</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acorns</td>
<td>Toy – <em>used as spinning tops</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walnut shells</td>
<td>Toy – <em>halved shells were filled with clay and thrown as dice</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yerba Santa leaves</td>
<td>Medicine – <em>made into tea for colds</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toyon leaves</td>
<td>Medicine – <em>made into tea for stomachaches</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willow bark</td>
<td>Medicine – <em>made into tea for fevers</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TONGVA ACTIVITY #2

HERITAGE THEME: PRESERVATION
CONTENT STANDARDS: 3.1.1, 3.2.1
MULTIPLE INTELLIGENCES: VERBAL/LINGUISTIC, INTERPERSONAL
HERITAGE RESOURCE: "How California Was Made" story

"Make Your Own Myth"

Objectives:

· Students will read the traditional Tongva story, "How California Was Made."

· Students will identify the natural resources mentioned in the story.

· Students will discuss why myths and legends are created and display their understanding by creating their own explanatory myth.

· Students will brainstorm ideas for preserving non-physical resources like memories and traditional stories.

Background Information:

. Information on geographical features, plants, and animals native to the San Gabriel Valley (see BOOKS at Duarte library)

Materials:

. “How California Was Made” story
. “Make Your Own Myth” List
. OPTIONAL: Pictures or fact cards about plants and animals native to the San Gabriel Valley
. OPTIONAL: Paper and markers or other drawing supplies

2 Available online. See Community Heritage Resources Guide entry #15.
STEPS:

1.) Go around the classroom and have each student read aloud a small section of "How California Was Made" until the whole story has been told. Ask students what kinds of plants, animals, or geographical features were mentioned in the story. Have them identify local examples (for instance, the San Gabriel Mountains).

2.) Ask students what the purpose of the story was- what was it trying to teach or explain to the audience? Tell students that myths, legends, and traditional stories are often people's way of explaining pieces of their environment. If possible, brainstorm examples from other cultures. Teachers may wish to use this activity during a holiday season to give students an immediate context for yearly traditions and culturally significant stories.

3.) Have students (individually or in pairs) write a short story explaining some physical trait of a plant, animal, or geographical feature native to the San Gabriel Valley. For instance, "why does the rabbit have long ears?" or "why are toyon berries red?" Some suggestions have been included in the "Make Your Own Myth" starter list.

4.) Collect the stories. Ask students if they know why some myths and stories have survived to the present day and some have not. Discuss how historians, archaeologists, and ordinary people all play a part in preserving information about the past. Tell students that modern Tongva are trying to preserve their traditional stories today.

5.) Using a piece of poster paper or the whiteboard brainstorm with students about ways that they can preserve the stories they have just written (such as telling the story every year on a special day, writing a book and donating it to a library, recording themselves telling the story aloud, etc.).
MAKE YOUR OWN MYTH

GEOGRAPHY:
Rivers
Mountains

ANIMALS:
Rabbit
Deer
Squirrel
Badger
Grasshopper
Antelope
Coyote
Skunk
Gopher
Snake

PLANTS:
Toyon
Black oak
White sage
California poppy
Deer grass
Yucca
Tule
Black sage
Prickly Pear Cactus
Acorn
TONGVA ACTIVITY #3

HERITAGE THEME: STEWARDSHIP
CONTENT STANDARDS: 3.2.1, 3.2.2
MULTIPLE INTELLIGENCES: VERBAL/LINGUISTIC, VISUAL/SPATIAL, INTERPERSONAL
HERITAGE RESOURCES: QUOTES from “O, My Ancestor: Recognition and Renewal for the Gabrielino-Tongva People of the Los Angeles Area” by C. Jurmain & W. McCawley

“Design a Tongva Community Center”

Objectives:

· Students will learn about Tongva crafts, plant usage, and traditional beliefs.

· Students will discuss why remembering and protecting the past is important.

· Students will propose solutions to the problem of cultural preservation that modern Tongva face.

Background Information:

· Tradition Tongva crafts, plant usage, and folklore (see BOOKS at Duarte library)

Materials:

· Large piece of poster paper
· Markers, colored pencils, or crayons
· “Being Gabrielino/Tongva Today” handout
· OPTIONAL: construction paper, scissors, glue, tape, paint, paint brushes

---

3 Available in full at the Duarte Public Library. See Community Heritage Resources Guide entry #2.
STEPS:

1.) Have students read aloud passages from the “Being Gabrielino/Tongva Today” handout to the class.

2.) Ask students why the Tongva in these passages are upset. Why is it important to them to preserve their culture? Ask if any students have traditions or stories in their family passed on from their parents or grandparents. How would they feel if those traditions disappeared?

3.) Divide students into 3 “research” groups: Traditional Crafts, Plant Usage, and Folklore. Have each group research their subject using the internet, the Duarte Public Library, or other classroom handouts.

4.) Divide a large poster into 3 sections. Tell the students that they are going to design a Community Center for Tongva who want to learn or teach others about their culture today. Groups can rotate turns working on their section of the poster, designing buildings, landscape, or other features based on their research. Possibilities include a garden for food and medicine plants, picnic tables for crafting outdoors, and a library for stories. Leave space for a “plaque” somewhere on the poster.

5.) Have students (as a group) write a short message to put in the “plaque” space explaining why it is important to protect the resources at the Community Center.
BEING GABRIELINO/TONGVA TODAY

“We all know the history of what happened to our people. We didn’t have a lot. A lot was taken away. Some of the last fragments we have to hold on to were those stories.” – Craig Torres

“You’re put into a different environment, and then everything else is taken from you. You’re told that’s not what you’re doing anymore. You’re not doing Indian things anymore.” – Arthur Morales

“When I was in the third and fourth grade and we were taught California history, I wanted to raise my hand so bad and tell that teacher, ‘I’m one of those people that you’re teaching us about’.” – Angie Behrns

“I know history books still say we’re extinct. [My daughter] is working hard, and has with different people in different parts of the community who are trying to show that we still exist, and we’re still around.” – Arthur Morales

---

5 Quote taken from pg. 51 of Jurmain & McCawley 2009.
6 Quote taken from pg. 235 of Jurmain & McCawley 2009.
7 Quote taken from pg. 49 of Jurmain & McCawley 2009.
CLASSROOM ACTIVITIES

RANCHO SET
**RANCHO ACTIVITY #1**

**HERITAGE THEME:** CHANGE OVER TIME  
**CONTENT STANDARDS:** 3.1.2, 3.3.2  
**MULTIPLE INTELLIGENCES:** LOGICAL/MATHEMATICAL, INTERPERSONAL  
**HERITAGE RESOURCES:** BRANDING IRON and OIL LAMP\(^8\)

"*Rancho Azusa de Duarte Trade Game*

**Objectives:**

. Students will discover what resources were and were not available to people living on Ranch Azusa de Duarte in the 1840s.

. Students will learn about trade and economy in Mexican California.

. Students will compare and contrast the rancho lifestyle with their own by participating in an explanatory game.

**Background Information:**

. Items that California rancheros would or would not have access to (see CALIFORNIA RANCHO FACT CARDS and BOOKS at Duarte library).

**Materials:**

. Branding iron and oil lamp  
. Blank white index cards  
. Markers or other drawing supplies  
. “*Rancho Azusa de Duarte Trade Game*” List  
. **OPTIONAL:** household items to represent trade goods (ex. cotton balls = wool, brown paper bags = cattle hides, tea candles = tallow)

---

\(^8\) Available at the Duarte Historical Museum. See Community Heritage Resources Guide entry #1.
**STEPS:**

1.) Ask students if they know where the items in their house were made. If possible, bring in household items with stamps or stickers that show where they were produced. Tell students that when Andres Duarte was alive it took much longer to ship items from one country to another. When traders from the United States or other countries did make it to California, Andres Duarte and others traded things they made on their rancho for things that they could not make themselves.

2.) Pass around the branding iron and the oil lamp. Ask students what materials they think were available on a rancho based on these items.

3.) Divide students in 2 groups: Rancheros from Azusa de Duarte and American traders. Give each group their half of the “Rancho Azusa de Duarte Trade Game” list. Have students draw pictures of these items on index cards to represent their inventory. Depending on how rare the item was, it can be represented anywhere from 1-10 times. You may also choose to use small household items or other physical objects to represent trade goods (see Materials). Finally, make each group a “shopping list” of 5-10 items that they want to buy from the other group.

4.) Have students act out a trade session in which American traders come to visit Rancho Azusa de Duarte. Students should barter with each other with the goal of getting every item on their shopping list. You can set up end goals (for example, the rancho group must hold onto at least 4 of their “tallow” cards, the American traders must keep 2 of their “silk rebozo” cards). You can also create a “pricing” system for the students to work within (for instance, 3 “cattle hide” cards = 1 “piano” card).

5.) During the activity, pose as a time-traveler and occasionally ask students to explain their actions, justify their purchases, or put the value of an item in a modern context.
RANCHO AZUSA DE DUARTE TRADE GAME

RANCHERO ITEMS:
Leather boots
Saddles
Harnesses
Cattle hides
Tallow
Candles
Wool
Blankets

AMERICAN TRADER ITEMS:
Piano
Silk rebozo (shawl)
China dishware
Books
Nails
Hammers
Axes
Spoons
Belt buckles
Mirrors

Note: The rancheros have fewer items to trade with! Their main exports were cattle hides and tallow.
RANCHO ACTIVITY #2

HERITAGE THEME: PRESERVATION
CONTENT STANDARDS: 3.1, 3.3.3
MULTIPLE INTELLIGENCES: VISUAL/SPATIAL, BODILY/KINESTHETIC, INTERPERSONAL
HERITAGE RESOURCES: DISEÑO from Duarte's land grant request

"Mapping the Rancho"

Objectives:

. Students will discuss the concepts of landmarks and geographical features while studying Duarte's diseño, or sketch map.

. Students will develop basic map-making and spatial organization skills by recording a small section of their school or a nearby park.

. Students will learn that maps are one way that information is preserved.

Background Information:

. A description of the land grant process (see BOOKS on DUARTE HISTORY at Duarte library and museum)

Materials:

. Photocopy of Duarte's diseño
. String or yarn cut to a standard length (ex. 1 yard)
. Graph paper
. Pencils & erasers
. Rulers

10 Copies available from the Duarte Historical Museum. See Community Heritage Resources Guide entry #1.
STEPS:

1.) Discuss Duarte’s *diseño* with the students—how he drew it and what the purpose was. See if any students can identify the landmarks on the map. Talk about the things you would include on a map—things that are large, don’t move, or that are important to you. Ask what they would add to the map if they were to update it today. Ask students what they would include if they were making a map of the school.

2.) Go over the basic elements of a map: the grid, compass, legend/key, and scale. Explain that these elements help the reader of the map understand what they are looking at.

3.) Pick a contained area (such as a nearby park or the schoolyard) and divide it into sections. Assign students to different sections. Suggested group size is 3 students: one drawer, two measurers. Have each group make a sketch map of their section by having two students use the string as a “ruler” to measure the distance between landmarks while the third student records the measurements. Have students rotate so that each gets to measure and record. You can expand the difficulty by laying out chairs, boxes, or other items for students to record on their map.

4.) Have each student explain their map to another group, pointing out what landmarks they chose and why.

5.) Discuss how maps can reveal information about the past. Ask students how maps are similar or different from books, photographs, or a person’s memories. Ask students what information they think people from the future will learn from the maps they created.
DISEÑO FOR RANCHO AZUSA DE DUARTE

1841 sketch map submitted with Duarte’s land grant application. The rancho is bordered by the San Gabriel Mountains to the north and Hugo Reid’s Rancho Santa Anita to the west. The San Gabriel River runs through the center of the rancho.

An electronic copy of this document is available at the Duarte Historical Museum.
RANCHO ACTIVITY #3

HERITAGE THEME: STEWARDSHIP
CONTENT STANDARDS: 3.3, 3.3.3
MULTIPLE INTELLIGENCES: VISUAL/SPATIAL, INTRAPERSONAL, INTERPERSONAL
HERITAGE RESOURCES: Andres Duarte BAPTISMAL RECORD, DISEÑO, and LAND TRANSFER DOCUMENT

"History Puzzle, My Story Puzzle"

Objectives:

. Students will understand “artifacts” as pieces of a person’s life that when put in sequence can tell a story.

. Students will demonstrate this knowledge by creating “history puzzles” of their own lives.

. Students will learn about the problems historians and archaeologists have when sites are destroyed or data is incomplete.

. Students will discuss why remembering and protecting the past is important.

Background Information:

. Life of Andres Duarte (see BOOKS at Duarte library and museum)

Materials:

. Baptismal record, diseño, and land transfer deed
. “History Puzzle” handout
. Markers, colored pencils, or crayons
. Scissors

11 Copies available from the Duarte Historical Museum. See Community Heritage Resources Guide entry #1.
STEPS:

1.) Show students the Baptismal Record, Diseño, and Land Transfer Deed in that order. Explain how each document is a puzzle piece telling a small piece of Andres Duarte's life story. The baptismal record represents his birth near San Juan Capistrano, while the diseño symbolizes his adulthood when he received the land that became his rancho. The last piece shows his later years when he became poor and had to sell pieces of his rancho to pay debts.

2.) Have each student fill out a “History Puzzle” handout, drawing a picture in each of the 5 spaces that represents a piece of his or her personal story. The picture can be a scene, a single object, or a symbol. Each one should represent an important moment in their life, something they accomplished, or their personal interests like sports or a favorite T.V. show.

3.) Have students cut out the puzzle shapes and write their initials on the back of each piece. Collect each one and mix them up, combining 2 students’ puzzles. Then take 3 pieces out of the pile and give them to a group of students. Ask the students to piece together the puzzles without looking at backs to see the initials.

4.) As a group, discuss with students what was hard about piecing the puzzles together and what was easy. Was it easier if you recognized your friend’s drawing style? Did everyone pick a similar kind of picture to draw (ex. a birthday cake or a picture of the school)? What if you had an incomplete puzzle? Could you guess what was in the blank spaces?

5.) Tell students that historians and archaeologists have the same problems when they do research or dig sites. Sometimes the puzzle pieces have been lost, sometimes they have been stolen. Sometimes they’re still there, but broken beyond repair. Using a piece of poster paper or the whiteboard brainstorm with students about some ways that they can protect the “puzzle pieces” that are still around.
ANDRES DUARTE BAPTISMAL RECORD

November 30, 1805, Mission San Juan Capistrano

An electronic copy of this document is available at the Duarte Historical Museum.
DISEÑO FOR RANCHO AZUSA DE DUARTE

1841 sketch map submitted with Duarte’s land grant application. The rancho is bordered by the San Gabriel Mountains to the north and Hugo Reid’s Rancho Santa Anita to the west. The San Gabriel River runs through the center of the rancho.

An electronic copy of this document is available at the Duarte Historical Museum.
LAND TRANSFER DEED

December 15, 1855 deed selling 100 acres of land for $200 to Michael Whistler. Signed with cross marks by Andres and Gertrudis Duarte, who were illiterate.

An electronic copy of this document is available at the Duarte Historical Museum.
HISTORY PUZZLE

When I was little...  ...a few years ago...  ...today

Pick 5 events that tell the story of your life so far. Show one event in each piece of the puzzle. Draw what happened, use symbols, or be creative!
Children's Books
Title: A Story of Seven Sisters: A Tongva Pleides Legend
Author: Pamela Max
Year: 2010
Type: Fiction

Title: Gabrielino
Author: Barbara A. Gray-Kanatiiosh
Year: 2004
Type: Nonfiction

Title: The Tongva of California
Author: Jack S. Williams
Year: 2003
Type: Nonfiction

Title: The Gabrielino.
Author: Bruce W. Miller
Year: 1991
Type: Nonfiction

Title: Island of the Blue Dolphins.
Author: Scott O'Dell
Year: 1960
Type: Fiction

Adult's Books
Title: O My Ancestor: Recognition and Renewal for the Gabrielino-Tongva People of Los Angeles
Author: Claudia K. Jurmain and William McCawley
Year: 2009
Type: Nonfiction
Title: Images of America: Duarte
Author: Irwin Margiloff, Neal Earle, & the Duarte Historical Society
Year: 2009
Type: Nonfiction

Title: The Gale Encyclopedia of Native American Tribes, Vol. 4: California, Pacific Northwest, Pacific Islands.
Author: Sharon Malinowski
Year: 1998
Type: Nonfiction

Title: The First Americans: California Indians
Author: Cynthia L. Keyworth
Year: 1991
Type: Nonfiction

Title: Handbook of North American Indians, Vol. 8: California
Author: William C. Sturtevant
Year: 1978
Type: Nonfiction

Title: On the Duarte
Author: R. Aloysia Moore & Bernice Bozeman Watson
Year: 1976
Type: Nonfiction

Title: California's Gabrielino Indians
Author: Bernice Johnston
Year: 1962
Type: Nonfiction

Title: History of Monrovia and Duarte
Author: Charles F. Davis
Year: 1938
Type: Nonfiction
AT THE DUARTE HISTORICAL MUSEUM

Title: Images of America: Duarte
Author: Irwin Margiloff, Neal Earle, & the Duarte Historical Society
Year: 2009
Type: Nonfiction

Title: On the Duarte
Author: R. Aloysia Moore & Bernice Bozeman Watson
Year: 1976
Type: Nonfiction

Title: The Sequent Occupance of the Rancho Azusa de Duarte, A Segment of the Upper San Gabriel Valley of California
Author: Ida May Schrode
Year: 1948
Type: Nonfiction
AT OTHER LOS ANGELES AREA LIBRARIES

Title: The First Angelinos: The Gabrielino Indians of Los Angeles
Author: William McCawley
Year: 1996
Type: Nonfiction

Title: The Indians of Los Angeles County: Hugo Reid's Letters of 1852
Author: Robert F. Heizer
Year: 1968
Type: Nonfiction

Title: Handbook of the Indians of California, Vol. 1
Author: A.L. Kroeber
Year: 1925
Type: Nonfiction

Title: The Beginning of the World
Author: Don Newton
Year: 1998
Type: Poetry
COMMUNITY HERITAGE

RESOURCES GUIDE
INSTITUTIONS

1. DUARTE HISTORICAL MUSEUM
   Location: 777 Encanto Parkway, Duarte, CA 91010
   Services: The museum houses several objects, documents, and photographs related to the history of Duarte that range from the rancho era up until the recent past. It is also a good resource for performing scholarly research and has among other texts the three books on Duarte history mentioned in the Recommended Readings List. The museum is available for field trips, and teachers may arrange with museum staff to "check-out" a small number of items for use as visual aids in their classrooms.
   Fees: None
   Contact Info
   Phone: (626) 357-9419
   Website: http://www.duartehistory.org/museum.htm
   Hours: Wednesday: 1st and 3rd of every month, 1pm-3pm
   Saturday: 1pm-4pm

2. DUARTE PUBLIC LIBRARY
   Location: 1301 Buena Vista St., Duarte, CA 91010
   Services: In addition to several adult and children's books on Native American tribes and California history, the Duarte Public Library has a free intra-library loan system that allows patrons to check out books from other LA County libraries. Patrons may also request books from libraries outside the LA county system for a fee of $3.00. Library staff are available to visit schools as well as order materials from other libraries for class projects. The library also offers online "Homework Help" for students with a library card and storytelling hours accompanied by arts and crafts projects. Library cards are required to check out materials, but are free to obtain.
Fees: Free with LA County Public Library card
$3.00 for requesting books outside of the LA county system

Contact Info
Phone: (626) 358-1865
Website: http://www.colapublib.org/libs/duarte/index.php
Hours: Monday - Thursday: 11am-8pm
       Friday - Saturday: 11am-6pm

3. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
(DUARTE CITY HALL)
Location: 1600 Huntington Drive, Duarte CA 91010
Services: Because they are responsible for issuing building permits
          and conducting inspections, the Community Development
          department has access to several historical photographs
          that show how Duarte’s landscape has changed over time.
          The department is also tied to many of the city’s historic
          preservation goals and policies. They have a hard copy of
          the historic resources survey of Duarte conducted by Cal
          Poly Pomona students in 2003. Survey materials include a
          list of potentially significant properties, a map for a
          proposed historic district, informational posters and
          timelines, and a Duarte history-themed board game for
          children. In general, the department is a good source of
          background information on Duarte history.

Fees: None

Contact Info
Phone: City Hall Info Desk - (626) 357-7931
Website: http://www.accessduarte.com
Hours: Monday-Thursday: 7:30am-6pm
4. **BURMINCO ROCKS & MINERALS**  
**Location:** 128 South Encinitas Avenue, Monrovia, CA 91016  
*(10 min from Duarte)*  
**Services:** This supply store sells a variety of rock samples to meet the needs of teachers, students, and collectors. Samples could be used to provide students with tangible examples of the materials used by Native Americans to create tools, weapons, jewelry, and other personal effects.

**Fees:** Products are individually priced.

**Contact Info**  
**Phone:** (877) 224-7081 *(toll free)*  
(626) 358-4478  
**Website:** http://www.burminco.com  
**Hours:** Wednesday-Saturday: 9:30am-5:30pm

5. **OCB TRADING POST**  
**Location:** 657 E. Arrow Hwy, Glendora CA 91740  
*(15 min from Duarte)*  
**Services:** This store sells a number of indigenous crafting materials, including plants, shells, hides, and horns. Teachers can use these samples in many ways: as examples to illustrate information learned in textbooks, as crafting supplies for projects, or as props in classroom games or skits.

**Fees:** Products are individually priced.

**Contact Info**  
**Phone:** (626) 914-0306  
**Website:** http://www.ocbtp.com  
**Hours:** Monday-Saturday: 10am-7pm  
Sunday: 10am-5pm
6. **LOS ANGELES COUNTY ARBORETUM & BOTANIC GARDENS**

**Location:** 301 North Baldwin Avenue, Arcadia CA 91007  
*(15 min from Duarte)*

**Services:** The arboretum provides a guided **field trip** for school groups called “Early California History” which covers the Gabrielino/Tongva, Mission, Rancho, and American periods. During the tour students explore replica kiys (Tongva dwellings), a historic 1840 adobe house, and other historic properties. The arboretum also offers a **grant** for 3rd and 4th grade teachers from Title 1 schools that covers the cost of transportation to and from the arboretum. Downloadable **prep and assessment sheets** for the guided tour are available on the website in the section “Just for Teachers & Schools.”

**Fees:** Free student admission  
Free adult admission unless exceeding ratio of 1 adult/8 students, $8.00 per adult  
Transportation grant for Title 1 schools

**Contact Info**

**Phone:**  
*School Tours* - (626) 821-3212  
*Youth Education Coordinator* - (626) 821-5897

**Website:** [http://www.arboretum.org/](http://www.arboretum.org/)

**Hours:** Monday-Sunday: 9am-4:30pm  
Tours conducted Wednesdays and Fridays

---

7. **SANTA FE DAM NATURE CENTER**

**Location:** 15501 E. Arrow Highway, Irwindale CA 91706  
*(15 min from Duarte)*

**Services:** The Nature Center offers field trips that combine environmental education with Native American culture and history. These include nature walks and a 1.3 mile interpretive hiking trail led by docents that discuss plant identification and use by indigenous California tribes. The center itself also has displays and lectures on rocks, gems,
minerals, animals, and plants. Additionally, the center holds special events where paleontologists and archaeologists are invited to lecture and an ongoing program called “Tongva Topics” conducted on Wednesdays and Thursdays.

Fees: Free student & teacher admission  
$10.00 vehicle entry fee on Weekends, Free on Weekdays

Contact Info
Phone: (626) 812-0935  
Website: http://www.sgmrc.org/sfd.html  
Hours: Monday – Saturday: 10am-1pm

8. RANCHO SANTA ANA BOTANIC GARDENS
Location: 1500 North College Avenue, Claremont CA 91711  
(25 min from Duarte)
Services: Rancho Santa Ana offers guided field trips for schools that cover both natural science and Tongva history and culture. The “Native Partners” tour discusses the importance of plant usage to the Tongva communities of the past and present, and allows students to participate in gathering and crafting activities. For a fee of $40.00 teachers may rent out the “Native Partners” outreach kit for their classrooms for a 2-week period. They can also visit the website and download the associated teacher’s packet which includes background information, classroom activities, and games for students.

Fees: School tours - Free teacher admission, $4.50 per student  
Outreach kit - $40.00 for 2 weeks

Contact Info
Phone: Education Department – (909) 625-8767  
Website: http://www.rsabg.org/learn/tours-and-programs  
Hours: Monday – Sunday: 8am-5pm
9. **NATURAL HISTORY MUSEUM OF LOS ANGELES**

**Location:** 900 Exposition Blvd, Los Angeles CA 90007
 *(30 min from Duarte)*

**Services:** In addition to offering field trips for school groups, the Natural History Museum provides teachers with several online resources to supplement their visit. These include printable field trip guides and lesson plans that are tied to exhibits in the halls of California and American history. The museum also has workshops and programs available for teachers who want to expand their knowledge of natural or social science.

**Fees:** Free admission if booked at least 3 weeks in advance

**Contact Info**

**Phone:** School Tours - (213) 763-3529
Education Programs - (213) 763-ED4U

**Website:**
http://www.nhm.org/site/plan-your-visit/school-visits
http://www.nhm.org/site/for-teachers

**Hours:** Monday-Sunday: 9:30am-5pm

10. **AMERICAN INDIAN RESOURCES CENTER**
(HUNTINGTON PARK LIBRARY)

**Location:** 6518 Miles Avenue, Huntington Park, CA 90255
 *(30 min from Duarte)*

**Services:** Dedicated to exploring Native American culture and history in California from pre-Columbian times to the present, the center houses a collection of materials including books, films, magazines, microfilm, CDs, cassette tapes, newsletters, and newspapers. These materials cover a wide range of topics: art, architecture, education, fiction, history, languages, literature, federal Indian law, and tribal law. The center also offers a Teacher's Resources Collection that provides teachers with lesson plans, recommended literature, background information, and a discussion of the
issues related to teaching Native American history in the classroom. Most materials are available through the Duarte library’s free intra-library loan system.

**Fees:** Free with LA County Public Library card

**Contact Info**

**Phone** Huntington Park Library Info Desk - (323) 583-2794

**Website:** http://www.colapublib.org/services/ethnic/indian.php4

**Hours:** Tuesday-Thursday: 10am-8pm
Saturday: 8am-6pm

11. **MUSEUM OF THE AMERICAN WEST**
   **(AUTRY NATIONAL CENTER)**

   **Location:** 4700 Western Heritage Way, Los Angeles, CA 90027
   (30 min from Duarte)

   **Services:** While the Southwest Museum of the American Indian is currently closed for renovations, the Museum of the American West offers several field trip options that focus on different subjects and are aimed at different age groups. The website offers free downloadable lesson plans that prepare students for their visit. Also available are “Community Stories” outreach kits which contain objects, books, and worksheets that cover a specific theme in California history. Teachers may rent kits out for a 2-week period, either for $25.00 or for free if they teach at a Title 1 school, and some of the worksheets are available to download online. Finally, the museum offers teacher workshops, storytelling programs, and a Free Bus Program that covers transportation costs for Title 1 schools.

   **Fees:** *School tours* - Free on 2nd Tuesday of the month
   **OR** $1 per person

   *Outreach kits* - Free for Title 1 schools
   **OR** $25.00 for 2 weeks
Free Bus Program for Title 1 schools

**Contact Info**

**Phone:** School Tours - (323) 667-2000 ex. 336  
**Website:** http://theautry.org/education/overview  
**Hours:** Tuesday – Friday: 10am-4pm  
Saturday – Sunday: 11am-5pm

---

**12. RANCHO LOS ALAMITOS**

**Address:** 6400 Bixby Hill Road, Long Beach CA 90815  
*(40 min from Duarte)*

**Services:** The rancho offers **field trips** for school groups in the form of guided tours of the property that cover Tongva history and culture as well as California rancho history. These visits combine lectures with **hands-on activities** such as carving soapstone necklaces. The rancho also sells a **teacher’s kit** produced in partnership with the Smithsonian Institute called “Footprints on the Land: Issues of Cultural Geography,” which includes several historic photographs from the rancho’s collection.

**Fees:**  
*School tours* - Free student & teacher admission  
*“Footprints on the Land”* - $90.00 + $12.50 shipping & handling

**Contact Info**

**Phone:** (562) 431-3541  
**Website:** http://www.rancholosalamitos.com/location.html  
**Email:** info@rancholosalamitos.com (to book school tours)  
**Hours:** Wednesday – Sunday: 1pm-5pm
13. GABRIELINO/TONGVA TEACHER WORKSHOPS & CLASSROOM VISITS

Services: Julia Bogany is the director of Cultural Affairs for the Gabrielino/Tongva Tribal Council of San Gabriel. Her workshops for adults and classroom visits for students discuss traditional Tongva crafts and plant usage, and include hands-on crafting activities for participants.

Fees: Classroom visits - $2.00-$5.00 per student
Teacher workshops - $10.00 per teacher

Contact Info
Phone: (909) 567-2580
Website: N/A
Email: juliabogany@aol.com
Hours: by appointment

14. BRINGING CALIFORNIA HISTORY TO LIFE THROUGH MUSIC (CALICANTO ASSOCIATES)

Services: Calicanto Associates has produced a teacher's booklet that includes authentic songs, dances, and games drawn from 5 periods of California history: Native California tribes, European Exploration, Spanish & Mexican rule, early U.S. statehood, and the Gold Rush. The booklet also provides informative maps, timelines, and content background, and has an accompanying CD. Teachers can order the booklet and CD from the Calicanto Associates website for $30.00 and $15.00, respectively. Calicanto Associates also puts on teacher workshops where they demonstrate and train teachers in the use of their materials.

Fees: “They Came Singing” – booklet $30.00
“They Came Singing” – CD $15.00
Booklet & CD - $40.00
15. BOWERS MUSEUM OF CULTURAL ART CURRICULUM GUIDES

Services: The Bowers Museum has produced two extensive curriculum guides that are free to download from their website. The *Southern California Indian Curriculum Guide* is primarily Gabrielino-themed and covers subjects ranging from folklore to economy to geography. It also includes the traditional Tongva story, “How California Was Made.” The *Early California: Exploration and Settlement Curriculum Guide* focuses on southern California, particularly the Los Angeles area. It provides information on both the mission and rancho periods. Both guides include historical background information and several useful maps, handouts, and worksheets.

Fees: None

Contact Info
Phone: N/A
Website: http://www.bowers.org/files/BowersSClndianGuide.pdf
Hours: N/A

16. DRAMATIC CHANGES OF THE SAN GABRIEL VALLEY FROM THE TIME OF THE GABRIELINO INDIANS UNTIL TODAY

Services: This Gabrielino-themed unit of study was designed by Rosa Carbajal, Tricia Franklin, Gladys Gimenez, and D.J. Ries. It lists the rational, objectives, and relevant state content standards for the unit. It also provides teaching strategies, lesson plans, and additional background content.
information. A copy of this unit can be found at Royal Oaks Elementary School with fourth-grade teacher Ms. Debbie Ogden.

**Fees:** None

**Contact Info**

**Phone:** N/A  
**Website:** N/A  
**Email:** dogden@duarte.k12.ca.us (put “Duarte Toolkit” in subject line)  
**Hours:** N/A

17. **CALIFORNIA RANCHO FACT CARDS**

**Services:** Toucan Valley Publications has produced a 33-page booklet describing everyday life on California ranchos. The booklet contains individual profiles of several historic ranchos in California. While Rancho Azusa de Duarte is not included, neighboring properties such as Hugo Reid’s Rancho Santa Anita are. In addition the binder includes general descriptions of everyday routines, common foods, leisure activities, the hide and tallow trade, and the eventual decline of the ranchos. A copy of this booklet can be found at the Duarte Public Library.

**Fees:** Free with LA County Public Library card  
OR $32.00 from Toucan Valley Publications

**Contact Info**

**Phone:** N/A  
**Website:** http://www.toucanvalley.com/ranchosfc.htm  
**Email:** access@socialstudies.com (to order Fact Cards)  
**Hours:** N/A
18. SOCIETY FOR AMERICAN ARCHAEOLOGY (SAA): RESOURCES FOR EDUCATORS

Services: The SAA website offers free access to a number of classroom resources for teachers, including archaeology-themed lesson plans, teacher workshops, fieldwork opportunities, links to professional archaeology publications, and sources for artifact replica kits.

Fees: None

Contact Info
Phone: N/A
Website: http://www.saa.org/publicftp/PUBLIC/resources/foredu.html
Hours: N/A

19. SOCIETY FOR CALIFORNIA ARCHAEOLOGY (SCA): CALIFORNIA ARCHAEOLOGY IN THE CLASSROOM

Services: The SCA website provides teachers with downloadable lesson plans to use in the classroom, as well as a list of readings on archaeology and a contact for obtaining maps, slides, visual aids, or an archaeologist guest speaker.

Fees: None

Contact Info
Phone: N/A
Website: http://www.scahome.org/about_ca_archaeology/classroom.html
Email: adie@scahome.org (Adie Whitaker, SAA contact)
Hours: N/A
OTHER ARCHAEOLOGY RESOURCES

20. CALIFORNIA ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITE STEWARDSHIP PROGRAM (CASSP)

Services: CASSP is a statewide program directed by the Society for California Archaeology (SCA) that trains volunteers to work with professional archaeologists to monitor and record sites and other properties in their local area. All volunteers must be 18 years or older. Volunteers must preregister and attend a 2-day training workshop for a fee of $25. Volunteers can expect to make site visits once per month.

Fees: Training workshops - $25.00 per person

Contact Info
Phone: N/A
Website: http://www.cassp.org
Email: bpodon@discoveryworks.com (to preregister for workshops)
Hours: Check website for workshop schedules

21. PACIFIC COAST ARCHAEOLOGICAL SOCIETY (PCAS)

Services: PCAS is an avocational archaeology group in the Orange County area that holds monthly lecture meetings, publishes a newsletter and a scholarly journal, and also organizes field trips to prehistoric sites for its members. Members also put on archaeology outreach events for schools and other organizations.

Fees: Membership - $45.00 per year

Contact Info
Phone: Membership - (714) 539-6354
Website: http://www.pcas.org
Hours: N/A
GUEST SPEAKER FORM
Guest Speaker Form

GENERAL

School Name: _____________________________________________
Address: ________________________________________________
Teacher: ________________________________________________
Room #: ________________________________________________
Grade Level: ____________________________________________

PRESENTATION

Number of students: _______________________________________

Time: ___________________________________________________

Students with special needs: _______________________________
____________________________
____________________________
____________________________
____________________________

Additional notes: (e.g., team-teaching, minimum day, presentation is before recess) _______________________________________
____________________________
____________________________
____________________________
____________________________

Context Statement: (what related subjects have students already covered? What will they cover after the presentation?) ____________________________
____________________________
____________________________
____________________________
____________________________

Prompt: (is there a specific topic or theme the presentation should focus on?) ____________________________
____________________________
____________________________
____________________________
____________________________
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