

# Reverse Outline: “Where the Wild Things Should Be: Healing Nature Deficit Disorder through the Schoolyard”

## I. Intro

### A. Introducing the topic at hand

1. Children have less access to nature...than previous generations
2. Growing body of research from various countries proves that this is a viable topic for discussion
3. Richard Louv, “Nature Deficit Disorder” (NDD)

### B. Louv is not alone in his beliefs

1. Problem remains unsolved
2. Thesis → I’m going to propose a solution

## II. Background Information

### A. Defining nature

1. Evidence: Cambridge Dictionary
2. I’m operating off of this definition; it can be integrated into a schoolyard

### B. Humans need contact with nature

1. Evidence: E.O. Wilson: biophilia
2. Evidence: Louise Chawla: cyclical model → effect on children
3. Evidence: James Gibson: psychology → children as both subjects and agents

## III. Why the Current Schoolyard Set Up Fails

### A. The schoolyard is the perfect place to address NDD

1. Evidence: Peter Stearns, historian
2. Evidence: Peter Blatchford, psychologist

#### Reasons why it fails

### B. The current set up does not meet children’s needs

1. Evidence: Herbert Spencer → 1890 “surplus energy theory” → why schoolyards are the way they are

2. Description of playgrounds that conform to this theory
3. Evidence: opinions → Children don't like this set-up

C. Playgrounds are adult centric

1. Evidence: Schulman & Peters analysis of schoolyards in Baltimore, Boston, and Detroit
2. This set up is easier to maintain but encourages environmental apathy
3. Evidence: Malone and Tranter → neat and safe environments that adults like stamp out creative, natural environments

IV. The Benefits of Greened School Grounds

A. Physiological: combats ADD and obesity

1. Evidence: Taylor, Kuo, Sullivan study
2. Logic: diversifies "play repertoire" to increase movement and activity

--paragraph to shift gears--

B. Helps children have better relationships with other children

1. Evidence: Herrington and Studtmann, landscape architects
  - a. Social hierarchy becomes based off of who can be the most creative/intellectual rather than who can be the playground hero
2. 2006 questionnaire-based study → less aggression

C. Shapes relationships between children and the natural world

1. Evidence: Pyle, "Eden in Vacant lot"
2. Schoolyards can act as vacant lot spaces
  - a. Evidence: 2012 case study
  - b. Evidence: Toronto greening program

D. Empowers children

1. Evidence: Malone and Tranter
2. Children become agents by constructing their own relationship with nature

V. Filling the Gap in Research: What Should Define Natural Schoolyard Design

A. Principle One: Biodiversity

1. Example of what I mean by biodiversity
2. Counter → attention to possibility of danger
3. Biodiversity brings biodiversity (wildlife)

B. Principle Two: Sensory Stimulation

1. SS offers opportunities to imagine, learn, discover
2. Examples of different stimulating features

C. Principle Three: Diversity of Topography

1. Natural elements as play equipment
2. Diversity of topography offers places for safety and protection
3. Counter → we need to sacrifice convenience for the sake of children

D. Principle Four: Theory of Loose Parts

1. Evidence: Simon Nicholson, Theory of Loose Parts
2. Examples of loose parts
3. Counter → current schoolyard equipment isn't safe either
4. Conclusion section: Children's views and needs are different from those of adults
  - a. Evidence: Matthews and Limb
  - b. Evidence: Lester and Maudsley

VI. Conclusion

A. Summary of previous five roman numerals

B. Change can actually be accomplished

1. Being done at Peninsula School in Menlo Park
2. Being done at Ohlone Elementary in Palo Alto

C. Close with emphasis on "Do it for the children."