

INFUSING TRIBAL CURRICULUM INTO K-12 SCHOOLS: A CASE STUDY  
OF OREGON'S NATIVE AMERICAN EDUCATIONAL POLICIES

by

SHADIIN DOROTHY GARCIA

A DISSERTATION

Presented to the Department of Education Studies  
and the Graduate School of the University of Oregon  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy

March 2017

DISSERTATION APPROVAL PAGE

Student: Shadiin Dorothy Garcia

Title: Infusing Tribal Curriculum into K-12 Schools: A Case Study of Oregon's Native American Educational Policies

This dissertation has been accepted and approved in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy degree in the Department of Education Studies by:

Dr. Joanna Goode	Chairperson
Dr. Lisa A. Mazzei	Core Member
Dr. Audrey Lucero	Core Member
Dr. Brigid Flannery	Institutional Representative

and

Scott L. Pratt	Dean of the Graduate School
----------------	-----------------------------

Original approval signatures are on file with the University of Oregon Graduate School.

Degree awarded March 2017

© 2017 Shadiin Dorothy Garcia

## DISSERTATION ABSTRACT

Shadiin Dorothy Garcia

Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Education Studies

March 2017

Title: Infusing Tribal Curriculum into K-12 Schools: A Case Study of Oregon's Native Education Policies

Not having accurate contemporary, historical and place-based curriculum drafted in consultation with tribes is a huge disservice and a violation of the trust agreements the United States government entered into with its sovereign nations. Through a single state case study, this research explores how a tribally written curriculum attempts to address this violation by examining the state context of the Native American education landscape and state policy. This research utilizes the theoretical frameworks of Red Pedagogy, Tribal Critical Theory and Culturally Sustaining Pedagogy to explore the intentions of the tribal curriculum writers and the professional development provider of the Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde Tribal History curriculum unit; Oregon's American Indian/Alaska Native Education State Plan, and the legislative policy of Senate Bill 13. The study concluded with the following implications for policy, theory, and practice: Indigenous curricular endeavors that center indigenous values, incorporate local context are important, and acknowledge the role of colonialism and are just part of the larger systemic response of decolonization; Implementation challenges are rooted in a colonized paradigm and expanding reform to the educator preparation and policy realm is critical so that all educators (Native and non-Native benefit); Addressing power and hegemonic

structures in contexts outside of education (with the local indigenous communities) create a larger and necessary accountability scope; Indigenous knowledge is nuanced, varied, and evolving and thus, needs robust professional development that incorporates best and promising practices in concert with local indigenous communities for both inservice and preservice fields; And without policy and state incentives, the implementation challenges will continue.

## CURRICULUM VITAE

NAME OF AUTHOR: Shadiin Dorothy Garcia

GRADUATE AND UNDERGRADUATE SCHOOLS ATTENDED:

University of Oregon, Eugene  
Yale University, New Haven

DEGREES AWARDED:

Doctor of Philosophy, Critical and Sociocultural Studies in Education, 2017,  
University of Oregon  
Master of Education, Educational Leadership, 2005, University of Oregon  
Bachelor of Arts, English, 1997, Yale University

AREAS OF SPECIAL INTEREST:

Indigenous Education  
Curriculum Theory  
Public Policy in P-20 and in Education Preparation Arenas  
Family and Community Engagement

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:

Owner/Consultant, Shoreline Consulting, 2016-2017

Director of TeachOregon, Chalkboard Project, 2016-2016

Deputy Director of Research and Policy, Chief Education Office, 2014-2016

Administrator, Springfield High School, 2013-2014

Administrator, Arts and Technology Academy, 2006 - 2013

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

These acknowledgements are not so much about the dissertation but rather my entire experience in this program. Thank you to my committee and especially to Dr. Joanna Goode. Her unwavering faith in me made this possible. You doggedly kept me from dropping out in the face of blatant targeted racism, life threatening meningitis, and rollercoaster career changes.

A raised fist of solidarity and love to my Oregon Families: Jose Luis Alonso, Sarita Amaya, Angela Bluhm, Claire Breslow, Shayna Breslow, Kevin Bourgault, Prentice Crawford, my Ault-Hanlon Crew, Divya Bheda, José da Silva, Leah Dunbar, Rena Dunbar, Jim Garcia, Jeff Johnson, Robin Johnson, Katie Knehans, Johnny Lake, Sandra Lozano, my Maas-Despain Crew, Seth Pfaefflin, Danny Ramirez, Kevin Rowan, my Sabala Crew, Leilani Sabzalian, my Skornick-Hayes Crew, the Trampoline Collective (Aimee Craig, Kim Ednie, Whitney Grubbs, Laura Kantor Fellows, Heidi McGowan, Scott Nine, and Eric Toshalis), Anne Tomlanovich, Peter Tromba, Anselmo Villanueva, Jane Waite, and my beautiful Yamada Crew.

A warm hug to my New Mexico family: my extended brothers and sisters; all my aunties and uncles; Alan Marks and Sally Voorheis; Tim Lopez, Aura Gonzales, and Bridget Maestas; and especially to my sister, Jodi Bagodi for continuing to inspire me.

A special thank you to the Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde – the wise curriculum creators, to Mercedes, and to Leslie Riggs. A warm shout out to my steadfast friend, April Campbell, who tirelessly fights the good fight. While I reside in Oregon, I am from the Sovereign Nation of Laguna Pueblo, Seama Village. My heart lives there, as well, alongside my mother, Marcelle Anne.

A bone-crushing embrace to my lifelines: Jay, whose friendship sustains us; Beth, whose strength shapes her; Johnna Anne, whose selflessness defines her; Wesley, whose determination fuels him; Sunny, whose smile owns us; Leonard, whose generosity feeds us; Gabriel, whose fearlessness inspires us; and Zay, whose empathy and courage keep us warm.

A final thank you to my Daddy – for always being there.



This dissertation is dedicated to my father, John L. Garcia

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Research Focus and Question.....	8
II. LITERATURE REVIEW.....	10
Part One: Curriculum as a Tool for Whiteness.....	10
Part Two: Native American Education.....	20
Part Three: Teacher Knowledge.....	31
III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY.....	40
Epistemological and Ontological Assumptions.....	40
Research Design.....	45
Data Collection and Management.....	46
Participants.....	46
Interviews.....	48
Documents.....	44
Teacher Implementation Observation.....	49
Data Analysis.....	50
Role of the Research.....	50
IV. FINDINGS.....	53
Grand Ronde Tribal History Curriculum Unit Analysis.....	54
Curriculum Contributors and Professional Development Provider Analysis.....	60
Confirmation of Erasure and/or Inaccurate Curriculum.....	61
This Curriculum Benefits Native and Non-Native Educators.....	63

Chapter	Page
Prioritize Content in Educator Preparation Programs.....	65
Analyses of Oregon Political Landscape in Which the Curriculum is Operating.....	67
Analysis of the Silence.....	76
V. DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	82
Educator Preparation Programs .....	88
Current Teachers and Administrators .....	91
State Policy .....	93
Academia .....	94
Indigenous Students in Higher Education.....	95
Conclusion .....	96
APPENDIX: MONTANA’S INDIAN EDUCATION FOR ALL ESSENTIAL UNDERSTANDINGS .....	97
REFERENCES CITED.....	99

# CHAPTER I

## INTRODUCTION

*This year has been a better school year for me. Teachers see me. Remember how you talked about how school should feel? Well, I have no interest in surviving in school. I want to thrive in school.*

*– Isaiah Koiishe, 13 years old,  
Laguna Pueblo and Louisiana Choctaw*

“On the blank backside of the map I handed you, please write down the name of the 9 federal recognized tribes in Oregon.” This was my opening activity in a presentation to a room full of roughly 100 licensed educators. The room was in your typical hotel conference style setting. There were tables of eight draped with white linen table cloths with hotel logo inscribed notepads and mints scattered on the table. Water droplets were predictably sweating down the sides of the pitchers. Participants were settling into my 90-minute session and exhibiting common conference behavior: doodling, emailing, texting. And, the room was a typical sea of whiteness. In this state, where less than one in ten public school teachers are individuals of color working with our more than 36.6 percent students of color.

I repeated the question and the air in the room changed. After uncomfortable laughter (from them) and a long awkward minute, I told them they could ask each other at their tables. They nervously drank water and avoided eye contact with me. After a few more uncomfortable minutes, I said they could flip the piece of paper over and use the Oregon landscape and names on the map to help them. They started eating the mints on the table and shifted often in their seats.

I have delivered this presentation across Oregon to *hundreds* of *educators* – all educators in either public schools or educator preparation programs – and never has an

individual or a group been able to name more than 4. Schools have effectively erased Oregon tribal people from the landscape. I wish it ended with just the erasure of Oregon tribal people. After the training, educators *always*, come up to me and show me lessons they are using, and they are riddled with inaccuracies, racist stereotypes, and void of 21<sup>st</sup> century references with regard to Indians<sup>1</sup>.

This dissertation has personal meaning for me because I experienced this curricular erasure and racism my entire life, but it wasn't until I experienced it through hearts and minds of my sons that it took a new significance.

“Don’t get mad, mom,” says my 11-year-old son. “Too late, son,” I respond smiling and hugging him, “So, spill it.” He proceeded to show me his 4<sup>th</sup> grade assignment: *Your writing assignment is to imagine you are one of the explorers. Create your character. Decide your motives for sailing to the New World. Decide which European country you are sailing from. Are you a captain, a noble person, a merchant, a minister? Are you sailing alone or with your family?* Needless to say, I did get mad. And sad. This assignment asked my son to imagine what it would be to participate in the genocide of Indigenous communities. Once I read the paper, he looked up at me with beautiful brown eyes filled with tears, “And, mom, I love my teacher. Please help me figure this out.” The insidiousness of curricular micro-aggressions forces children to navigate the political and emotional terrain of confronting their own erasure while

---

<sup>1</sup> I use the term American Indian/Alaska Native, Indian, Native, indigenous, and tribal interchangeably to refer to first peoples in what is now called the United States. I recognize that there is considerable diversity among Oregon’s 9 federally recognized confederated tribes and I recognize that there are descendants of more than a hundred Oregon tribes and bands. I also recognize that there are more than 550 American Indian tribes. And there is diversity and complexity in terminology. For the purposes of this paper and as a nod to that diversity, I use the terms interchangeably.

simultaneously developing a love of learning and positive relationships with their teachers. When all he wants to do is love learning and his teacher.

His brother came home three days after he started high school with the same phrase, “Okay, so mom...don’t get mad.” His assignment: *Choose a country that is important to you in some way. I would prefer for it to show your family heritage. But it may not be the United States.*” When your father is Louisiana Choctaw and your mother is Laguna Pueblo and Chicana from New Mexico, what country is he supposed to choose? Again, my son is forced to navigate a system that has endorsed the erasure of our communities.

When I was in college, ten freshmen rubbed brown shoe polish on their arms and faces, put on paper bag imitation buckskin fringed vests, wore fake feather headbands and proceeded to dance and whoop while drunk on my front yard. They were the new freshman initiates of the Yale Lacrosse Team. The previous year they initiated four freshmen and their theme was the four seasons, but in my junior year there were ten of them and so the theme was the *Ten Little Indians*. Hence, their racist outfits and behavior. They had heard the song the *Ten Little Indian* in their elementary school classrooms and assumed it was harmless. Inaccurate images of indigenous people cement themselves into the psyche of all who are exposed and create ubiquitously hostile learning environments.

It is 2017 and educators, schools of education, and public school administrators are finally starting to use terms like culturally relevant curriculum, culturally responsive teaching, culturally sustaining pedagogy, and question terms like the achievement gap and minority. Researchers and scholars have been speaking that language for decades –

Delpit, 2006; Dubois, 1903; Gay, 2010; Noguera, 2006; Swisher, 1996; Valencia, 1997; Valencia, 2012; Woodson, 1933, to name a few. Furthermore, I am not talking about a revolution, but rather a slow emergence of concepts congruent with educational equity. However, the prolific work of the scholars has yet to permeate the landscape of the public education domain, much less address the erasure of indigenous communities in Oregon. While erasure takes many forms for indigenous communities, curriculum in public education is a site of both power and potential to confront and ameliorate its impacts.

In Oregon, recent state mandates have created the platform directing districts to teach culturally relevant curriculum. In 2006, Oregon's Superintendent of Public Instruction, Susan Castillo outlined the Oregon American Indian/Alaska Native Education State Plan (Oregon, 2006). Members and educators of American Indian and Alaska Native communities, the State Board of Education, and staff of the Oregon Department of Education approved it. The plan included 11 state educational goals, which supported both the policy of the Oregon Department of Education, the educational philosophy of many American Indian/Alaska Native communities, and the Indian Student Bill of Rights. The Plan was intended to bolster the vision of the Oregon Educational Act for the 21st Century by expanding and respecting the educational rights and opportunities of American Indian and Alaska Native children. Unfortunately, like many initiatives, this one was unfunded and lacked a robust implementation plan.

Under the leadership of April Campbell, Education Director, of the Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde, the tribe chose to prioritize the state plan even though it was an unfunded mandate. The Education Department developed a robust tribal curricular unit. This curriculum aligned to English Language Arts and Literacy Common Core State

Standards at the 4<sup>th</sup> grade level as well as state standard for teaching about Oregon tribes. Elements of this work included tribal members as curriculum authors, professional development on culturally responsive pedagogy, and supportive willing schools and teachers. The promise of the endeavor excited both tribal members and the greater Grand Ronde community by addressing the statewide dearth of accurate tribally-based curriculum. If current educators failed to see Oregon Indigenous communities, curriculum developed by and for Native communities could serve as a revelatory roadmap to recognize both historical and contemporary realities of Native America in a way that serves all students.

On the heels of this curriculum, in July 2013, Oregon Department of Education created the American Indian Alaska Native Advisory Panel in an effort to review and revise the American Indian/ Alaska Native (AI/AN) Education State Plan adopted by the Board in 2006. The Advisory Panel consists of the following:

- A member of the Burns Paiute Tribe
- A member of the Confederated Tribes of the Coos
- A member of the Lower Umpqua and Siuslaw Indians
- A member of the Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community of Oregon
- A member of the Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians
- A member of the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation
- A member of the Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs; Coquille Indian Tribe
- A member of the Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians



- A member of the Klamath Tribes
- Five directors of Title VI (Indian Education Programs as Part A of the Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015),
- One Title VI parent group committee member
- One representatives from the Native American Youth and Family Center in Portland
- Superintendent of Jefferson County School District,
- A member from the following tribes: Laguna Pueblo, Tlingit Tribe of Alaska, Winnebago/Chippewa Tribe, and Yakama Tribes
- Representative from the Oregon Indian Education Association
- One indigenous community member from George Fox University

The AI/AN Advisory Panel finalized the AI/AN Education State Plan and on April 9, 2015 the Oregon State School Board's endorsed its implementation. The Deputy State Superintendent of Instruction showed explicit support for the work of the office of the Advisor to Deputy State Superintendent on Indian Education, April Campbell (A. Campbell, personal communication, April 13, 2015). The work required to obtain state board endorsement required time, multiple stakeholder convenings, multiple state board presentations and more and the Deputy State Superintendent of Instruction provided all the support and prioritization necessary for Campbell office to accomplish this task.

There are other Oregon policies that align with the ODE's prioritization of Indian Education. In the Oregon 1999 legislative session, Senate Bill 103 was passed by the Senate and the house (70<sup>th</sup> Oregon Legislative Assembly—1999 regular session.

Enrolled Senate Bill 103-A. Retrieved at <http://ode.state.or.us/policy/state/sb103.aspx>). It directed the Superintendent of Public Instruction to:

- To increase efforts to evaluate the distribution of ethnic, racial and cultural backgrounds of Oregon's students and advance the use of demographic data for curricula and program planning.
- To examine strategies to inform school district boards, administrators, teachers, parents and the public about multicultural and diversity laws and policies.
- To identify and review exemplary multicultural curricula for different grade levels based on the needs of Oregon's public school students.
- To identify and review strategies to integrate multicultural curricula with other educational programs.
- To evaluate how current laws on diversity and multicultural education are being implemented and applied throughout the public school system

Senate Bill 103 occurred in the aftermath the 1990 Ballot Measure 5 which changed Oregon's property tax and public school funding and on the heels of House Bill 3565 (statewide assessment, evaluation, and standard based school reform). The scope of both Ballot Measure Five and House Bill 3565 were enormous and caused monumental shifts in the Oregon Department of Education. Unfortunately, there are not implementation reports of Senate Bill 103 in the required subsequent biennia, 2001 or 2003 (Wallace Foundation, 2004, p.24). However, there is evidence of state commitment to the tenor of Senate Bill 103. One example can be found in the Oregon Legislative Budget Note in the 2003 Ways and Means Subcommittee directing ODE to "coordinate statewide initiatives

to enhance cultural competency, training, mentoring, and recruitment of minority educators in Oregon” (Wallace Foundation, 2004, p.25).

### **Research Focus and Questions**

The purpose of this study is to explore the intentions of the tribal curriculum writers and the professional development provider of the Grand Ronde Tribal History curriculum unit. It is guided by three questions:

- What was the curriculum designed to do?
- What, if any, implementation challenges exist with tribally written curriculum?
- How can understanding curriculum development/implementation landscape for tribal education inform policy and practice?

Not having accurate contemporary, historical and place-based curriculum drafted in consultation with tribes is a huge disservice and a violation of the trust agreements the United States government entered into with its sovereign nations. Studying the context of Oregon as a case study of statewide endeavors can inform what steps are necessary to ensure erasure of indigenous people stops. This study draws heavily on three theoretical bodies of knowledge: Culturally Sustaining Pedagogy (Paris and Alim, 2014); Red Pedagogy (Grande, 2004); and Tribal Critical Theory (Brayboy, 2005). And the units of analysis will be viewed through these theoretical lenses. While this analysis will rely on these lenses, the literature review in Chapter II will discuss relevant scholars in the *context* of what background knowledge is necessary to understand the context of curriculum, assimilationist policies, and teacher knowledge (as it relates to this study). Chapter III, in addition to providing an overview of the research methodology will also do a deep dive into the three theories that I use in the analysis. Chapter IV will discuss

the findings that resulted in the following themes: Indigenous curricular endeavors that center indigenous values, incorporate local context are important, and acknowledge the role of colonialism and are just part of the larger systemic response of decolonization; Implementation challenges are rooted in a colonized paradigm and expanding reform to the educator preparation and policy realm is critical so that all educators (Native and non-Native benefit); Addressing power and hegemonic structures in contexts outside of education (with the local indigenous communities) create a larger and necessary accountability scope; Indigenous knowledge is nuanced, varied, and evolving and thus, needs robust professional development that incorporates best and promising practices in concert with local indigenous communities for both inservice and preservice fields; And without policy and state incentives, the implementation challenges will continue. Finally, Chapter V discusses the findings and outlines recommendations for educator preparation programs, current teachers and administrators, academia, state policy, and Indigenous students in higher education.

## CHAPTER II

### LITERATURE REVIEW

*U.S. policies toward Indigenous peoples are rooted in imperialism, White supremacy, and a desire for material gain. – Bryan Brayboy, Lumbee scholar*

Because this research focuses on Indigenous curriculum, professional development and teacher knowledge, the review of literature requires three parts. Part one engages in a curricular theory literature review examining how curriculum normalizes whiteness. While I predominantly pull from Castagno's (2009) work for the first section of the literature review and while it does inform the work, I am using her work primarily as a heuristic to organize and understand how whiteness is normalized; not as a primary theoretical lens. Second, part two engages in a review of United States assimilationist ideology with schooling policy, describing how boarding schools and the push to urban centers embraced a "Kill the Indian, Save the Man" belief system, including how educational policies have resulted in particular classroom practices that typically fail to incorporate culturally and linguistically relevant curriculum and pedagogy for Native American Students. Finally, part three is teacher knowledge as it relates to this research study followed by a brief nod to best practices in the field of professional development as it relates to this study.

#### **Part One: Curriculum as a Tool for Whiteness**

For centuries, curriculum has functioned to normalize whiteness in schools, and thus to perpetuate white culture. In response to this normalization is a rich history of curricular approaches that engage with contemporary scholarship and challenge that status quo.

Angelina Castagno (2009) created a framework for categorizing six approaches specific to multicultural education. This literature review locates relevant theorists in each typology and shows ways that curricula serve to perpetuate, maintain, and challenge hegemonic practices. Castagno's categories are:

- educating for assimilation (perpetuate);
- educating for amalgamation (perpetuate);
- educating for pluralism (maintain);
- educating for cross-cultural competence (maintain);
- educating for critical awareness (challenge); and
- educating for social action (challenge)

As with any heuristic, these categories are not perfect silos and occasionally overlap. However, they create a method to view ways in which curriculum functions that I will apply to the analysis of this Oregon case study.

**Educating for assimilation (perpetuate).** Castagno (2009) summarizes education for assimilation: "Diversity is perceived as a threat and something to be ignored or downplayed. Power and neutrality are located in the dominant mainstream culture. Students are educated to assume their role in the current social order." (p.47) Franklin Bobbitt, heralded as the grandfather of the curriculum field, published *The Curriculum* in 1918 endorsing the use of scientific method and activity analysis in curriculum construction. In this historic text, he developed a theory of "large group consciousness" where he discussed feelings of belonging, success and failure through a Eurocentric lens (Bobbitt, 1918; Apple, 2004). Bobbitt's contemporaries W.W.Charters

(1923), Edward L. Thorndike (1931), and Charles C. Peters (1942) had similar influences and correspondingly, their theories also promoted a white, mainstream paradigm.

Concurrently, in the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, the United State government forcibly removed Native American children from their homes and placed them boarding schools where “the predominant view of politicians and Indian Affairs ‘experts’ during the late 1880s was that Indians should be ‘civilized’ and assimilated into the Euro-American way of life as rapidly as possible, taking on the customs and economic activities of the settlers” (Littlefield, 1989, p. 431). What followed was a legacy of genocidal, assimilationist policies, and practices that continue well into the 21st century.

While these are overt examples of assimilation, covert examples are found in subtler curricular manifestations. For example, Slivka (2011) examined art curriculum in the Carlisle boarding school and found that although students were supposedly allowed to draw Native people, they slowly became so inculcated in White values that one sees a visual trajectory of erasure of Native dress and actions slowly replaced with European ones, creating generations of “civilized” Indian art created by Indians. Slivka also exposed Estelle Reel, Superintendent of Indian School in 1901 who was lauded as progressive because she encouraged Native arts and crafts in schools. However, her art curriculum was often used to undermine Native identity: “This mode of reform oversimplifies, generalizes and prescribes cultural practices, to all Native students regardless of their actual tribal background and to those whose Native identity had no correspondence to the craft practices prescribed” (p.237). The atrocity is not merely the undermining of Indigenous identity, but also that her supposed support of “Native identity through ‘authentic’ practices seemed to favor students who through the

establishment of boarding schools often ran away...” (p.238). Students who ran away were rebelling; when they returned, they saw doing “Native art” as rebelling also thereby shaping their actions in what they thought was resistance, but was actually perpetuated mainstream ideologies. Although these efforts had disastrous effects on all people, Lomawaima’s (1994) research on the Chilocco Indian School and other boarding schools chronicled survivance and tribal unity occurring in the face of the oppression as well.

**Education for amalgamation (perpetuate).** Castagno (2009) summarizes education for amalgamation as “neutrality towards diversity. Commonalities across people and groups are emphasized in order to reduce prejudice and promote unity” (p.47). Addressing students of color in schools progressed - forcing schools to recognize that the landscape of their classrooms was changing. As the era of Indian boarding schools died, a wave of reform geared at desegregating schools entered the landscape. After years of fighting it, institutions had to adjust and amalgamation served that role. Schools used Sleeter and Grant’s (2003) term - a “human relations approach.” This approach still lent itself to “low teacher expectations for students of color, disproportionate placement of students of color in special education, and disproportionate disciplinary referrals of students of color” (Sleeter, 2011, p.11).

Curricular manifestations of this can be seen through a lens of deficit thinking. According to Johnson (1994), deficit thinking refers to the “labeling of poor minority students and their families as disadvantaged, at risk and uninvolved” (p.36). Valenzuela (2002) explains deficit thinking as schools actively subtracting language, culture, and community-based identity, then blaming students and families for not experiencing mainstream academic success in the aftermath of that erasure. As a result of these faulty



assumptions and deficit thinking, schools “superimpose programs designed for historically successful students and families on students and on families from low-income and culturally/linguistically diverse (CLD) communities” (Garcia & Guerra, 2004, p.152). Schools enlisted tracking and over-representing students of color in special education classes. Current manifestations in deficit thinking can be seen in Title I programs and special education programs; instead of focusing on instruction, the focus is on what students lack (Ferri, 2012, p.865). Arguments for colorblindness and using standardized test scores as evidence for tracking further oppress already marginalized groups.

**Education for pluralism (maintain).** Castagno (2009) summarizes education for pluralism as “a cultural relativist position. Cultural differences are celebrated and respected” (p.47). Multiculturalism and biculturalism took root in the aftermath of the Brown Berets, American Indian, and Civil Rights Movements of the 60 and 70s. However, their manifestation in classrooms according to Ladson-Billings and Tate (1995), “often ends up being reduced ‘to trivial examples and artifacts of cultures such as eating ethnic or cultural foods, singing songs or dancing, [and/or] reading folktales’” (p. 61). Joel Spring (1988) articulates in *American Education* that

the child from a collectivist society learns to think in individualist terms when dealing with American schools and institutions but switches to a collectivist view when interacting with family and the surrounding immigrant community. (p. 158).

Educating for pluralism means that for schools to meet the needs of students, teachers need to recognize the student’s culture and background. However, it requires students to navigate through a multitude of worlds. The damaging effects of this are profound.

Spring's theory is that a student operating in one paradigm that actively oppresses another. In classroom contexts, this typology of education serves to maintain hegemonic structures. Deloria and Wildcat (2001) assert that the social adjustment often results in students having to choose one of those worlds:

When the social adjustment from Indian community-based culture to non-Indian urban networking culture has to be made at the same time, many students adopt a very rigid posture concerning personal, group and community values. Too often they model themselves after the professionals in their academic field or their institutional situation. This adjustment then forces them outside their Indian circle and greatly inhibits their ability to draw from their own tribal traditions the lessons that could be profitably learned regarding both science and the social world in which they live. (p. 81-82)

Not only does this force a value-laden navigation, but also isolates students from their communities of healing, living, and learning.

Further approaches that allow for celebrations of cultures typically emphasize a "healing of past wounds" (Mohanty, 1994), which does not acknowledge systemic and institutional power dynamics. Such celebrations of culture also succeed at essentializing groups of people (Sleeter, 2011, p.14), which has devastating effects on ethnic identity development (Lomawaima, 1999). When foods and cultures are exoticized in classrooms, it maintains a power hierarchy and dangerous binary of normal and other. It also does not address the existence of multiracial children.

**Education for cross-cultural competence (maintain).** Castagno (2009) states that an education for cross-cultural competence is where "competence and acculturation

is different and multiple cultural settings is encouraged” (p.47). Biculturalism overlaps with this typology in that it anticipates a cross-cultural understanding of two worlds. Gonzalez, Moll and Amanti (2005) entered the educational landscape with the “Funds of Knowledge” concept which asserts,

Our position is that public schools often ignore the strategic and cultural resources, which we have termed funds of knowledge, that households contain. We argue that these funds not only provide the basis for understanding the cultural systems from which U.S.- Mexican children emerge, but that they are also important and useful assets in the classroom. (p. 47)

This concept, much like a bilingual approach, asks educators to view students as rich in community resources and extant knowledge instead of viewing students as having deficits. This curricular theory, though critical, also allows for the maintenance of dominant cultures alongside students of color, in this case, Mexican and Mexican American students. Although it is important for teachers to include the assets of their students, it does not necessarily mean that their current curricular choices will change. It is a move in that direction because non-white values will push on the values of mainstream curriculum, but requires that teachers be willing to change their curricular units extensively and it requires that their district prioritize professional development accordingly.

I want to introduce the concept of the hidden curriculum here because it permeates the first five typologies. McLaren (1989) defines it as:

The hidden curriculum deals with the tacit ways in which knowledge and behavior get constructed outside the usual course materials and formally

scheduled lessons. It is part of the bureaucratic and managerial “press” of the school—the combined forces by which students are induced to comply with the dominant ideologies and social practices related to authority, behavior and morality. (p.183-184)

According to Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery and Taubman (1995), researchers found the reinforcing nature of hidden curricula exists in progressive and non-progressive programs alike, cementing the pervasiveness of this dominant ideology. Slattery asserts that the hidden curriculum operates like subliminal messaging to suggest acceptable behaviors through “the expectations, rewards, and culture of the school” (p.301). Students and families under the impression that schools are neutral places to learn are quickly indoctrinated via formal and informal curriculum within a mainstream white paradigm. A great local example of this is when a Springfield Public School administrator told me (in response to Native students’ requests to wear a Pendleton stole at graduation) that wearing a gap and gown is neutral as well as the yellow graduation cords that signify an academic honor; and that “Native American garb” is not neutral. Racist terminology aside, to assert that excelling at white curricular AP courses where one value (the dominant one) is heralded as normal as neutral is a fallacy. Thornton (2009) asserts that the problem with calling this theory the hidden curriculum is the overarching knowledge that it is not hidden. Although hidden curriculum is a well-known educational theory, it behooves educators to consider that the name itself serves to maintain a type of hegemony.

**Education for critical awareness (challenge).** Castagno (2009) asserts that this typology occurs when teachers facilitate an increased awareness, and a questioning, of

the status quo, relations of power and social structures. Sleeter and Bernal (2004) assert, “Ironically (given its historical roots) a good deal of what occurs within the arena of multicultural education today does not address power relations critically, particularly racism” (p.240). Barton and Levstik (1988) argue for a critical examination of the curriculum stating, “Students’ understanding of history would be more complete if they knew that the past has been characterized by dissent as well as consensus, setbacks, as well as advances, restriction of opportunity as well as expansion” (261). Their research yielded alarming results demonstrating students of all racial groups “maintained faith in the image of an idea of expanding rights and progress” (258). Schools who flip the curricular paradigm often challenge the educational status quo:

The curriculum of public schools is organized around the cultural frame of reference of European Americans, while the curriculum of new ethnocentric schools is organized around the cultural frames of references of African Americans, Native Americans, and Hispanics” (Spring, 2011, p.172).

Unfortunately, many of these schools are silos existing in a mainstream framework. They are not exempt from testing mandates, federally defined notions of “highly qualified” teachers, and sometimes even state sanctioned curriculum (because their students could be tested on state sanctioned content). Educators can undermine the white paradigmatic messages in state sanctioned curriculum if they can teach students how to critically question curricular choices.

**Education for social action (challenge).** Castagno (2009) asserts “in addition to being aware of the status quo and inequity, students must work to change structural inequalities and promote social change” (p.47). Various scholars assert we must use

lenses of Latino/a Critical Theory, Critical Race Theory and Tribal Critical Race Theory in order to obtain substantial shifts in education (Brayboy, 2005; Castagno, 2012; Castagno & Brayboy, 2008; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 2006; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; Solorzano & Bernal, 2008). Ladson-Billings and Tate (2006) explain, “as critical race theory scholars we unabashedly reject a paradigm that attempts to be everything to everyone and consequently become nothing for anyone, allowing the status quo to prevail” (p.25). Castagno (2012) researched an Indigenous Teacher Preparation program. She discovered that it succeeded in perpetuating colonization because it created a “hybrid experience” of both whiteness and Indigeneity asserting that change can only come when the white institution is challenged. Sandy Grande (2004), another curricular scholar, states:

We must engage the best of our creative and critical capacities to discern the path of social justice and then follow it. The ongoing injustices of the world call educators-as- students-as-activists to work together—to be in solidarity as we work to change the history of the empire and struggle in the common project of decolonization. (p.175)

Grande also believe that a direct challenge is necessary. Within this typology, educators can find examples of social action like the Kamehameha Early Elementary Program for Native Hawaiians and Rock Point and Rough Rock community schools for Navajo students (Sleeter, 2011). However, both are still evaluated by mainstream standards. They ask for ways to reject mainstream evaluative measures and redefine success. It is antithetical that the Social Justice Education Project in Tucson, Arizona models on

“critically conscious intellectualism” points to their standardized achievement data and graduation rates to prove their success (Cammarota & Romera, 2009).

Kumashiro (2004), in contrast to the critical race theorists, challenged the notion that there is one way to respond to colonialism. For him, social action lives in raising critical questioning and embracing an uncertainty in teaching. Slattery also differentiates himself from the critical theorists, but through his version of postmodern philosophy. He contends that:

Modern visions of education, as characterized by the Tylerian Rational, behavioral lesson plans, context-free objectives, competence and external evaluation, accountability politics, dualistic models that separate teacher and student, meaning and context, subjective persons and objective knowledge, body and spirit, learning and environment, and models of linear progress through value-neutral information transmission are no longer acceptable in the postmodern era. (Slattery, 2013, p.216)

He believes in the re-questioning and examining of what we are doing through a postmodern lens as well as action oriented responses. In conclusion, this review of the literature examined curriculum theory through six multicultural typologies. While curriculum theory drives this research study, the unique context of Native American education is central to this work. Whiteness exists as a construct in a historical trajectory and it is critical to examine that trajectory in the United States’ treatment of Native Americans in schools.

## **Part Two: Native American Education**

The ongoing history of the relationship between Indigenous communities and the

United States is a story of both survival and genocide. In spite of terrorist attacks, rape, forced boarding schools, back-breaking labor, theft, genocide, and other atrocities Native communities have found ways to survive. In spite of its every effort at annihilation, the government coined their survival, “the Indian Problem” and enacted laws whose goal was the death of all Natives and/or complete assimilation of those who survived. Indian Commissioner Thomas Morgan wrote in 1889 “the Indian must conform 'to the white man's way,' peaceably if they will, forcibly if they must" (Reyhner, 2006).

This section of the literature review discusses episodic historical moments of Native American education beginning with the early 19th century, describing how boarding schools and the push to urban centers embraced a “Kill the Indian, Save the man” belief. Schools often found themselves as the epicenter for assimilationist policies that sought the erasure of Native languages, belief systems and cultures. Education’s historical role as a weapon of genocide requires an in-depth analysis of educational approaches and a process of vigilance and reflection to ensure that such approaches end. This section engages in such a practice to describe how contemporary policies have resulted in classroom practices that neglect culturally and linguistically relevant and sustaining curriculum and pedagogy for Native students. However, instead of using a linear timeline approach, this essay approaches historical accounting via an alternative framework. The Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory (Smiley & Sather, 2009) prepared a report entitled, “Indian Education Policies in Five Northwest Region States.” This report found that the five states of Montana, Idaho, Washington, Alaska, and Oregon adopted six policies:

1. Academic standards address Native American culture and history



2. Native American culture and history are part of school curriculum
3. Native American community is involved on advisory boards
4. Teacher certification is promoted for speakers of Native American languages.
5. Native American students may learn their native languages as part of the education program
6. College scholarship or tuition assistance programs are provided for Native American students (Smiley & Sather, 2002, p. 60)

These policies exist as a reaction or remedy to the genocidal practices of the United States government. Although these policies are now eight years old, they can still function as an informatory heuristic. Through the lens of these policies, this essay investigates historical approaches to Indigenous education beginning in the 19th century and current attempts to actualize culturally responsive and culturally sustaining practices.

**Academic standards address Native American culture and history.** This policy requires schools implement culturally responsive, relevant and sustaining methods. In 1802, 1819 and 1823, the government enacted three policies oppressing the sovereignty of Natives. In 1802, Congress passed a law authorizing \$15,000 per annum to promote “civilization” among Natives. In 1819, the US government gave money to churches to teach Natives how to be white. Four years later, the US Supreme Court ruled in *Johnson v. McIntosh* (1823) that tribal sovereignty was diminished based on European rights of discovery. These three policies worked to eradicate Native ideologies, values, and languages.

However, despite centuries of colonization Native communities still exist. One way their survival manifests itself is in their inability to find congruency with mainstream public educational institutions (Butterfield, 1994; Reyhner, 1989; St. Germaine, 1995; Nieto, 1996; Swisher & Deyle, 1987). This first policy arises from the refusal to assimilate; states are changing their practices to meet the needs of Native students. For example, Alaska State Standard 4 AAC 04.200 says teachers must use “culturally appropriate communication, instructional strategies, and ways of knowing, and using knowledge of the cultural standards.”

**Native American culture and history are part of school curriculum and Native American community is involved on advisory boards.** This section combines these two policies because it is culturally incongruent to incorporate tribal culture and history without direct involvement of the local Native community. The intent behind such approaches is that Natives will have direct involvement in educational programming. The involvement of Native voices is critical to reclaiming educational sovereignty, but inclusion itself does not necessarily result in emancipation from the hegemonic structures in place.

According to the U.S. Department of Education (1991), the 1794 Treaty with the Oneida, Tuscarora and Stockbridge Indians is the first time the United States included educational provisions for Natives. Article 2 of the treaty outlines that it is the responsibility of the government to “instruct some young men of the three nations in the arts of the miller and the sawyer.” This was the first of many arrangements requiring Natives to adopt Eurocentric content. But the content did not align with indigenous ways, so men returned to their homes unable to use their training. In 1860, the US Government

established the first federal Indian boarding school on the Yakama Reservation. In 1870, Congress authorized appropriations of \$100,000 to operate federal industrial schools for Indians. In 1879, Captain Richard Henry Pratt founded Carlisle Indian Industrial School as the first off-reservation boarding school in Pennsylvania. In addition to forced separation, boarding schools emphasized obedience:

This emphasis on uniformity and regimented discipline lasted four and half centuries as educational institutions strove to reshape Native individuals and societies. All American mission and federal boarding schools, from their inception until World War II, utilized the disciplines of military regimentation and uniformity to train students in subservience and conformity. (Lomawaima, 1999, p. 15)

By 1887, the US government was allocating more than a million dollars a year to educate Natives in Eurocentric values.

In 1898, President McKinley appointee, Estelle Reel “created an extensive curriculum guide titled: Course of Study for Indian Schools. It was the first formally published, and distributed curriculum intended for all Native students in the government-run schools” (Slivka, 2011, p.234). Reel’s curriculum allowed Native girls to produce culturally based pottery, basketry and rugs. But because the construction of items also reinforced tribal values, the government “might tolerate them on isolated reservations, but could not endorse them in the schools” (Lomawaima & McCarty, p. 286). It is noteworthy that Reel’s motivation was economic and that she did not allow students to adhere to all of their cultural ideologies but rather maintained the authority on “how and in what manner, the Native peoples’ identity was to be manifest” so that it would be of

monetary value. Slivka (2011) notes that Reel was characterized as a reformist even though she exerted her rhetoric of “our Indians” and “became engaged in the exoticism and commodification of Native material culture” (p. 238). This manifests itself today in textbooks that discuss Native history in wars lost and/or highlighting the Native American art resurgence particularly, pottery and jewelry. This assures the public that the Indian has been civilized and their relics can now be purchased.

In 1972, the Indian Education Act became law. It was originally a part of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965, Public Law No. 89-10. This established the Office of Indian Education within the US Department of Education and the National Advisory Council on Indian Education. Membership consisted of 15 people from federally recognized tribes. Later, the Indian Education Act of 1972 was reauthorized as Part A, Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1994 (Public Law 103-382). According to the American Indian Heritage Support center, “this legislation is unique in that it is the only federal legislation that provides direct financial support for the education of all American Indian and Native Alaskan students in public, tribal, as well as Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) schools.” In 2001 Indian Education was reauthorized as Title VII as part of the No Child Left Behind Act. In 2015, it was reauthorized as Title VI as part of the Every Student Succeeds Act. Because this reauthorization is so recent, we will keep the focus on the work of Title VII.

With this shift, the Department of Education changed its focus to standards, achievement, and accountability. Thus, the focus of Title VII programs narrowed on these mainstream goals. The National Indian Education’s preliminary report “No Child Left Behind in Indian Country” (2005) documented the majority of concerns regarding

the impact of NCLB on Title VII program as having a detrimental impact on culture-based education. Participants in the report worried that in the reauthorization under NCLB, Title VII would be conflated with Title I and lose its “sovereignty” within the initial legislation, causing a “diminishment of its [Title VII’s] fundamental purposes... [and shifting] the uses of Title VII to focus on remedial programs typically supported by Title I” (p. 15). Formula grants became focused more on direct instruction, rote learning, and compensatory learning activities. This caused concern around “a broad-based reduction and disappearance of culturally-based education in schools and a significant concern for the diminishment of schools to provide effective and meaningful education for Native students” (p. 16). Winstead, Lawrence, Brantmeier, and Frey (2008) give an example of the oppressive nature of NCLB in classrooms:

English grammar pedagogy serves to reify an allegedly homogeneous Standard American English grammar. Dialect and stylistic differences that lie outside of the state’s conceptions of *correct* language use, established mostly by members of the Euro-American, middle-class dominant group, are viewed as *incorrect* and slated for “corrective action.” In effect, imposing a Standard American English, central to perpetuating a dominant “linguistic ideology”...(p. 51)

Examples like these abound in the NCLB language of pedagogy, curriculum, and assessment. The two policies when implemented can remedy pieces of the NCLB incongruencies because learning Native history and culture with Native community input requires a non-Eurocentric approach to pedagogy, curriculum, and assessment.

**Teacher certification is promoted for speakers of Native American languages.** This fourth policy (Teacher certification for Native American language

speakers) make possible the 5th policy (Native American students may learn their native languages as part of the education program), therefore this section reviews two examples of state measures only:

Notwithstanding AS 14.20.020 (b), a person may be issued a limited certificate, valid only in the area of expertise for which it is issued, to teach Alaska Native language or culture, military science, or a vocational or technical course for which the board determines by regulation that baccalaureate degree training is not sufficiently available (Alaska Statute. § 14.20.025).

1) 33-1280. American Indian Languages Teaching Authorization

(1) As used in this section, "Indian tribe" is as defined in section 67-4001, Idaho Code.

(2) It is the policy of the state of Idaho to preserve, protect and promote the rights of Indian tribes to use, practice and develop their native languages and to encourage American Indians in the state to use, study and teach their native languages in order to encourage and promote:

- (a) The survival of the native language;
- (b) Increased student scholarship;
- (c) Increased student awareness of the student's culture and history; and
- (d) Increased student success. (Idaho Code 33-1280)

These statutes allow Native speakers to forego state teacher licensure programs. Because of the US policy of language genocide, there is a dearth of Native language teachers. These policies remedy that. They further place more Indigenous teachers in schools which profoundly impacts Native and non-Native students alike.

**Native American students may learn their native languages as part of the education program.** The fifth policy adopted by the five states is that Native American students may learn their native languages as part of the education program. From early missionaries until the late 1700s, assimilationist methods were taught in various tribal languages and in fact had bibles translated (Szasz, 1988). Therefore, there is a historical precedent for acknowledging the relevancy of Indigenous languages, albeit for assimilationist purposes. Interestingly, in 1828, the Cherokee signed a treaty with the United States that stated, “It is further agreed by the United States to pay \$1,000 toward the purchase of a Printing Press and Types to aid toward the Cherokees in the progress of education and to benefit and enlighten them as people” (Treaty with Cherokee, 1828). These efforts were not in an effort to maintain the Cherokee language but rather along the lines of many bilingual education programs – encourage any method leading to acculturation.

The use of their own language as a means to “assimilate” indigenous people however, took a turn. In 1868, the Report of the Indian Peace Commissioners summarized the “Indian Problem” as follows, “in the difference of language to-day lies two-thirds of our trouble...schools should be established, which children should be required to attend; their barbarous dialect should be blotted out and the English language substituted” (Report of the Indian Peace Commissioners, 1868, pp. 16-17). The 1887 Report of the Commission of Indian Affairs reinforced this: “The instruction of the Indians in the vernacular is not only of no use to them, but is detrimental to the cause of their education and civilization, and no school will be permitted on the reservation in which the English language is not exclusively taught” (Atkins, 1887, p. xxi- xxiii).

President Grant criticized bilingual missionaries and threatened monetary withholdings (Leibowitz, 1971). Russell (2002) explained the methods through which some missionary schools obeyed Grant, “When the missionary ‘heard an Indian student speaking Tlingit, he would soak a sponge with hot peppers and bitter tasting resin and then rinse the verboten vocabulary from the offender’s mouth’” (p. 100). The impact of boarding and missionary schools is complex; while cruelty and oppression set the standard, modes of survivance emerged in the non-transference of white values when students returned to the reservations.

There is no other federal policy with specific regard to Native American language until the Native American Languages Act (NALA) 1990/1992. This does not suggest that acts like the Indian Education Act of 1972 and/or the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act of 1975 and/or any of the Bilingual Acts did not also include actions that fostered language instruction and revitalization, but there are no other policies that directly address Native American languages on a federal (not tribal) level. Interestingly the U.S. Office for Civil Rights eliminated an Alaska program where “Tlingit children were put in speech-therapy classes, not to correct an impediment, but to eliminate their regional ‘Indian’ accent in English” (Caskell, 2002, p.103). NALA states: “the status of the cultures and languages of Native Americans is unique and the United States has the responsibility to act together with Native Americans to ensure the survival of these unique cultures and languages” (Section 102). Bilingual and Native language programs were acting in relative isolation like at Rough Rock Community School on the Navajo reservation or in random BIA schools. However, organizations like the American Indian Language Development Institute and the Oregon Indian Education Association



were actively working on developing programs, curriculum and mechanisms creating revitalization efforts. The Esther Martinez Native American Languages Preservation Act of 2006 specifies curriculum, childcare series, seat time, enrollment, teacher training and more, outlining a federal commitment to language revitalization. According to Oregon scholar, David Lewis,

The programs were mainly driven by access to funding, like Esther Martinez, but Tribal funding in general mostly runs through the BIA and DOE. Community development block grants, grants to keep kids off drugs, health and welfare. In fact, in the scholarly community, it was the publicizing of the Loss of Native Languages as a public media campaign that freed up federal funding for recovery and education. Then there were some key programs that offered model of language recovery, the Moari education programs, Hawaiian immersion programs, and the Master Apprentice program at Berkeley, which was inspired by Loren Bommelyn of the Tolowa Deeni nation. The language program at Grand Ronde was inspired by the Hawaiian and master Apprentice programs. (D. Lewis, personal communication, February 8, 2017)

Like teachers of Native Languages there are few professionals implementing both powerful language preservations and revitalization across **all** arenas of public schooling.

**College scholarship or tuition assistance programs are provided for Native American students.** Following are three examples of federal policy allocating funds to the educating/assimilation of Natives:

- 1897, Congress appropriated funds for sectarian schools for American Indian Children.

- 1921 the Snyder Act gave the Bureau of Indian Affairs the power to allocate federal funds to American Indian children
- 1934 The Howard-Wheeler Act (Indian Reorganization Act) provided funds to public schools for Indian educational programs which authorized an appropriation of \$250,000 annually “for loans to Indians for the payment of tuition and other expenses in recognized vocational and trade schools.”

Policies prior to 1956 allocated federal funds to schools or programs but not to individuals. In an effort to train Native workers, Congress passed the Indian Vocational Act in 1956. Unfortunately, it part of the effort to get the tribes to assimilate and leave the reservations, and part of the overall termination policy of the federal government. Today there are many states that have created a legal pathway for Indigenous students to attend higher education institutions. Most states have requirements like residence and blood quantum level. These measures supposedly address the low numbers of Indigenous students in higher education but also may serve to assimilate Indigenous communities.

In conclusion, this literature review hopes to give its readers historical and curricular background to better situate the context in which this tribal curriculum finds itself. Without this context, it would not be possible to grasp the gravity of cultural and language erasure in schools.

### **Part Three: Teacher Knowledge**

This study discovering what tribally written curriculum for both Native and non-Native teachers is designed to do. The context of this requires a base level of understanding of the field of “teacher knowledge.” The field of teacher knowledge is wide and varied in its scope. This section will review a few of the major contributors in

the field and provide a short analysis of their strengths and limitations as it applies to this study.

Shulman (1986) compels us to review the teacher knowledge from both the late 1800s and the academy's view on teaching to understand the historical roots' role in limiting the teacher knowledge research. The genesis of Shulman's analysis came from what he calls an "unbalance" in perspective:

From the perspectives of teacher development and teacher education, a host of questions arise. Where do teacher explanations come from? How do teachers decide what to teach, how to represent it, how to question students about it and how to deal with problems of misunderstanding? The cognitive psychology of learning has focused almost exclusively on such questions in recent years, but strictly from the perspective of learners. Research on teaching has tended to ignore those issues with respect to teachers. (p.8)

This in and of itself reveals a one-sided paradigm. Not a mutual learning endeavor.

However, limiting in scope, in his analysis, Shulman outlines three categories of teacher knowledge: content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, and curricular knowledge (Shulman, 1986, p. 9). Content knowledge includes both the syntactic and the substantive structures of a discipline and requires that a teacher be more versed in their area than that of their "lay colleague" (p.9). Pedagogical content knowledge extends content knowledge to include a "armamentarium" of ways to convey and conceptualize that knowledge effectively. Curricular knowledge refers to an understanding and knowledge of the plethora of curricula on their said area of expertise.

In Shulman's work 14 years later, he explores the pedagogical tensions and coins a new term, "community property" which is the process by which a teacher works to extract and make visible a student's thinking so they can debate, re-think and co-construct (Shulman, 2000, p. 133). This framing is getting closer to Paulo Friere's notion of not seeing students as empty vessels, but it still frames the teacher as the expert and does not create a parallel of a teacher's mind changing and re-forming because of the input from the students.

A shift away from the "subject matter" as knowledge can be seen when Connelly, Clandinin, and He (1997) coined the phrase *personal practical knowledge*: "a teacher's past experience, in the teacher's present mind and body, and in the future plans and actions." (p.666). Connelly et al, (1997) endeavored to amplify the strength of a narrative as inquiry research methodology and agenda that has elevated teacher education research to new heights, but it is in their early explorations of understanding teacher knowledge, that this section finds its immediate value. In their exploration of the personal practical knowledge, Connelly et al. drafted teachers as co-researchers to analyze texts that helped sculpt this knowledge concept by using a landscape metaphor to expand this knowledge concept to include influences inside the classroom, outside the classroom and in teachers' personal lives. The strength in this understanding of knowledge is that it allows for new knowledge to be developed in the environment in which they find themselves. The limitation become evident when one finds a lack of diverse ways of being and knowing within that environment thereby reducing the ability to understand and in engage with indigenous knowledge.

Cochran-Smith and Lytle (1999) also ascribe to the notion that teacher knowledge is more than just content and in fact requires a more developed and politicized understanding teacher knowledge. They assert the three distinct conceptions of teacher knowledge: knowledge-for-practice, knowledge-in-practice, and knowledge-of-practice. Knowledge-*for*-practice is formal knowledge, content knowledge, and foundational education theory that include effective practices and strategies for teaching (p.254). This knowledge come from universities who have been heavily influenced by Shulman's work on teacher knowledge. This concept asserts that teachers learn a body of work and then apply it, but that they do not generate the knowledge themselves (p.257). Knowledge-*in*-practice refers to the knowledge gained through teaching experience, active reflection, professional development, continuous improvements, and inquiry (p.262). These authors assert that this concept is akin to Clandinin and Connelly's (1995) as including "that body of convictions and meanings, conscious or unconscious, that have arisen from experience (intimate, social, and traditional) and are expressed in a person's practices" (p.265). It is in that sense that this concept sees teachers as generators of knowledge: "teacher learning hinges on enhancing teachers' understandings of their own actions-that is, their own assumptions, their own reasoning and decisions, and their own inventions of new knowledge to fit unique and shifting classroom situations" (p.267) and this includes them examining what they know and believe. Finally, knowledge-*of*-practice asserts that teachers (new and experienced) through their classroom sites and schools use inquiry to "make problematic their own knowledge and practice as well as the knowledge and practice of others and thus stand in a different relationship to knowledge" (p.273). This concept challenges the binaries inherent in the previous two: formal and informal; new

and experienced; and knowledge and learning. Cochran-Smith and Lytle (1999) call the work in knowledge-of-practice inquiry communities and developed a construct called *inquiry of stance* to explain how teacher knowledge is generated. This stance represents how teachers are researchers themselves in the knowledge generation: “the work of inquiry communities is both social and political; that is, it involves making problematic the current arrangements of schooling; the ways knowledge is constructed, evaluated, and used; and teachers' individual and collective roles in bringing about change” (p.289). These concept of knowledge-of-practice further explained through *inquiry of stance* does not stand alone in its assertion that teacher knowledge needs to be understood as part of a larger socio-cultural and political endeavor (Moll, Amanti, Neff & Gonzalez, 1992; Gonzalez, Andrade, Civil & Moll, 2001; Kincheloe, 2004; Malott,; Apple, 2014). Kincheloe states: “It is naïve and dangerous to think that teachers can become the rigorous professionals envisioned here without a conceptual understanding of contemporary and past societies and the socio-cultural, political, and economic forces that have shaped them” (p.50). While these scholars and more champion critical, emancipatory, and or democratic concepts of teacher knowledge, they did not discuss the nor seek to actively address erasure of indigenous communities in the educational curricular landscape.

The struggle then is a more difficult question. Curriculum is a tool for whiteness and has created a hegemonic paradigm in which students and educators are marinated. Indian education policies, both good and bad, have not been able to completely permeate that paradigm. The problem is embedded in a political and epistemological hotbed of knowledge construction. If knowledge is construed with a from a Western ideological

framework -- majority of educators in Oregon are white, (Chief Education Office, 2016, p.6) and whiteness is normalized in schools then it is a foregone conclusion that Indigenous values and ideologies will be erased within the K12 educational system. Assimilation is the requirement for success and when assimilation cannot happen, rampant dropouts occur. Scholars Malott, Waukau, and Waukau-Villagomez (2009) outline the dangers of this incongruency:

As a result of this hegemony, through the various socializing institutions, such as schools, especially working class schools, young people tend not to be actively engaged in the construction of their own philosophies, but are rather far too often indoctrinated by teachers who themselves have been indoctrinated with the same dominant approach as the sole producers of valid knowledge and creator of the *one* “right” answer, such as *Columbus discovered America*, and *the U.S. is the world’s most democratic nation because it was founded by the wise believers of free market enterprise.*” (p.11)

Champagne (Abu-Saad, I., & Champagne, 2006) also notes the incongruency associated with a system that embraces only one way of being and knowing, “Native students often find the forms of centralized administrations, modes of teaching, social and cultural interaction, and competition in schools and colleges very different and alien from their own communities” (p. 149). Curricular choices in schools today exclude Native student culture and at times embody views that devalue history, culture and communities (US Congress Senate, 1969; Garrod and Larimore, 1997; Huffman, 2008). Examining this paradigmatic challenge at the curricular level in collaboration with tribes is not only important but it is necessary if we hope to stop the erasure of indigenous ways of being

and knowing. It is further important to note that this study is informed by the context of decolonization as it relates the discussion of how knowledge is constructed.

Decolonization is a huge concept and even varies in its understandings among Indigenous authors (Alfred, 2005; Cornstassel, 2012; Tuck and Wang, 2012). With regard to this research is helpful to remember how both Grande (2004; 2010) and Brayboy (2005) interact with it conceptually. Grande (2010) states:

For teachers and students, this means that we must be willing to act as agents of transgression, posing critical questions and engaging dangerous discourse. It means calling into question the hegemonic discourses of unilateralism, monoculturalism, English-only, consumerism, nationalism, and free-market fundamentalism that construct education as a privilege and consider instead the implications of multilateralism, multiculturalism, multilingualism, contingency, and coalition that reasserts education as the right of a people. In the end, it also means undertaking a deep examination of the colonialist project and its implications for all of us, understanding that at root is the quest for a reconciliation of the relationship between democracy (the rights of a nation) and sovereignty (the rights of a people). (pp.204-5)

Grande (2010) also reminds us that Red Pedagogy embraces a hope “that we will shape schools and processes of learning around a decolonial imaginary” and she defines that imaginary one where “Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples work in solidarity to build transcultural and transnational coalitions to construct a nation free of imperialist, colonialist, and capitalist exploitation” (p.206). In a complementary way, while Brayboy (2005) does not explicitly define colonization, he calls upon us to acknowledge how



endemic colonization is so that we can become the willing agents Grande asks us to be (p.431).

A closer look at the curricular landscape, at assimilationist policies, and at how knowledge is rarely constructed through an indigenous lens, requires we must take a final turn to what the field of professional development contributes in terms of how to best help educators gain this information. The field of professional development (PD) is a wide and varied as that of teacher knowledge and as such it has multiple definitions (Joyce et al., 1976; Gall and Renchler, 1985; Fullen, 1995; Day, 1999; Guskey, 2000 and more). This study is not interested in the myriad definitions, but rather wants to call attention to a few shifts in how professional development is implemented. While the field agrees largely that PD plays an important role, two of the shifts in its implementation are grounded in the contexts of collaboration and reflection (professional learning communities) and connection to the school/district vision.

With regard to professional learning communities, scores of scholars have chronicled the effective nature of learning environment that requires on-going reflection, collaboration with colleagues, and a sharing of professional learning goals (DuFour & Eaker, 1998; Hargreaves & Fink, 2006; Mitchell & Sackney, 2009a; Stoll & Louis, 2007). With regard to connection, scholars cite the need for the PD to not exemplify the typical in-service days of “sit and get” workshops and instead endorse PD that aligns with the school/district; have clear outcomes; acknowledge stages of teachers and the context of teachers. (Brown-Easton, 2004; Feiman-Nemser, 2001; Guskey, 2000a; Joyce and Showers, 2002; Lieberman & Miller, 2000; Lieberman & Wilkins, 2006). Finally, the field of PD also asks school to take into consideration the PD program, the teachers, the

facilitators, theory, and the context (Borko, 2004; Hawley and Valli, 1999; Tomlinson, 2005). The latter is the part that the research study draws your attention to. What happens if districts are not prioritizing AI/AN content? If teachers are not indigenous (and therefore not versed in indigeneity)? If the facilitators, for example, cannot explain decolonization? If theories on indigenous education are unknown? If educators do not know the context of their students or the content?

Best practices in the field of professional development creates major tensions with regard to American Indian/Alaska Native curriculum professional development. It requires educators learn all the aforementioned understandings of whiteness in the context of assimilationist policies before one can even begin to understand the deep nuance of American Indian/Alaska Native culture, values, politics, and more. The strongest tension by far lies in a person's ability to be willing to confront, examine, and reflect upon their role with in the decolonizing instruction. This study examines what tribally created curriculum and tribally provided professional development is designed to accomplish in the context of a renewed state Indian education plan paired with a legislative policy. The following chapter will outline the methodologies utilized.

## CHAPTER III

### RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

*Colonized peoples have been compelled to define what it means to be human because there is a deep understanding of what it has meant to be considered not fully human, to be savage.*  
- Linda Tuhiwai Smith, *Ngāti Awa and Ngāti Porou scholar*

The purpose of this study is to explore an effort by an Oregon tribe to address systemic erasure in the curricular landscape of Oregon. This study asks the following questions:

- What was the curriculum designed to do?
- What, if any, implementation challenges exist with tribally written curriculum?
- How can understanding curriculum development/implementation landscape for tribal education inform policy and practice?

This is a qualitative case study of a single state, Oregon. To compile this case study, I employ a few different methodological approaches. This case study includes: 1) narrative inquiry approach to including voices of curriculum designers/editors/PD; and 2) critical policy analysis; and 3) curriculum review using some defined theoretical approaches; together they demonstrate the opportunities, challenges, and complexity of integrating this knowledge into the school curriculum.

In this chapter, the epistemological and ontological assumptions, the research design, the participants, the data collection and management, the data analysis, the role of the researcher, the assumptions of the study, and the limitations of the study are discussed.

#### **Epistemological and Ontological Assumptions**

The philosophical assumptions underlying this research are rooted in Culturally Sustaining Pedagogy (Paris & Alim, 2014), Tribal Crit Theory (TCT) (Brayboy, 1990), and Red Pedagogy (Grande, 2006).

All three imply a subjective epistemology and the ontological belief that reality is socially constructed. Sandy Grande's *Red Pedagogy*, which has the following precepts:

1. Red pedagogy is primarily a pedagogical project (inherently political, cultural, spiritual, and intellectual).
2. Red pedagogy is fundamentally rooted in indigenous knowledge and praxis.
3. Red pedagogy is informed by critical theories of education.
4. Red pedagogy promotes an education for decolonization.
5. Red pedagogy is a project that interrogates both democracy and indigenous sovereignty.
6. Red pedagogy actively cultivates praxis of collective agency.
7. Red pedagogy is grounded in hope. (Grande, p. 250)

Although one might argue that this theory centers indigeneity in schools whose primary target is not indigenous students, this theory is solidly grounded in the field of critical theory whose umbrella serves to deepen the engagement of broader critical and revolutionary theories and praxis. Also, although, CTGR, does not have a tribal school and their tribal children attend local public schools, everyone is still occupying the land that was originally that of the local tribes. This curriculum is meant to benefit Native and non-native students.

Tribal Critical Race Theory (TCRT) (Brayboy, 2005) is an afterbirth of Critical Race Theory (CRT) and it is both honors the roots of CRT and addresses its shortcoming. The central claim in TCRT is that “colonization is endemic to society” (p. 429). This is a direct response to CRT in that it does “not address the specific needs of tribal peoples because it does not address American Indians’ liminality as both legal/political and racialized beings or the experience of colonization” (pp. 428-429).

1. Colonization is endemic to society.
2. U.S. policies toward Indigenous peoples are rooted in imperialism, White supremacy, and a desire for material gain.
3. Indigenous peoples occupy a liminal space that accounts for both the political and racialized natures of our identities.
4. Indigenous peoples have a desire to obtain and forge tribal sovereignty, tribal autonomy, self-determination, and self-identification.
5. The concepts of culture, knowledge, and power take on new meaning when examined through an Indigenous lens.
6. Governmental policies and educational policies toward Indigenous peoples are intimately linked around the problematic goal of assimilation.
7. Tribal philosophies, beliefs, customs, traditions, and visions for the future are central to understanding the lived realities of Indigenous peoples, but they also illustrate the differences and adaptability among individuals and groups.
8. Stories are not separate from theory; they make up theory and are, therefore, real and legitimate sources of data and ways of being.

Tribal Critical Race Theory requires an examination of policy with an indigenous lens. It informs this work in an unapologetic stance of acknowledging colonialism and addressing assimilation.

Prior to 2012, the language of social justice with regard to curriculum and instruction was primarily framed around culturally relevant pedagogy –“a pedagogy that recognizes the importance of including cultural references in all aspects of learning, continually empowering students (Ladson-Billings, 1995, p12), and culturally responsive teaching—“Culturally responsive teaching is using the cultural knowledge, prior experiences, frames of references, and performances styles of ethnically diverse to make learning encounters more relevant to and effective for them” (Gay, 2012, p.31). These bodies of work heavily influenced the rhetoric around addressing the infamous achievement gap. In 2012, Django Paris coined the phrase “culturally sustaining pedagogy” extending and problematizing these two schools of thought. Paris (2012) defines culturally sustaining pedagogy as followings:

The term culturally sustaining requires that our pedagogies be more than responsive of or relevant to the cultural experiences and practices of young people—it requires that they support young people in sustaining the cultural and linguistic competence of their communities while simultaneously offering access to dominant cultural competence.

Culturally sustaining pedagogy, then, has as its explicit goal supporting multilingualism and multiculturalism in practice and perspective for students and teachers. That is, culturally sustaining pedagogy seeks to perpetuate and foster—to *sustain—linguistic, literate, and cultural*

*pluralism as part of the democratic project of schooling.* (emphasis added, p.95)

It is not enough to help a person navigate through a hegemonic system nor is it enough to provide sample novels that a student might find relevant; rather, we must create an environment where multiple ways of being and knowing can thrive. In 2015, Paris and Alim reflected on culturally sustain pedagogy (CSP) and determined that the following is necessary:

- CSP must extend the previous visions of asset pedagogies by demanding explicitly pluralist outcomes that are not centered on White, middle-class, monolingual, and monocultural norms of educational achievement.
- CSP must focus on the practices and knowledges of communities of color with the understanding that fostering linguistic and cultural flexibility has become an educational imperative, as multilingualism and multiculturalism are increasingly linked to access and power.
- CSP must resist static, unidirectional notions of culture and race that reinforce traditional versions of difference and (in)equality without attending to shifting and evolving ones.
- CSP must be willing to seriously contend head-on with the problematic as well as the many progressive aspects of our communities and the young people they foster.

CSP tenets direct me to pay attention to the solutions and potential policies and ensure that we are not merely seeking to address an immediate need but rather ensure that we are creating something that adds to a system where students are thriving not just surviving.

In short, Red Pedagogy, Tribal Critical Race Theory (TribalCrit), and Culturally Sustaining Pedagogy lend me the necessary lens to analysis this single state case study.

### **Research Design**

Using a case study design, this study utilized interviews, document analyses, observations, and semi-structured interviews. According to Flyvbjerg (p.301) case studies

1. Have an individual unit that can be studied in a number of ways
2. Differ from cross unit analysis because they comprise more detail, richness, completeness and variance
3. Emphasize “developmental factors, meaning that a case typically evolves in time, often as a string of concrete and interrelated events that occur ‘at such a time, in such a place’ and that constitute the case when seen as a whole” (p.312)
4. Are situated in a context that requires exploration

This case study fits all four definitional components. In depth analysis of the authors of the curriculum combined with the curricular analysis within the context of Oregon education policy makes single state case study an approach. Further, Stake (1995) explains that case studies are investigated because,

We are interested in them [case studies] for both their uniqueness and commonality. We would like to hear their stories. We may have reservations about some things the people tell us, just as they will question some of the things we will tell about them. But we enter the scene with a sincere interest in learning how they function in their ordinary pursuits and milieus and with a willingness to put aside many presumptions while we learn (p.1).



## **Data Collection and Management**

Yin (2003) and Stake (1995) list at least six sources of evidence; physical artifacts, archival records, interviews, documentation, direct observation, and participant-observation. Glesne (1999) and Creswell (1998) list interviews, observation and document collection, and surveys as sources of evidence. Prior to collecting and managing the data, University of Oregon's Institutional Review Board approved the research project. All participants were informed of the purpose of the study and signed a consent form prior to data collection. As required by the IRB, the consent form included the purpose of the study, statement of voluntary participation, information about the confidentiality of the study, and the option to withdraw from the study at any time. This research uses existing data including but not limited to the Grand Ronde Tribal History curriculum unit, professional development materials and interview transcripts. The interview participants are three curriculum writers and one professional development provider.

## **Participants**

The primary participants in this study were six individuals selected because of their involvement in the curriculum design. All six interviewees identified as Oregon tribal members; five are members of the Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde and one is a member of the Confederated Tribes of Siletz. All have a bachelor's degree or higher and all five work in the field of education. All but one participant gave permission to use their given names. Participants include:

- Mercedes Reeves, Professional Development Provider, a CTGR Tribal member

- April Campbell, Curriculum Writer, a CTGR Tribal member
- Jennifer (not her real name), Curriculum Writer, Confederated Tribes of Siletz Tribal member
- David Lewis, Curriculum Editor and Contributor, a CTGR Tribal Member
- Kathy Cole, Curriculum Writer, a CTGR Tribal member
- Eirik Thorsgard, Curriculum Editor and Contributor, a CTGR Tribal member

Mercedes, a licensed teacher with a Master's degree, was chosen because participate because she is the Curriculum Specialist for the CTGR and in her role she provides all of the professional development for this curriculum. She provides curricular support to teachers, Native and non-Native, and she provides support to schools all across Oregon. April Campbell, Jennifer, and Kathy were chosen because they all wrote the GRTHCU. April Campbell was previously the Education Director for the CTRG and in her roles as the Indian Education Advisor to the Deputy Superintendent of Public Instruction she works to ensure endeavors like this one are supported statewide. Jennifer has held the following positions in her career: College and Career Counselor/Academic Advisor, Adult Education Coordinator/GED Instructor, and Curriculum Specialist for the CTGR and also served as adjunct faculty at Chemeketa Community College. Kathy, a CTGR tribal member, taught up to 10 years in the public school and for 13 years has been teaching high school and adult classes in Chinook Wawa at the CTGR Education Center. David Lewis, a CTGR Tribal member with Takelma, Santiam, Chinook, Molalla ancestry has a PhD in Anthropology and worked for the tribe from 2006 to 2014 as Department Manager of the Cultural Department. He helped to write much of the history, added narratives and images from his collections, reviewed and corrected portions of the history

and made suggestions about other units to include. Eirik Thorsgard, a Grand Ronde tribal member, previously worked for the CTGR in both the Tribal Historic Preservation Office as well as the Education Department. He helped gather background information for the writers of the 4th grade curriculum and helped with making comments and edits. Later during its implementation, he did some classroom outreach at Willamina Elementary School and told stories, and then worked as the Education Division Manager in the full dissemination of the material to school in Oregon.

### **Interviews**

The interview strategy is one identified by Patton (2003) as the “Informal Conversational Interview”, which “offers maximum flexibility to pursue information in whatever direction appears to be most appropriate, depending on what emerges...” (p. 342). The interviews lasted from 30 – 60 minutes depending on the participant responses. They were conducted where the participant felt most comfortable. Interviews were both audio-recorded and the research took notes. Participants were informed that they could review the interview summaries and make additions or corrections as necessary.

The interviews began with the following initial prompts and questions:

1. Tell me about your background.
2. What are your thoughts on the Grand Ronde Tribal History 4th Grade Curriculum and what has been your role as it relates to this curriculum?
3. What are your hopes for Native teachers and this curriculum?
4. What are your hopes for non-Native teachers and this curriculum?

5. What is critical to include in the professional development for teachers regarding this curriculum?
6. What is the most pressing concern in teacher preparation in the context of education for Native Americans in Oregon?
7. How do you think that pressing concern(s) can be addressed?
8. What type of knowledge do you think teachers need in order to effectively implement this curriculum?

I also asked follow up questions in each interview.

### **Documents**

Documents and artifacts were collected from district, school, state, instructional, and community sources. Critical documents included the Oregon Grand Ronde Tribal History curriculum unit, supplemental curriculum, professional development materials and notes. They were cross-referenced with interviews where applicable. Triangulation was used to verify and support findings.

### **Teacher Implementation Observations**

Initially, my plan was to observe teachers using the curriculum. I identified the set of teachers in the spring and made arrangements to interview them in the fall. When fall arrived, I followed up with the five teachers. They informed me that they taught the curriculum during the summer school session and since none of them taught the 4<sup>th</sup> grade, they were not planning to use the curriculum.

So, I searched for other teachers to observe. I emailed and called over 40 teachers. I heard back from five. Their anonymous anecdotal evidence is also incorporated into the findings. Noteworthy is what I learned from the conversations of

those teachers who declined to be interviewed actually aligned with the themes I identified from the curriculum contributors.

### **Data Analysis**

I used the following steps to analyze data, as defined by Creswell (2003, p. 191-195):

Step 1: The researcher organized and prepare the data for analysis by transcribing the interviews, creating folders to code, arrange, and separate the data.

Step 2: The researcher read through all of the data to obtain a sense of the data and to determine what theme(s) may exist.

Step 3: The researcher coded the themes and labeled them into categories.

Step 4: The researcher used the codes to describe the setting, people, events, categories, and themes.

Step 5: The researcher used narrative passages to convey the findings.

Step 6: The findings were interpreted based upon the researcher's understanding using the theoretical framework outlined in this chapter.

Using the theories of Tribal Critical Race Theory, Red Pedagogy, and Culturally Sustaining Pedagogy, I clustered the themes from these interviews, analyzed the curriculum, and blended my analysis with the context of the Oregon American Indian/Alaska Native Education State Plan and the impending legislative curricular policy. All of these contributed to the final analysis.

### **Role of the Researcher**

Patton stated the instrument of qualitative research is a human being (2002). As such, the perspective of the researcher is unavoidably embedded within the context of the

research. Reality in qualitative research is dependent on multiple interpretations by researchers and participants (Merriam, 2001).

My role in this research endeavor is complex. I am Chicana. I am Laguna Pueblo. I am a woman. I am a mother. I am a practitioner. I am a proponent of sovereignty. The halls of the white academy have marginalized me on all six fronts. I walk with deep scars of violence, fear and sadness as a result of my educational and professional experiences, and it is a fact that my experience pales in comparison to many in home community who endure a daily oppressive onslaught of deep-seated institutionalized and individual racism. Castagno (2012) asserts that “genuine service requires humility” (p.18). Conducting research for the academy also re-inscribes a new type of genocide, an academic genocide. And to say that I have not been shaped by the white academy would be a lie. I am studied in western ways of knowing and have been living away from my home for more than 24 years. I can say with confidence that while I resisted colonization on every possible front, it has impacted who I am.

Further, I am a Chicana/Laguna Pueblo woman whose indigeneity has no ties with the Oregon tribal communities. With regard to this particular research endeavor, I enter as an indigenous insider/outsider from more than one perspective. Smith asserts that “indigenous research approaches problematize the insider model in different ways because there are multiple ways of both being an insider and an outsider in indigenous contexts” (p. 137). I am not from Oregon though I have lived here for more than 13 years. I am not from Grand Ronde, though I am an indigenous person. I am not from the community of Grand Ronde, but I have close relationships with many tribal members. I am a researcher at a White academy though I reject ever identifying myself as one who

aligns with their research values. I have worked for two Oregon governors and I do not align politically with anything of theirs that is not simultaneously emancipatory and sovereign in nature. I was a practitioner who developed curriculum and taught students yet I no longer work in public schools. Smith also asserts, “insider research has to be as ethical and respectful, as reflexive and critical as outside research. It also needs to be humble” (p.139). I cannot escape my own lens, but I can engage in an ongoing process of reflection so that I can analyze the ways in which my lens intersects and interacts with this research endeavor.

As laid out, the methodological approach used to compile an Oregon case study captures the voice of tribal curriculum designers, an examination of the curriculum, and probes at implementation challenges. Further, my role as a member of the Oregon American Indian/Alaska Native State Education Advisory Panel member, former Deputy Director of Research and Policy for the Chief Education Office (CEdO), CEdO representative on the Tribal Government to Government Education Cluster, and former teacher and administrator, has kept me both informed and centered within both the curricular and the state policy context. Combined this approach is an ideal approach to answer the three research questions.

## CHAPTER IV

### FINDINGS

*It is in-depth information that is desperately needed in Oregon. It is aligned to common core state standards which makes it more appealing to educators. But it is more than just lesson plans. It is a hands-on look into your neighbor's house. Reservations exist and Indians are real and this curriculum shows you that and shares the culture and history of the Grand Ronde people. - Mercedes*

The purpose of this qualitative case study was to explore what tribal curriculum writers and the professional development provider of the Grand Ronde Tribal History curriculum unit intended the curriculum to accomplish. Data were collected from curriculum developers, curriculum editors, professional development providers, legislative policy and an education state plan. This chapter will discuss the data analysis of the curriculum that resulted in the following three themes:

1. Factual historical account of the United States Government;
2. Embedded cultural values; and
3. Contemporary landscape of the CTGR.

Second, an analysis of the interviewees resulted in the following themes:

1. A confirmation of erasure and/or inaccurate curriculum
2. This curriculum benefits Native and non-Native teachers
3. Prioritize content in teacher preparation programs

And finally, an analysis of the Oregon American Indian/Alaska Native Education State Plan and the current Senate Bill 13: Tribal History and Sovereignty For All in the context of the previous six themes.



## **Grand Ronde Tribal History Curriculum Unit Analysis**

The Grand Ronde Tribal History Curriculum Unit (GRTHCU) was an endeavor that involved the CTGR's Education Department, Tribal Library, Land and Culture Department, Public Affairs and various Tribal staff members. The 15 lessons included in the curriculum are: Pre-termination time period (Time Immemorial to 1855); Pre-Termination (1855- Removal of Tribes to Reservation Life); Five Principal Tribes of CTG; Laws and Treaties; Housing; Transportation; Fishing and Hunting; Stories and Oral History; Plants; Basketry/Gathering; Clothing; Language; Termination; Restoration; and Sovereignty and Tribal Government Today.

The GRTHCU covers a wealth of information, but this research calls attention to following three themes and their relevance to this project: factual historical account of the United State Government; embedded cultural values; and contemporary landscape of the CTGR.

One of the main reasons we need historically accurate curricula is because the current text books tend to either glorify the US government or to omit tribal history altogether. This curriculum addresses that in many of its lessons; the following are two examples:

*Native people were gathered up near Ft. Lane, at the base of Table Rock (near present day Medford) and forced to march during the winter months beginning February 23 through March 25, 1856, to the Grand Ronde Indian Reservation. The march was over 30 days long. During this march 8 people died and 8 babies were born, so the military officers supervising the march were able to state that*

*“they had arrived with the number of people they had left with”* (Campbell et al., p.40).

This lesson accurately demonstrates how the United States Government forced people to leave their homes and relocate on foot to an assigned location in the middle of winter. It also shows how the military chose to omit the deaths of the tribal members. Further this lesson includes journaling as a way for students to connect with the content and to consider what it would be like to have your land terminated and be forced to remain a location over which you had no say in choosing. Tribal Crit Theory builds on this recognition of the policies and histories “that colonization is endemic in society and explicitly recognizes that the policies of the United States toward American Indians are rooted in imperialism, White supremacy, and a desire for material gain” (Brayboy, 2005, p. 431). CTGR lesson plan explicitly address this colonization with regard to both federal and local policies. The following is another example of an accurate portrayal of the United States Government:

*During the period after relocation to the Reservation, many children were sent to the Chemawa Indian Boarding School. Many children were forced to attend, further separating the community from its traditional values and teachings, and indoctrinating the children into the major society. There was also a Catholic boarding school called St. Michaels in Grand Ronde that was used extensively as well* (Campbell et al., p.102).

In that section, the intent is to cover the treaties and what happened when treaties are violated (boarding schools). A previous lesson reviews the five principle bands of the CTGR and teaches significant historical facts; effectively “personalizing” a group of

people to students and then, the unit follows with the broken treaties and forced termination and relocation. The significance of this order is poignant because it aims to ensure that students and teachers grasp the gravity of historical facts – connecting actual people to the events.

Red Pedagogy (2004) requires a new way of examining content and the CTGR curriculum does that:

They [indigenous people] refused to succumb to a system that elevates humans above all other creatures and treats nature at the hostel entity to be exploited, subdued, and abandoned. Nevertheless. Those with the greatest stake in sovereignty for indigenous peoples –that is indigenous people themselves– need more than a spirit of resistance, they need a pedagogical structure that provides methods of inquiry and analysis that expose, challenge, and disrupt the continuing colonization of their land and resources. (Grande, p. 87)

Curricula that ties the experiences to actual communities is an example of that new pedagogy. Red Pedagogy (2004) requires that while it is necessary to discuss the horrific tragedies, they do not need to be couched as an inevitable consequence and must be considered in the wider context of “whitestream consumption” (Grande, p.102). I argue that the personalization aspects to the curriculum accomplish that.

A second theme in the curriculum is that it embeds the significance of cultural values in the lessons like naming ceremonies, line dancing, feather dancing and more.

For example:

*The traditions with canoes are being brought back in Native Communities today.  
Every year The Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde are part of the canoe*

*journey. Members of our tribe travel by canoe to the next closest tribe. At the new tribe, the canoes are welcomed and fed with singing and dancing to follow.*

*Everyone camps for the night and then the canoes travel to the next tribe, with the tribe that has hosted the previous evening joining the group (Campbell et al., p.177).*

The lesson describes the types and elements of canoes, part and roles for people on the canoe, and their historical significance and then links the historical significance to a current day canoe journey. The GRTHCU then follows with an exploration of fishing.

*Most of the Tribes and Bands that were relocated to the Grand Ronde Reservation fished at local rivers around their ancestral homelands. They excelled at knowing when the fish runs were, and in constructing equipment to make fishing easier. Even after the treaties and relocation to the reservation, Tribal members would obtain special permits to return to the Willamette Falls and the mouth of the Salmon River to fish for salmon, lampreys and other fish. Fishing is still an important part of the culture of Grand Ronde today (Campbell et al., p.228).*

The particular significance of this can be realized in the remarkable fact that even after a death march and termination, tribal members obtained fishing rights. It is an important part of their culture not just because it was a past practice but because it indicates an exception (special permits) that implies their distinct sovereign rights. This curricular approach is reinforced by Grande's (2004) articulation of her theory: "A red pedagogy is historically grounded in local and tribal narratives, intellectually informed by ancestral

ways of knowing, politically centered in issues of sovereignty, and morally inspired by deep connections among the earth, its beings, and the spirit world” (p. 35).

Finally, another major struggle indigenous people face are ingrained stereotypes that never depict Native people in a contemporary context. The GRTHCU addresses it in many ways, one of which is a scavenger hunt of their tribal website:

1. *Name two of the Tribal Elders that speak in the video, “Restoration, It was Unanimous.”*
2. *Who is the Tribal member that talks in the audio clip titled, “It Started with a Phone Call”?*
3. *What kind of fundraising efforts did the Tribe do to help with Restoration?*
4. *When did the Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde receive its federal recognition status (House Resolution 3885)?*
5. *Name at least five things that the Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde people participate in today.*

Further the lesson also embeds the history and significance of restoration and how it has contributed to the purchase and/creation of the following:

*Tribal Community Center*

*Spirit Mountain Casino*

*Natural Resources Department*

*Grand Meadows*

*Health and Wellness Center*

*Governance Center*

*Elder Housing*

*Spirit Mountain Lodge*

*Education Building*

*Tribal Library*

*West Valley Veterans Memorial*

*Chxi Musam Illihi housing development*

*Grand Ronde Station*

*Adult Foster Care*

*Elder's Activity Centerspirit*

*Portland Area Office*

*Grand Ronde Station*

*Tribal plankhouse*

*Willamina Middle School property*

*Grand Ronde Tribal Housing Authority Office*

Through this lesson, the stereotypes shift and student and teachers see the reality of tribal people as multifaceted people living next door: artists, builders, singers, doctors, entrepreneurs, hunters, fishermen and women, scholars, aunties, grandparents, teachers and more. The lessons discuss how restoration is a vital part of Oregon's history and it details the story of a community's survival and empowerment. Grande (2004) spends a considerable section in *Red Pedagogy* delineating why identity is essential to an emancipatory endeavor like this one: "A red pedagogy is committed to providing American Indian students the social and intellectual space to reimagine what it means to be Indian in contemporary US society, arming them with a critical analysis of the intersecting systems of domination and the tools to navigate them" (p.118) When

students are able to deconstruct the stereotypes and situate themselves with a context, they can better navigate themselves within it.

### **Curriculum Contributors and Professional Development Provider Analysis**

When creating the curriculum, the writers, researched information for lessons with the assistance of the Tribal Librarian, Land and Culture and Education staff, tribal ethnohistorians, and worked alongside Tribal Cultural Department staff to ensure accuracy and appropriateness of content. They drafted and revised lesson plans aligned to common core state standards, created units and reviewed the unit list with tribal community members. This process took a little less than four months. According to Jennifer, “I researched information for lessons with the assistance of the Tribal Librarian, Land and Culture and Education staff, worked alongside Tribal Cultural Department staff to ensure accuracy and appropriateness of content, drafted and revised lesson plans. I would meet with the other curriculum writers throughout the project to ensure we were meeting our meeting our time frame and maintaining consistency throughout the curriculum.” They met up to three times a week both at the CTGR and in Salem to discuss content, adjustments, and research. Because the CRGR prioritized this endeavor they curriculum writers completed this work during their work day and were compensated as full time tribal employees.

After the curriculum was completed and approved by the CTGR Tribal Council, it was piloted in the Willamina School District where the CTGR students attend elementary school. In Willamina, it was piloted in the fourth-grade classrooms as well as a special education classroom. It was additionally piloted by a fourth-grade teacher at Pleasant Hill Elementary School by a teacher who is a member of the CTGR. The pilot feedback

from teachers and student was then incorporated into the curriculum and the CTGR offered a one-day professional development. Mercedes describes the day as follows:

The first PD training done for the 4<sup>th</sup> grade curriculum took place in Salem, Oregon at a conference hall in October of 2014. This PD was hosted by Salem Keizer's School District Indian Ed Department. There were roughly 60 educators who attended the training, all from the Salem-Keizer district. To launch the curriculum, I gave each educator a hard copy of the curriculum to take back to their school in hopes it'd be incorporated into the classroom right away. The training was a full day packed with information on the curriculum and the importance of teaching historically accurate information and the importance of being culturally appropriate and relevant in the classroom. After the training the Indian Ed specialist of the Salem-Keizer and I decided to really bring home the training we needed to invite the educators to the reservation. We then invited the educators to Grand Ronde in January for a training on the reservation. We had roughly 30 educators show for this training. We spent the first part of the day in the classroom learning more about the curriculum and the Tribe's history. We then went to the plankhouse and then Fort Yamhill for a guided hike.

The three following themes emerged from the interviews:

1. A confirmation of erasure and/or inaccurate curriculum
2. This curriculum benefits Native and non-Native teachers
3. Prioritize content in teacher preparation programs

### **A Confirmation of Erasure and/or Inaccurate Curriculum**



*I didn't learn anything about the Pacific Northwest natives in school. I only remember learning about Plains Indians. I can remember in fifth grade we had to give a report on a historical person. Teacher chose mine and everyone else got to pick there's. She chose Sitting Bull for me. At the time, it was okay but looking back on it I should've been offended. – Mercedes*

Not only did she not learn about her tribal history, but she was in a classroom where her teacher's assumptions manifested in a racial micro-aggression that Mercedes remembers today. We had an in-depth conversation about how it felt to learn tribal history after adulthood and the toll it takes on student identity development. Kathy had the same experience: *"I never had this content when I was a student or a teacher. I seen what goes on in schools and it is awful, none of it is from our region. It is all from the East or Alaska. And it was in the form of art or teepees."* Brayboy (2005) affirms her experience,

The everyday experiences of American Indians, the Indigenous inhabitants of the Americas, have essentially been removed from the awareness of dominant members of U.S. society. These viable images have instead been replaced with fixed images from the past of what American Indians once were. The colonization has been so complete that even many American Indians fail to recognize that we are taking up colonialist ideas when we fail to express ourselves in ways that may challenge dominant society's ideas about who and what we are supposed to be, how we are supposed to behave, and what we are supposed to be within the larger population. (p.431)

Their experiences of inaccurate curriculum aligns with April's experience when she worked for the CTGR:

*As staff for the Education Division, we continually had teachers across the state contacting us asking us for anything they could use to teach their students about the history of the Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde. There was nothing classroom-ready, authentic and accurate to hand them prior to this curriculum. -- During my tenure, as CTGR Education Director, I witnessed many inaccuracies around AI peoples. Often lesson plans/curriculum was inaccurate or taught in the historical sense.*

The significance is that April and teachers across the state confirmed the erasure and the teachers were forced to seek it on their own. Red Pedagogy acknowledges this theme with the following claim: "...that Indians as the modern people remain invisible, allowing a wide array of distorted myths to flourish as contemporary reality: that all the "real" Indians are extinct, that all surviving Indians are either alcoholics or gaming entrepreneurs. Meanwhile as these images are circulated, the intensive, ongoing court battles over land, natural resources, and federal recognition are relegated to the margins of the discourse, fueling that great lie of the 21<sup>st</sup> century – that America's "Indian problem" has long been solved" (p.103).

**This Curriculum Benefits Native and non-Native Educators.** For native teachers, Jennifer believes it can be an entry point for Native teachers to share who they are with their students: *"I hope that Native teachers are able to use their own knowledge and experiences to infuse into the curriculum."* Kathy extends that possibility to include another benefit: *"I think it will make Native teachers feel proud. They could even*

*something from their own culture to the class. They will feel good about teaching the truth and sharing something of themselves.” Eirik acknowledges how teachers might even become part of the curricular writing endeavor: “I hope that this serves as a springboard to allow more material to be developed by both Native teachers and other Tribes to help display to full breadth of indigenous of history and culture and help with contextualizing Grand Ronde in Western Oregon.”*

For non-native teachers, April believes that this curriculum plays a huge role in supporting teachers who are trying to make a difference in classrooms: *“We want all educators to feel appreciated and supported for the work they do with our future leaders.”* Mercedes names that support in terms of actual learning:

*My hope is for non-Native teachers to understand the historical ties Natives have to this land and for them to understand Natives are real and are still here the value of Native culture and how resilient Natives are and been throughout history.*

Eirik’s agrees that supporting non-Native teachers was also a goal:

*The plan was for this to be a tool for them to have pre-prepared material for classes to teach a thorough and vetted form of history rather than a generic history of other tribal groups and attempting to unintentionally create stereotypes of indigenous communities. I also hope these teachers feel more comfortable in helping expose children to different cultures in an academic setting where they can learn just how diverse our country and world is.*

The point he makes about the type of curriculum is valuable because it speaks to teachers feeling secure and confident in the information they are sharing in their classrooms.

Grande (2004) actually summarizes her theoretical treatise with an affirming sentiment:

“The hope is that such pedagogy (red) will helped shape schools and processes of learning around the ‘decolonial imaginary.’ Within this fourth space of being, the dream is that indigenious and non-indigenious peoples will work in solidarity to envision a way of life free from exploitation and replete with spirit. The invitation is for scholars, educators, and students to exercise critical consciousness at the same time they recognize the world of knowledge far exceeds their ability to know. (p.176)

**Prioritize Content in Educator Preparation Programs.** All persons interviewed stated that educator preparation programs need to require AI/AN content in order to be a certified teacher. It is currently not a requirement. April also believes in the power of “*creating an AI [American Indian] teaching certification for licensed educators.*” For current teachers, David recommends the following:

*Offer CEUs [continuing educating units] to teachers about how to teach about Native history and culture. Also, to have a program to allow Native people to come into classes to offer their own perspectives on tribal history and culture.*

Jennifer aligns with David’s statement about utilizing knowledge from Native communities: *I think this [lack of awareness of Native culture, or history] can be addressed by having faculty and administration reach out to the tribes to set up meetings, attend Tribal events, and visit Tribal facilities.*

The knowledge they are referring to is the knowledge found in the GRTHCU. It is information that is new to Native and non-Native teachers alike. Teachers need to have a knowledge base to use this curriculum well. Kathy asserts, *“I don’t think that all teachers even know that there are Native Americans in this area.”* David agreed, *“Most teachers do not appropriately teach any Native subjects.”* Mercedes believes teachers need to see *“the misinformation that’s being taught and the damage that it has/is causing for Native American culture and learn a deep understanding of where we have been and where we are now.”*

Kathy’s further comments confirm what the teachers earlier stated – that they are afraid to teach the content:

*Each teacher is going to teach what they know and they gain confidence with experience. They will have never experienced this content. Sovereignty is hard to understand. They are going to need a lot of professional training. Take for example the language. It is recorded but the students cannot see the mouth movements. Teachers need to face their fears and not be intimidated to talk to us.*

Kathy, David, April, Jennifer, Eirik and Mercedes all believe teachers need a base level of understanding on tribes, their historical context, and sovereignty. David recommends expanding beyond the base level:

*So, understanding the whole gamut of civil rights and cultural issues in American society is a necessity. Then, locally the teachers should be given time to learn about local tribes. It does not do any good to have teacher only teaching about “Native Americans” as if we are all of one group and culture. They need to have an understanding of the local Chinookans, the Kalapuyans, or whatever tribe that*

*lived and lives still in the area of the town they are teaching in. That connection kids have to the place they live is important to them.*

Red Pedagogy (2004) asks that we have deep understandings of sovereignty: “moreover, in times when fierce xenophobia is disguised as patriotic nationalism, it is incumbent upon all of us to conceptualize ways of being operate beyond the dispirited, displaced, and patriarchal notions of nationhood and citizenship” (p.174). It is clear that the contributors and professional development provider are all deeply invested in this curriculum and have a firm grasp on the task in front of Oregon educators. The curriculum is a first step toward that task but all interviewed believe addressing it before people are licensed teachers is critical.

### **Analysis of Oregon Political Landscape in which the Curriculum is Operating**

The state of Oregon is at a critical juncture politically with regard to requiring AI/AN curriculum in a K-12 setting. The Oregon American Indian/Alaska Native Education State Plan as was mentioned in the introduction was updated in 2015 and aligns with Oregon Department of Education’s current strategic plan. Further, a new legislative policy Senate Bill 13 is currently proposed in an effort to meet one of the curricular objectives of that state Plan. Both the Indian Education plan and the legislative policy have been informed by local Indigenous communities in Oregon and work occurring in the Pacific Northwest. ODE through the Office of the Indian Education (OIE) Advisor to Deputy Superintendent of Public Instruction has been researching the effectiveness of plans and policies in terms of requiring curriculum implementation.

Washington’s Since Time Immemorial: Tribal Sovereignty in Washington State

curriculum, Montana's Indian Education for All and The People's of Idaho: Native Settlers.

The Oregon American Indian/Alaska Native Education State Plan has five domains and eleven objectives. All of the eleven objectives are curricular in nature and all are interrelated:

*Learners*

1. Increase graduation rates for AI/AN students to meet or exceed state wide average of all students
2. Increase college or career readiness of AI/AN students to meet or exceed statewide average of all students. All AI/AN students will have the opportunity to graduate from HS with a minimum of three college credits.
3. Increase AI/AN attendance to meet or exceed statewide average for all students.

*Educators*

4. Districts will recruit, hire, place, and retain a minimum of 5% AI/AN educators (equally distributed among administrators, teachers, & support staff) or a percentage equal to the percentage of AI/ AN students in the district, whichever is greater.

Objective four has particular support in Brayboy's later work:

There is also a need to consider the ways we prepare Indigenous college and graduate students to become teachers and serve the needs of Native students. Simultaneously, it is important that state and education leaders, teachers, principals, and other members of the community be prepared to meet the ever-

changing world in which tribal peoples find themselves. Building local capacity necessitates starting with both young children and teachers with the hope of meeting in the middle. In other words, it involves moving toward a place where children's academic achievement improves under the guidance of Indigenous teachers, engaged in culturally responsive schooling, and that these young people will, themselves, eventually move into positions as teachers and guide the next generation of learners. (Brayboy et al., 2014, pp.580-581)

5. Ensure 100% of educators (administrators, teachers, support staff, school boards) receive AI/AN culturally responsive training at least once per academic year.
6. 100% of pre- service students completing Oregon Native American Teacher Preparation Programs (UO & PSU) will be recruited by an Oregon school or tribe.

*Schools/Districts*

7. Every school district in Oregon implements (K-12) historically accurate, culturally embedded, place-based, contemporary, and developmentally appropriate AI/AN curriculum, assessment tools, and instructional materials that are developed in collaboration with local tribes and are aligned with the Common Core State Standards and state standards.

Objective Seven is perhaps the one that aligns most strongly with the theoretical precepts of Red Pedagogy (2004):

I argue that as long as of the political project a critical education fails to be interrelationship between human consumption, capitalistic exploitation, and the



struggle for quote democracy,” it will fail to provide emancipatory pedagogy’s that are sustainable and pertinence for the global age” (p.7).

“Historically accurate, culturally embedded, place-based addresses” cannot be taught without addresses those interrelationships.

### *Communities*

8. Chief Education Office, ODE, ELD, YDC, HECC, and TSPC will strategically invest and collaborate with Oregon’s federally recognized tribes, Native/Indian organizations, Title VII Programs, and AI/AN community programs to implement, support, and maintain culturally relevant family/parent engagement so that every AI/AN child will begin their educational journey ready to succeed.

This learning objective is supported by Tribal Crit’s Theoretical tenet number four:

TribalCrit is rooted in a belief in and desire to obtain and forge tribal autonomy, self-determination, self-identification, and ultimately tribal sovereignty. Tribal autonomy is the ability of communities and tribal nations to have control over existing land bases, natural resources, and tribal national boundaries. Autonomy is also linked to the ability to interact with the U.S. and other nations on a nation-to-nation basis. Self-determination is the ability to define what happens with autonomy, how, why, and to what ends, rather than being forced to ask permission from the United States. (Brayboy, 2005, pp.433-434)

The strategy for this objective requires the education state offices work with tribes in a government to government relationship so that tribes are co-constructing future endeavors.

*Oregon Department of Education*

9. Create accurate identification criteria for who is counted as an AI/AN student and require districts to collect data.

Objective nine is perhaps the objective that provides the largest challenge according to Grande (2004) because:

American Indian students do not enter into a social space in which identities compete with equal power for legitimacy; rather, they are infused into a political terrain that presumes their inferiority... As such, American Indian students are neither free to “reinvent” themselves nor able to liberally “transgress” borders of difference, but rather, remain captive to the determined spaces of colonialist rule. The students experience the binds of the paradox inherent in the current modes of identity theory and it becomes increasingly evident that neither of the cold linearity of blood quantum nor of tortured weakness of self-identification” (p.99).

Brayboy’s (2005) TCT also requires particular attention to American Indian identities:

The racialized status of American Indians appears to be the main emphasis of most members of U.S. society; this status ignores the legal/political one, and is directly tied to notions of colonialism, because larger society is unaware of the multiple statuses of Indigenous peoples. Currently, the different circulating discourses around what it means to be Indian as well as what constitutes

American Indian education establish a context in which American Indians must struggle for the right to be defined as both a legal/ political and a racial group. Even though our status as a legal/political group has been repeatedly articulated in government policy, legal code, and the everyday lives of American Indian individuals and communities, it remains a point of debate and contention in most popular settings. (p.433)

I firmly believe that the state does not have the capacity to understand the depths of American Indian identity politics, but that empowerment can result if the Oregon Indian community can effectively thread this needle.

10. Establish framework for accountability of implementation of the AI/AN State Plan.
11. Continue to build internal ODE capacity by strengthening the organizational infrastructure and increasing staffing to increase support to schools, Title VII, Oregon Federally Recognized Tribes, and AI/AN communities.

In small ways, the plan is mainstream in focus on mainstream measures like graduation rates and college and career readiness. But in many ways, it utilizes a lens of indigeneity in its objectives so that includes parent engagement, collaboration with tribes, and culturally appropriate curriculum which is what TCT requires, “TribalCrit problematizes the concepts of culture, knowledge, and power and offers alternative ways of understanding them through an Indigenous lens” (Brayboy, 2005, p.434).

Once the plan was approved and adopted by the Oregon Board of Education in 2015, ODE and the Chief Education Office began elevating the visibility of the plan statewide by holding community convenings at various tribes in Oregon. The convenings

consist of directors of all education state agencies with tribal community educators, parents, students, local school and community programs, and more. To date they have held convenings at the Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs, Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde, Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation, Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians, and the Burns Paiute Tribe. These convenings are already embodying Tribal Crit's eighth tenet that stories are theory. At every convening, tribal people stand up and tell their personal stories of colonization, survivance, and place. Directors of all educational state agencies are beginning to see their stories as what Brayboy (2005) calls, "real and legitimate forms of data and ways of being" (p.439). Also, as of January 2017, ODE has presented on all elements of the plan including the school and district expectations to over 1,500 people. The majority of those 1,500 are from the educational arena, including but not limited to teachers, administrators, non-profits, and educational governmental agencies. The venues have been primarily state wide education conference and agencies which include but are not limited to the following: Oregon School Board Association, Confederation of Oregon School Administrators, Oregon Department of Education, Early Learning Division, Higher Education Coordinating Commission, Chief Education Office, Oregon Leadership Network, Oregon Education Equity Workgroup, David Douglas and Tillamook School District Equity Pilot Work Groups, TeachOregon Network Forum (which includes the Educator Preparation Programs from Pacific University, Corbin University, Western Oregon University, University of Oregon, Portland State University, and George Fox University), Oregon Leadership Network and more. It is important to note that attendees in almost every venue have been voluntary. Tribal Crit's lens requires a connection

between theory and practice which requires the creation of structures and systems to address the “real, immediate, and future needs of tribal peoples and communities” (p.440).

Additionally, the AI/AN Advisory panel drafted and filed the following Senate Bill 13 Tribal History and Sovereignty for All for the 2017 legislative session:

*(1) The Department of Education shall:*

*(a) Develop a curriculum relating to the Native American experience in Oregon and make the curriculum available to school districts; and*

*(b) Provide professional development to teachers and administrators relating to the curriculum.*

*(2) The curriculum required by this section must be:*

*(a) For students in kindergarten through grade 12;*

*(b) Related to the Native American experience in Oregon, including tribal history, sovereignty issues, culture, treaty rights, government, socioeconomic experiences and current events;*

*(c) Historically accurate, culturally relevant, community-based, contemporary and developmentally appropriate; and*

As Red Pedagogy supports the exact same language in the AI/AN state plan, so does TCT:

While Indigenous ways of knowing and “book smarts” are often seen as diametrically opposed, these different forms of knowledge do not necessarily need to be in conflict (Barnhardt & Kawagley, 2005; Battiste, 2002; Harrison & Papa, 2005; Kawagley, 1995; Medicine, 2001). Rather, they complement each

other in powerful ways. This blending of knowledges—academic and cultural ones—creates knowledge that is key to survival (Barnhardt & Kawagley, 2004, 2005; Deloria, 1970; Medicine, 2001). The exercise of these various forms of knowledge is always context-specific and the different forms must be integrated with one another in order to achieve successful resistance and, thus, survival. For example, knowledge learned in school can be used in conjunction with tribal knowledge toward social justice for these communities. This strategic use of multiple forms of knowledge generates power that is situated, dynamic, and historically influenced. (Brayboy, 2005, p.435)

The historical accurate, place based, contemporary nature of the state law meets the theoretical tenets of Tribal Crit Theory.

- (d) Aligned with the academic content standards adopted under ORS 329.045.*
- (3) School districts must implement the curriculum developed under subsection (1) of this section for students in kindergarten through grade 12.*
- (4) The department may contract for the development of the curriculum under this section or for the provision of professional development.*
- (5) The department shall ensure that the federally recognized Indian tribes in Oregon are given the opportunity to collaborate in the development of the curriculum and the provision of professional development, and may make moneys available to those tribes to support collaboration efforts.*

Given the analysis of the interviews and the curriculum itself, Senate Bill 13 is the next natural progression. The interviewees discuss how teachers have been asking for support and how there is so little vetted content for teachers to access. They also

discussed the importance of placing tribal people in a contemporary and non-stereotypical context. This policy addresses exactly that. This is further confirmed by my final following analysis which demonstrates the implementation obstacles that prevented many students from receiving access to this curriculum. The critical component, Sandy Grande (2004), I think would assert is in the professional development:

Indigenous scholar Haunani K Trask writes, 'Thinking in one's own cultural referents leads to conceptualizing in one's own worldview which, in turn leads to disagreement with an eventual opposition to the dominant ideology.' Thus, where a revolutionary critical pedagogy compels students and educators to question how 'knowledge is related historically, culturally and institutionally to the process of colonization.' A Red Pedagogy compels students to question how (whitestream) knowledge is related to the processes of colonization. (p..56)

Robust professional development would compel **all** students (read: teachers) to question knowledge construction and colonization.

### **Analysis of the Silence**

My initial plan was to observe teachers using the curriculum. I identified the set of teachers in the spring and made arrangements to interview them in the fall. When fall arrived, I followed up with the five teachers (all non-Native). They informed me that they taught the curriculum during the summer school session and since none of them taught the 4<sup>th</sup> grade, they were not planning to use the curriculum. Not using the curriculum during the school year when all students can access the content is another form of erasure.

So, I searched for other teachers to observe. I emailed and called over 40 teachers. I heard back from five (all non-Native). The teachers who declined to be interviewed cited, fear, embarrassment, and anxiety about being able to teach the content correctly. They also cited worry that their school would not be okay with using this curriculum instead of the one the school already uses.

I realized that it would be impossible to find teachers to observe so I thought I would instead interview teachers who had taken the professional development even if they did not use the curriculum. I encountered the exact same radio silence. They cited that though they enjoyed the learning from the training, that they were worried about the consequences from their school leaders or personal consequences if they did not accurately implement content that they themselves were not familiar with on a personal level.

There is a significant body of work on white educators and their struggle to engage in the work necessary to understand concepts of whiteness, privilege, educational equity, race as a construct and more. (McIntosh, 1989; Frankenberg, 1993; Mazzei, 2008; Roediger, 1999; Kumashiro and Ngo, 2007, Leonardo, 2013). And while this study is not about interrogating this particular challenge, the silence of the teachers who took the professional development requires we acknowledge this is a particularly poignant implementation challenge.

The fear and concern surfaced is confirmed by the interviews of the curriculum contributors and it speaks volumes to implementation challenges. For example, principals will have huge a stake in the success of curricula like this and if they do not explicit prioritize it, teachers might be afraid to use it even though they are actively



seeking the content. Also, because the scope of units like this one are not generally created to span longer than a day or two, teachers might fear taking away time during the school year because of test-prep pressure and end up relegating it to use in summer programs. Further, if teachers fear the taboos of speaking about Indians, they will tend to avoid it in lieu of “experts.” The irony is that in lieu of “experts” they choose to use the current outdated non-tribally created textbooks and in doing so are perpetuating erasure or stereotypes.

This project set out to answer three questions:

1. What was the curriculum designed to do?
2. What, if any, implementation challenges exist with tribally written curriculum?
3. How can understanding curriculum development/implementation landscape for tribal education inform policy and practice?

One might think that the intentions of the curriculum designers and professional development providers have are contradictory in nature. On one hand, they invested in this endeavor and believed that curriculum with strong professional development was worthwhile. On the other hand, they all acknowledged that the system does not have teachers who are versed in the content. While they did assume that professional development was necessary, they did not stop there when asked about teacher preparation. They strongly believed that this content needs to be incorporated into the education preparation realm.

The implementation challenges are many: schools and systems who do not prioritize this content will be met with resistance and fear from teachers. Professional

development as supported in the literature review needs to be on-going, evolving, nuanced, and robust in order for educators to understand concepts as complex as sovereignty and termination. Further, cultural values were deeply embedded in the curricula and while they may be quickly accessible to tribal members, they might not be as easily understood by non-Native teachers. Finally, implementation requires developing relationships with tribal communities. All units of analysis (interviews, policy, State Plan, curriculum unit) pointed out the importance of reaching out to the local tribal community. This challenge is particularly big. How does one mandate relationship?

The concept of *trust responsibility* (Deyhle & Swisher, 1997) does not dwell on that challenge, but rather reminds us of what the responsibility means. The sovereign status of Native American tribes contributes to the unique educational environment in which culturally sustaining teaching and learning can occur.

In exchange for nearly 1 billion acres of land, certain services, protection against invasion, and self-government were to be provided in perpetuity, or "as long as the grass grows and rivers flow." More than 400 treaties solemnized the transactions—lands in exchange for promises—between sovereigns for nearly 100 years (1778 to 1871), thus creating a special relationship between Indian people and the federal government.

The foundation of this is one of trust: the Indians trust the United States to fulfill the promises which were given in exchange for land. The federal government's obligation to honor this trust relationship and to fulfill its treaty commitments is known as its trust responsibility (p. 114)

Further, legislative language of the Title VII (now Title VI) Indian Education is as follows:

It is the policy of the United States to fulfill the Federal Government's unique and continuing trust relationship with and responsibility to the Indian people for the education of Indian children. The Federal Government will continue to work with local educational agencies, Indian tribes and organizations, postsecondary institutions, and other entities toward the goal of ensuring that programs that serve Indian children are of the highest quality and provide for not only the basic 332 elementary and secondary educational needs, but also the unique educational and culturally related academic needs of these children. (20 U.S.C. § 7101)

The law also states that students' "unique cultural and academic needs" should be supported "so that such students can meet the same challenging State student academic achievement standards as all other students are expected to meet."

If trust responsibility negates the potential answers to the research questions, a further explanation of the relationship between tribal sovereignty and educational practice must be explored. The treaty agreements mean that first, the United State government is bound by law to honor and accept the trust relationship; and second, the values embedded in the GRTHCU, derived from the experiences of the writers and professional development providers, the Indian Education Advisor to Deputy Superintendent of Public Instruction, the Oregon American Indian/Alaska Native Education State Plan Advisory Panel, and ODE's current draft policy affirm that teachers should have the knowledge and skill to competently incorporate tribally written curriculum into their practice. The statewide policy imperatives provide both the impetus and the platform required to make

this happen. While the policy directives create the conditions necessary for implementation, the following recommendations provide both a vision and a roadmap for EPPs, school practitioners, policy makers, and academics to follow. The next chapter will discuss the implications of the study's findings and outline resulting recommendations.

## CHAPTER V

### DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

*... Cultural sovereignty encompasses the spiritual, emotional, mental, and physical aspects of our lives. Because of this, only Native peoples can decide what the ultimate contours of Native sovereignty will be.*

*- Wallace Coffey, Comanche & Rebecca Tsosie, Yaqui*

*What kind of professionals do we need in 'Indian Country?' The necessary condition is that they receive the requisite technical knowledge, skills, and abilities to advise Indian communities of an array of possible solutions and scenarios to address specific problems/issues. However, it is not a sufficient condition to meet the Tribal needs of culturally distinct Indigenous people. Any Tribal person or politically engaged Tribal member can testify to the fact that often when non-Indian professionals are hired to do things for Tribes, the clash of underlying worldviews— that is, Indigenous — versus — Western conflict — makes accomplishment of Tribal goals difficult, if not impossible. Daniel Wildcat, Power and Place (2001)*

In this dissertation, I proposed a case study of a single state as a methodology to examine the challenges of creating and implementing tribally written curriculum in a state where deep understandings of indigenous values, culture and history evades the current educator workforce. In this chapter I offer a summary of the significant findings in the context of the theoretical framework; also, using a neighboring state's research on their indigenous curricular implementation, I offer two typologies of recommendations for educator preparation programs, current teachers and administrators, educator preparation programs, academia, policy, and Indigenous students.

Red Pedagogy (Grande, 2004) and TribalCrit (Brayboy, 2005) require the use of an indigenous lens and that we directly acknowledge colonization. The GRTHCU does this with both its lesson plans (termination, treaties, land theft and more) and also embeds

the values of within the assignments. It does not however interrogate both democracy and indigenous sovereignty in the way both Grande (2004) and Brayboy (2005) theorize. It tries to by way of the sovereignty lesson, but it only scratches the surface. It introduces sovereignty and indigenous scholars of education and sovereignty can extend the lesson into a democratic inquiry, but your average non-Native teacher cannot. Grande (2005) asserts:

While the dire need to provide American Indian students with culturally relevant and affirming educational experiences is well noted, it is not sufficient. At a time when 90 percent of American Indian students attend non-Indian schools (Gallagher, 2000), it is not only imperative for Indian educators to insist on the incorporation of indigenous knowledge and praxis in schools but also to transform the institutional structures of schools themselves. In other words, in addition to the development of Native curricula, indigenous educations need to develop systems of analysis that help theorize the ways in which power and domination inform the processes and procedures of schooling. They need pedagogies that work to disrupt the structures of inequality. (pp.6-7)

Grande (2004) is not saying to *not* produce curricula like the GRTHCU, but rather it is a larger piece of the whole – Red Pedagogy requires we acknowledge that school reform is not the only answer. One of the recommendations mentioned later in embodies the following value of cross-sector and economic accountability:

Indian education was never simple about the desire to ‘civilize’ or even deculturalize a people, but rather, from its very inception, it was a project

designed to colonize Indian minds as a means of gaining access to Indian labor, land and resources. Therefore, unless educational reform happens concurrently with the analyses of forces of colonialism, it can only serve as a deeply insufficient (if not negligent) Band-Aid over the incessant wounds of imperialism. (p.19)

Those forces she refers to are capitalism and extractive policies. While this is true and I couldn't agree more, Grande never speaks explicitly to the unanticipated outcomes when tribal members write their own curricula. The curricula contributors all acknowledge that it was an empowering endeavor for both themselves and the larger community, and I would venture that if I were to dive deeper into the experiences of tribal members who participated in the knowledge generation, they would concur. This is not to say that Red Pedagogy would not endorse this. Grande (2004) states:

...the social engagement of ideas is my method. Specifically, I learned that my research is about ideas in motion. That is, ideas as they come alive within and through people(s), communities, events, texts, practices, policies, institutions, artistic expression, ceremonies, and rituals. I engage them "in motion" through a process of active and close observation wherein I live with, try on, and wrestle with ideas in a manner akin to Geertz's (1998) notion of "deep hanging out" but without the distinction between participant/observer. (p. 233)

Therefore, the "social engagement" of ideas is the process of creating the curriculum.

The exercise itself is decolonizing.

Brayboy (2005) too asserts that stories generated (in this case via curricular design) are theory itself—that the stories build communities, that they create shared knowledge and resisting colonization. And both he and Castagno (2009) assert that curriculum itself is not enough and reform requires a direct acknowledgement of the context of the hegemonic structure of schools:

Educators must pay more attention to the ways colonization, racism, and power matter in educational settings and work towards more effective and longer-term pre-service and in-service training that helps educators understand and strategize about their role as agents for social change and greater educational equity. (p. 49)

In short, what navigating the education landscape of Oregon (via the data, the theories, and my professional experience) has revealed is the deep nuanced understandings of indigeneity and the multiple varied cultural context of both Oregon tribal communities and urban Indian communities cannot be captured solely in curricular units.

Both the State Plan and Senate Bill 13 attempt to ameliorate curricular challenges by requiring professional development. Additionally, the curriculum contributors all believe that it should *also* live in a context of education preparation. However, the limitation there is the same as the limitations in the teacher sphere – there are too few faculty educators who understand the required nuances in Indian country. Therefore, the most significant finding is that Indian education cannot change without direct collaboration with local indigenous knowledge. What both TribalCrit and Red Pedagogy



do is center indigenous knowledge which is exactly what the State Plan, Senate Bill 13, the interviewees and the GRTHCU do and suggest. As Brayboy (2005) recommends:

...that no research should be conducted with Indigenous Peoples that is not in some way directed by a community and aimed toward improving the life chances and situations of specific communities and American Indians writ large. The research must be relevant and address the problems of the community; there is little room for abstract ideas in real communities. (p. 440)

While the third theory, Culturally Sustaining Pedagogy, that informs this research does not speak directly to indigeneity, it has tenets that resonate with the units of analyses, primarily in the prioritizing of multiple ways of being and knowing:

As we reposition our pedagogies to focus on the practices and knowledges of communities of color, we must do so with the understanding that fostering linguistic and cultural flexibility has become an educational imperative, as multilingualism and multiculturalism are increasingly linked to access and power. (Paris & Alim, 2014, p.95)

Those interviewed were all vested in both native and non-Native student growth and never expressed an interest for one epistemology to dominate but rather that the current one make space for an indigenous one. Paris & Alim, 2014 also reinforce the historical and contemporary nature of this pedagogical approach:

As those of us committed to educational justice seek to perpetuate and foster a pluralist present and future through our pedagogy, it is crucial that we understand the ways young people are enacting race, ethnicity, language, literacy, and cultural practices in both traditional and evolving ways. (p.90)

The call to both “traditional and evolving ways” can be read as a nod to the historical and contemporary context of Oregon Indians, tribal and urban.

The implications for policy, theory, and practice are clear and supported by both the findings and the theoretical frameworks:

- Indigenous curricular endeavors that center indigenous values, incorporate local context are important, and acknowledge the role of colonialism and are just part of the larger systemic response of decolonization
- Implementation challenges are rooted in a colonized paradigm and expanding reform to the educator preparation and policy realm is critical so that all educators (Native and non-Native benefit). Emphasis here is on the entire educator preparation continuum – not just teachers, but the preparation of administrators, counselors, and more
- Addressing power and hegemonic structures in contexts outside of education (with the local indigenous communities) create a larger and necessary accountability scope
- Indigenous knowledge is nuanced, varied, and evolving and thus, needs robust professional development that incorporates best and promising practices in concert with local indigenous communities for both inservice and preservice fields.
- Without policy and state incentives, the implementation challenges will continue

When looking to recommendations, I looked to a neighboring state who is a few years and steps ahead of Oregon in their own Indian Education journey—Montana.

Montana’s Indian Education for All (IEFA) initiative of 1999 has achieved a tremendous amount of success that many attribute to the fact that both their Superintendent of Public Instruction and their Director of the Indian Education Division are not only Native American, but are also proponents of social justice (Juneau and Broaddus, 2006). Montana’s IEFA’s seven essential understandings (see Appendix A) and the research of their curricular implementation (Ngai and Koehn, 2011) frame the recommendations. Using the seven essential understandings, Ngai and Keohn (2011) researched three implementation of Montana’s IEFA curriculum and found that

The specific outcomes of the Indigenous-education program varied according to the different instructional approaches teachers elected to pursue. Instructional comparisons showed that combining place-based instruction with guided reflection on personal connections with American Indian people through “boundary-breaking” approaches that aim to bring about critical consciousness ignited the most impressive changes in learners’ orientations (p. 249).

Ngai and Keohn, (2011) define “customary,” as traditional methods of teaching and teacher knowledge much like Cochran-Smith and Lytle’s, (1999) knowledge-for-practice; and they define “boundary breaking” as methods that require students “develop a critical consciousness about society, culture, place, people, and citizenship—locally and beyond” (Grande, 2004). It is these two definitions and the values inherent in the seven essential understanding that I have arrived at the framing for my recommendations.

### **Educator Preparation Programs (EPP)**

We are a teacher blaming society (Kumashiro, 2012). I myself am enraged at teachers when my sons are on the receiving end of curricular racial micro-aggressions. How can

one teach what one does not know? As April and Mercedes have stated, teachers call them all the time wanting curriculum so they can honor their students and families. EPP's have the imperative to prepare their students with methodological, pedagogical, and curricular tools to provide culturally sustaining education to their students. However, appropriate preparation can transcend customary approaches and achieve boundary breaking teaching and learning opportunities.

*Customary approach:*

- The state requires all EPPs include coursework that educators licensed in Oregon learn how to implement (K-12) historically accurate, culturally embedded, place-based, contemporary, and developmentally appropriate AI/AN curriculum, assessment tools, and instructional materials.
- On a national level, the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation develops a standard requiring all EPPs in the country develop a standard regarding the implementation (K-12) historically accurate, culturally embedded, place-based, contemporary, and developmentally appropriate AI/AN curriculum, assessment tools, and instructional materials in effort to meet the spirit of the federal trust relationship

*Boundary breaking approach:*

- As Jennifer recommended, “*faculty and administration reach out to the tribes to set up meetings, attend Tribal events, and visit Tribal facilities.*” EPPs develop authentic and sustaining relationships with the local tribes, the local urban and rural indigenous organizations/centers, the local Title VI parent groups and with tribal parents as stakeholders. EPPs faculty, full and adjunct, receive instruction

on the best ways to build collaborative relationships and are given the time and assistance to do so.

- EPPs develop a relationship with parallel departments that teach ethnic studies, linguistics, history, sociology and other appropriate disciplines and co-construct content so that future teachers learn what David calls “an understanding of the whole gamut of civil rights and cultural issues in American society.” Together they co-construct proficiencies for the content that are grounded in culturally sustaining pedagogy.
- EPP faculty learn to deconstruct where the dominant worldviews normalize racist systems and work to re-create their curricular content to reflect multiple ways of being and knowing – a cultural pluralism. As Brayboy and Castango (2009) recommend: “Educators must pay more attention to the ways colonization, racism, and power matter in educational settings and work towards more effective and longer-term pre-service and in-service training that helps educators understand and strategize about their role as agents for social change and greater educational equity” (p.49).
- The Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation works with the National Congress of the American Indian, the Bureau of Indian Education, the Office of Indian Education, and the National Indian Education Association to co-construct a standard that meets the federal trust responsibility.
- Deans of EPPs work actively with Teacher Standards and Practices Commission to create easier avenues for AI/AN people to receive licenses to teach AI/AN languages.

## **Current Teachers and Administrators**

### *Customary approach:*

- The state requires all teachers and administrators, new and current, receive professional development training on curriculum that meets the elements in the Oregon American Indian/Alaska Native Education State Plan.
- All school boards receive training on how to ensure implementation and accountability in their respective districts.
- Confederation of School Administrators (COSA) and Oregon School Boards Association (OSBA) work in partnership to help district administrators and school board with the associated training.
- School and District incorporate the Oregon American Indian/Alaska Native Education State Plan into their equity plans.

### *Boundary breaking approach:*

- School/Districts develop authentic and sustaining relationships with local tribes, local urban and rural indigenous organizations/centers, and the local Title VI parent groups. Districts are taught how to and are given the time necessary to build those relationships.
- School/Districts develop an culturally responsive and engaging framework for parents as key stakeholders in the co-construction of all instructional and behavior programs.
- District learn that “although in theory most diversity-related education policies and practices promise to bring about greater equity, too often in practice they actually maintain, legitimate, and thus perpetuate whiteness (Castagno, p 171).

Therefore, instead of an equity plan, districts create a robust plan of professional development for all district leaders (and then for teachers) to understand the socio-cultural context of schools. Schools can develop partnerships with ethnic studies programs/professors/community colleges, etc. that mirror more mainstream partnerships with higher education that have led to years of implementation on school systems and interventions (i.e. Response to Intervention, Positive Behavior Support, Research for Better Teaching).

- Educators participate in teaching all elements of the Oregon AI/AN Education State Plan to students and families as part of their Open Houses and Curriculum Nights.
- Districts restructure their teacher evaluation frameworks to incorporate an inquiry of stance with regard to indigeneity for educators in what we call Oregon and the United States. (Reminder: this stance “involves making problematic the current arrangements of schooling; the ways knowledge is constructed, evaluated, and used; and teachers' individual and collective roles in bringing about change.” (Cochran-Smith and Lytle, 1999, p.289)
- COSA, OSBA, and Education Service Districts develop a relationship with the local tribes, local cultural groups, the local urban and rural indigenous organizations/centers, and the local Title VI parent groups and restructure their organizations by centering cultural pluralism, by centering indigeneity, and by recognizing sovereign nature of Oregon tribes. They develop ways to offer credit, honorarium, etc to these organizations as a thank you for imparting their wisdom.

- Districts create a 5-year implementation plan for funding language immersion schools for AI/AN languages in their areas.

## **State Policy**

### *Customary approach:*

- Legislature approves a single position to oversee AI/AN state plan and policies, and agency structure places the work in a silo
- A one-time legislative appropriation funds all districts to embed (K-12) historically accurate, culturally embedded, place-based, contemporary, and developmentally appropriate AI/AN curriculum, assessment tools, and instructional materials.
- A one-time legislative appropriation funds tribes to work collaboratively with scholars of their choice to develop curriculum for K12 school districts and EPPs.

### *Boundary breaking approach:*

- State acknowledges the need for solutions to be cross-sector, community-based and collaborative. To that end, the state establishes a fund from variety of agencies to support tribes in developing, implementing, and evaluating innovative cross-sector and strength-based approaches to indigenous education including but not limited to housing, health care, transportation, agriculture and more.
- Develop a robust Office of Indian Education with a team of highly qualified employees who work in coordination with other departments within the state education agency, as well as across agencies, to create the necessary paradigmatic shift in systems to center indigenous education. To that end, State requires all educational agencies to take ownership in the implementation of the Oregon



AI/AN Education State Plan which means allotting FTE within their organizational structure

- An ongoing appropriation funds tribes to work collaboratively with scholars of their choice to not only develop curriculum for K12 school districts and EPPs, but also to fund ongoing processes/cycles of continuous reflection, revision, and adaptation. As Jennifer stated when writing the curriculum, she discovered that: *The curriculum itself ended up being a resource for Tribal members, family, staff and the community as well to learn more about the history.*
- State incentivizes language and culture immersion as key promising approaches through strategic funding and potentially state accountability system (i.e. the report card and system of support & intervention that ODE implements would acknowledge language and culture immersion as positive attributes / interventions)
- Legislation requires any EPP receiving public funds will offer free tuition and living expenses for descendants of AI/AN tribes, prioritizing first Oregon tribal communities.
- State directs higher education institutions to create a Tribal Community Development Degree (Bourgault, 2016)

## **Academia**

*Customary approach:*

- Conduct research without input from indigenous peoples.
- The Academy continues to produce statistical research that is grounded in Western ways of being and knowing.

*Boundary breaking approach:*

- Research from the universities serves and is co-owned by the communities it is serving.
- Research that exposes “structural inequalities and assimilatory processes and work toward debunking and deconstructing them; it also works to create structures that will address the real, immediate and future needs of tribal peoples and communities...The research must be relevant and address the problems of the community; there is little room for abstract ideas in real communities” (Brayboy, 2005 p. 440).
- Research content that is intersectional.
- Research that honors and promotes new ways of being and thinking in the world including different philosophical and methodological approaches that might conflict with Eurocentric models of research.

**Indigenous Students in Higher Education**

*Customary Approach*

- Institutions fund select students to pursue their doctorate
- Institutions create hostile learning environments when they question, problematize, or advocating for a decolonizing educational experience

*Boundary Breaking Approach*

*The largest barrier to individual intellectual sovereignty that I can see is the refusal of Indians to take their own traditions seriously and simply repeat Western notions of the world.  
(Deloria, 1998, p. 29)*

- Institutions recognize, honor, and fully support indigenous students.

- Institutions hire native faculty, support their efforts for tenure, and create opportunity for leadership positions.
- Institutions provide scholarship, research, and leadership opportunities for native students.
- Institutions fully fund indigenous studies programs, as well as other culturally inclusive programs that problematize white supremacy and create spaces for students of color to thrive

## **Conclusion**

*“We are not bookmarks in history. We are thriving, living people of culture. We are among you right now – in your classrooms. We are a living history. We’re not relegated to the past; we’re among you.”*  
- Leslie Riggs, CTGR Tribal Member

In short, this important curricular endeavor has opened the door to boundary breaking approaches that can undo over 500 years of colonization. People say all the time, “We have a choice to make...” I disagree. We have already made a choice. Is it the right one? What are we doing right now to embody the boundary breaking approaches? Our ancestors and our children are listening and watching.

## APPENDIX A

### MONTANA'S INDIAN EDUCATION FOR ALL ESSENTIAL UNDERSTANDINGS

1. There is great diversity among the twelve tribal nations of Montana in their languages, cultures, histories and governments. Each Nation has a distinct and unique cultural heritage that contributes to modern Montana.
2. There is great diversity among individual American Indians as identity is developed, defined and redefined by entities, organizations and people. A continuum of Indian identity, unique to each individual, ranges from assimilated to traditional. There is no generic American Indian.
3. The ideologies of Native traditional beliefs and spirituality persist into modern day life as tribal cultures, traditions, and languages are still practiced by many American Indian people and are incorporated into how tribes govern and manage their affairs. Additionally, each tribe has its own oral histories, which are as valid as written histories. These histories pre-date the “discovery” of North America.
4. Reservations are lands that have been reserved by the tribes for their own use through treaties, statutes, and executive orders and were not “given” to them. The principle that land should be acquired from the Indians only through their consent with treaties involved three assumptions:
  - a. Both parties to treaties were sovereign powers.
  - b. Indian tribes had some form of transferable title to the land.
  - c. Acquisition of Indian lands was solely a government matter not to be left to individual colonists.

5. There were many federal policies put into place throughout American history that have affected Indian people and still shape who they are today. Many of these policies conflicted with one another. Much of Indian history can be related through several major federal policy periods:
  - a. Colonization/Colonial Period 1492 – 1800s
  - b. Treaty Period 1789 - 1871
  - c. Assimilation Period - Allotment and Boarding School 1879 - 1934
  - d. Tribal Reorganization Period 1934 – 1958
  - e. Termination and Relocation Period 1953 – 1971
  - f. VI. Self-determination Period 1968 – Present
6. History is a story most often related through the subjective experience of the teller. With the inclusion of more and varied voices, histories are being rediscovered and revised. History told from an Indian perspective frequently conflicts with the stories mainstreams historians tell.
7. Under the American legal system, Indian tribes have sovereign powers, separate and independent from the federal and state governments. However, the extent and breadth of tribal sovereignty is not the same for each tribe (Montana Office of Public Instruction & Juneau, 2012, pp. 1-10).

## REFERENCES CITED

- Abu-Saad, I., & Champagne, Duane. (2006). *Indigenous education and empowerment: International perspectives* (Contemporary Native American communities; 17). Lanham: Altamira Press.
- Alaska Statue § 14.20.025. Retrieved [http://www.legis.state.ak.us/basis/folioproxy.asp?url=http://www.jnu01.legis.state.ak.us/cgi-bin/folioisa.dll/stattx04/query=\\*/doc/%7Bt5946%7D](http://www.legis.state.ak.us/basis/folioproxy.asp?url=http://www.jnu01.legis.state.ak.us/cgi-bin/folioisa.dll/stattx04/query=*/doc/%7Bt5946%7D).
- Alfred, T. (2005). *Wasáse: Indigenous pathways of action and freedom*. University of Toronto Press.
- Aston, John. (2001). Autopsy of hate: Ten years later. *Outsmart*, 8(6), 64-69. Apple, M. W. (2004). *Ideology and Curriculum*. New York: Routledge Falmer.
- Atkins, J.D.C. (1887). *Annual report of the commissioner of Indian affairs to the secretary of the interior for the year 1887*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Barton, K. C., & Levstik, L. S. (1998). "It Wasn't a Good Part of History": National Identity and Students' Explanations of Historical Significance. *Teachers College Record*, 99(3), 478- 513.
- Blackburn, M. V. (2004). Understanding Agency Beyond School Sanctioned Activities. *Theory Into Practice*, 43(2), 102-110.
- Bobbitt, F. (1918). *The Curriculum*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Bobbitt, F. (reprinted in 1975). A Significant Tendency in Curriculum-Making. *Elementary School Journal*, (75), 54-61.
- Borko, H. (2004). Professional Development and Teacher Learning: Mapping the Terrain. *Educational Researcher*, 33 (8), 3-15.
- Bourgault, K., (2016). *Navigating Tribal Credentialism: An Ethnographic Case Study of the Higher Education Perceptions within a Pacific Northwest Tribal Community* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from [https://scholarsbank.uoregon.edu/xmlui/.../Bourgault\\_oregon\\_0171A\\_11490.pdf?..1](https://scholarsbank.uoregon.edu/xmlui/.../Bourgault_oregon_0171A_11490.pdf?..1)
- Brayboy, B. M. J. (2005). Toward a tribal critical race theory in education. *Urban Review: Issues and Ideas in Public Education*, 5, 425-446.

- Brayboy, B., & Castagno, A. (2009). Self-determination through self-education: Culturally responsive schooling for Indigenous students in the USA, *Teaching Education*, 20(1): 31-53.
- Brayboy, B., Solyom, J., & Castagno, A. (2014). Looking into the Hearts of Native Peoples: Nation Building as an Institutional Orientation for Graduate Education. *American Journal of Education*, 120(4), 575-596.
- Brown-Easton, L. (2004). *Powerful Designs for Professional Learning*. Oxford, Ohio: NSDC.
- Butterfield, R. (1994). *Blueprints for Indian Education: Improving mainstream schooling*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. ED. 372898).
- Cammarota, J. & Romero, A. (2009). The Social Justice Project: A critically compassionate intellectualism for Chicana/o students. In W. Ayers, T. Quinn & D. Stovall (eds.), *Handbook for social justice education* (pp.465-476). New York, NY: Laurence Erlbaum.
- Campbell, A, Cole K., Minahan T. (2014). Grand Ronde tribal history curriculum unit: fourth grade level. Grand Ronde, Oregon: The Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde.
- Castagno, Angelina E., & Brayboy, Bryan McKinley Jones. (2008). Culturally Responsive Schooling for Indigenous Youth: A Review of the Literature. *Review of Educational Research*, 78(4), 941-993.
- Castagno, A. E. (2009). Making Sense of Multicultural Education: A Synthesis of the Various Typologies Found in the Literature. *Multicultural Perspectives*, 11(1), 43-48.
- Castagno, A. E. (2012). "They Prepared Me to Be a Teacher, but Not a Culturally Responsive Navajo Teacher for Navajo Kids": A Tribal Critical Race Theory Analysis of an Indigenous Teacher Preparation Program. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 51(1), 3-26.
- Charters, W. (1923). *Curriculum construction*. New York: The Macmillan.
- Chief Education Office (2016). Oregon Education Equity Report. Salem: Chief Education Office. Retrieved from <http://education.oregon.gov/portfolio/2016-educator-equity-report/>
- Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. (1999). Relationships of Knowledge and Practice: Teacher Learning in Communities. *Review of Research in Education*, 24, 249.

- Coles-Ritchie, M., & Charles, W. (2011). Indigenizing Assessment Using Community Funds of Knowledge: A Critical Action Research Study. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 50(3), 26-41.
- Congress of the U.S., Washington, DC. Senate Committee on Labor Public Welfare. (1969). Indian Education: A National Tragedy--A National Challenge. 1969 Report of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, United States Senate, Made by Its Special Subcommittee on Indian Education. *Indian Education: A National Tragedy--A National Challenge. 1969 Report of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, United States Senate, Made by Its Special Subcommittee on Indian Education.*, 1969.
- Corntassel, J. (2012). Re-envisioning resurgence: Indigenous pathways to decolonization and sustainable self-determination. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education, & Society*, 1(1), 86-101.
- Day, C. (1999). *Developing Teachers: The Challenges of Lifelong Learning*. London: Falmer Press.
- Deloria, V. and Wildcat, D. (2001). *Power and Place: Indian education in American*. Golden, CO: Fulcrum Resources.
- Delpit, L. (1995). *Other people's children: Cultural conflict in the classroom*. New York: New Press: Distributed by W.W. Norton.
- Deyhle, D., & Swisher, K. (1997). Research in American Indian and Alaska Native education: From assimilation to self-determination. *Review of Research in Education*, 22, 113-194.
- Du Bois, W. E. B. (1903). *The Souls of Black Folk*. Chicago: A.C. McClurg & Co.; Cambridge: University Press John Wilson and Son, Cambridge, U.S.A.
- Dufour, R., & Eaker, R. (1998). *Professional learning communities at work: Best practices for enhancing student achievement*. Bloomington, IN; Alexandria, VA: National Educational Service; Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Feiman-Nemser, S. (2001). From preparation to practice: Designing a continuum to strengthen and sustain teaching. *Teachers' College Record*, 103(6), 1013-1055.
- Frankenberg, R. (1993). *White Women, Race Matters The Social Construction of Whiteness*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Fullan, M. (1995). *Professional Development in Education: New Paradigms and Practices*. (Guskey, T. & Huberman, M. Eds.) New York: Teachers College Press



- Gall, M. D., Renchler, R. S. et al. (1985). Effective staff development for teachers: A research-based model (ERIC). College of Education, University of Oregon.
- Garcia, S. B., & Guerra, P. L. (2004). Deconstructing Deficit Thinking: Working with Educators to Create More Equitable Learning Environments. *Education And Urban Society*, 36(2), 150-168.
- Garrod, A., & Larimore, Colleen. (1997). *First person, first peoples : Native American college graduates tell their life stories* (Cornell paperbacks). Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Gay, G. (2010). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice* (2nd ed., Multicultural education series (New York, N.Y.)). New York: Teachers College.
- Gonzalez, N., L. Moll and C. Amanti (2005). *Funds of Knowledge: Theorizing Practices in Households, Communities and Classrooms*. New York, Routledge.
- Grande, S. (2004). *Red pedagogy: Native American social and political thought*. Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Grande, S. (2010). Chapter 21: Red Pedagogy. *Counterpoints*, 356, 199-207.
- Guskey, T. (2000a). *Evaluating Professional Development*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Corwin.
- Hargreaves, A., & Fink, D. (2006). *Sustainable leadership*. San Francisco: John Wiley and Sons.
- Hawley, W. & Valli, L. (1999). The essentials of effective professional development: A new consensus. In *Teaching as the Learning Profession: Handbook of Policy and Practice*. Darling-Hammond, L. & Sykes, G. (Eds.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Huffman, T. (2008). *American Indian higher educational experiences: Cultural visions and personal journeys*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Idaho Code 33-1280. Retrieved <http://legislature.idaho.gov/idstat/Title33/T33CH12SECT33-1280.htm>.
- Indian Education Act of 1972, Public law 92-318, 86 Stat.235 (1972).
- Johnson and Graham's Lessee v. McIntosh, 21 U.S. 543 (1823).
- Johnson, G. M. (1994). An ecological framework for conceptualizing educational risk. *Urban Education*, 29, 34-49.

- Joyce, B. & Showers, B. (2002). *Student Achievement Through Staff Development*, 3rd Ed. Alexandria: ASCD.
- Joyce, B. & Weil, M. with Calhoun, E. (1976). *Models of Teaching*, 1st edn. Boston: Allyn and Bacon
- Juneau, D., & Broaddus, M.S. (2006). And still the waters flow: the legacy of Indian education in Montana. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 88(3), 193-197.
- Kincheloe, Joe L. (2004). The Knowledges of Teacher Education: Developing a Critical Complex Epistemology. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 31(1), 49-66.
- Kumashiro, K. (2004). Uncertain beginnings: Learning to teach paradoxically. *Theory into Practice*. 43(2), 111-115.
- Kumashiro, K. K. (2012). *Bad teacher!: How blaming teachers distorts the bigger picture*. Teachers College Press.
- Kumashiro, K., & Ngo, Bic. (2007). *Six lenses for anti-oppressive education: Partial stories, improbable conversations* (Counterpoints (New York, N.Y.) ; v. 315). New York: Peter Lang.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). *The dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African American children* (1st ed., Jossey-Bass education series). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Ladson-Billings, G., & Tate, W. (1995). But that's just good teaching! The case for culturally relevant pedagogy. *Theory into Practice* 34(3). 159-165
- Ladson-Billings, G., & Tate, W. (2006). Toward a critical race theory of education. In A. Dixson & C. Rousseau (eds.), *Critical race theory in education: all God's children got a song*. (pp.11-30). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Lewis, D. (2017, February 8). Email communication.
- Lieberman, A. & Miller, L. (2000). Teaching and Teacher Development: A New Synthesis for a New Century. In Brandt, R. (Ed.) *Education in a New Era*, pp. 47-66.
- Lieberman, J. & Wilkins, E. (2006). The professional development pathways model: From policy to practice. *Kappa Delta Pi Record*. 42 (3), 124.
- Littlefield, A. (1989). *The B.I.A. boarding school: Theories of resistance and social reproduction*. *Humanity & Society*. 13 (4) pp.428-441.
- Lomawaima, K. T. (1994). *They called it prairie light: The story of Chillico Indian School*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

- Lomawaima, T. (1999). The Unnatural History of American Indian Education. In Swisher, K.G. & Tippeconnic, J. (Eds.), *Next Steps: Research and Practice to Advance Indian Education (3-31)*. Charleston, W.V.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools.
- Lomawaima, K., & McCarty, T. L. (2002). When Tribal Sovereignty Challenges Democracy: American Indian Education and the Democratic Ideal. *American Educational Research Journal*, 39(2), 279-305.
- Mazzei, Lisa A. (2008). Silence Speaks: Whiteness Revealed in the Absence of Voice. *Teaching and Teacher Education: An International Journal of Research and Studies*, 24(5), 1125-1136.
- McLaren, P. (1989). *Life in schools: An introduction to critical pedagogy in the foundations of education*. New York: Longman.
- Menefee, T., & Asino, T. (2014). Beyond Pure Forms: Appraising the Role of Indigenous Knowledge in Teacher Training. *International Perspectives on Education and Society*, 25, 23-35.
- Mitchell, C., & Sackney, L. (2009a). Sustainable improvement: Building learning communities that endure. Rotterdam: Sense.
- Mohanty, C. T. (1994). On race and voice: Challenges for liberal education in the 1990s. In H. Giroux & P. McLaren (Eds.), *Between borders: Pedagogy and the politics of cultural studies* (pp. 145-166). New York: Routledge.
- Montana Office of Public Instruction, & Juneau, D. (2010). Essential understandings regarding Montana Indians: Indian Education for All. Helena, MT: Office of Public Instruction.
- Ngai, K., & Koehn, P.H. (2011) Indigenous Education for Critical Democracy: Teacher Approaches and Learning Outcomes in a K-5 Indian Education for All Program. Equity and Excellence in Education
- Nieto, S. (1996). *Affirming Diversity*. White Plains. NY: Longman.
- No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*, 20 U.S.C. § 6319 (2008).
- Noguera, P., & Wing, Jean Yonemura. (2006). *Unfinished business: Closing the racial achievement gap in our schools* (1st ed., Jossey-Bass education series). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, a Wiley imprint.

- Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction: The Indian Education Office. (n.d). Essential questions. Retrieved from <http://www.indian-ed.org/about-sti/essentialquestions/>
- Oregon Department of Education. (2006). *Oregon American Indian Alaska Native education state plan*. Salem, OR: Oregon Dept. of Education.
- Paris, Django. (2012). Culturally Sustaining Pedagogy: A Needed Change in Stance, Terminology, and Practice. *Educational Researcher*, 41(3), 93-97.
- Paris, Django, & Alim, H. Samy. (2014). What Are We Seeking to Sustain through Culturally Sustaining Pedagogy? A Loving Critique Forward. *Harvard Educational Review*, 84(1), 85-100.
- Peters, C. (1942). *The curriculum of democratic education* (1st ed., McGraw-Hill series in education). New York and London: McGraw-Hill Book.
- Prucha, F. Ed.(1990). *Documents of United States Indian policy*. 2nd Ed. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Report of Indian Peace Commissioners*. (1868, January 7). House of Representatives, 40th Congress, 2nd Session, Executive Document No. 97. (Serial Set, 1337, Vol. 11, No. 97).
- Reyhner, J., & ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools, C. V. (1989). *Changes in American Indian Education: A Historical Retrospective for Educators in the United States*. ERIC Digest.
- Roediger, D. (1999). *The wages of whiteness : Race and the making of the American working class* (Rev. ed., Haymarket series). London ; New York: Verso.
- Ross, E. A. (1910). *Foundations of sociology*. New York: Macmillan.
- Russell, C. (2002). Language, Violence, and Indian Mis-education. *American Indian Culture And Research Journal*, 26(4), 97-112.
- Slattery, P. (2013). *Curriculum development in the postmodern era: Teaching and learning in an age of accountability*. New York: Routledge.
- Sleeter, C.E. & Bernal, D.D. (2004). Critical pedagogy, critical race theory, and antiracist education: Implications for multicultural education. In J.A. Banks and C.A.M. Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (2nd ed., pp240-258). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Slivka, K. (2011). Art, Craft, and Assimilation: Curriculum for Native Students during the Boarding School Era. *Studies In Art Education. A Journal Of Issues And Research In Art Education*, 52(3), 225-242.
- Spring, J. H. (2011). *American education: An introduction to social and political aspects*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- St. Germaine, R., & ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools, C. V. (1995). *Drop-Out Rates among American Indian and Alaska Native Students: Beyond Cultural Discontinuity*. ERIC Digest.
- Stoll, L., & Louis, K. S. (2007). Professional learning communities: Elaborating new approaches. In L. Stoll & K. S. Louis (Eds.), *Professional learning communities: Divergence, depth and dilemmas* (pp. 1–13). Berkshire, UK: Open University Press.
- Swisher K. & Deyle. D. (1987). Styles of learning and learning of styles: Educational conflicts for American Indian/Alaskan Native youth. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 8, 345-360.
- Swisher, Karen Gayton. (1996). Why Indian People Should Be the Ones To Write about Indian Education. *American Indian Quarterly*, 20(1), 83-90.
- Szasz, M. C. (1988). *Indian education in the American colonies, 1607-1783*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico.
- Taylor, F. (1967). *The principles of scientific management*. (Norton library). New York: Norton.
- The Native American Languages Act of 1990, P.L. 101-477 (1990).
- The Native American Languages Act of 1992, P.L. 102-524 (1992).
- Thorton, S. (2009). Silence on gays and lesbians in social studies curriculum. In D. Flinders & S. Thornton (eds.), *The Curriculum Studies Reader* (pp. 362-367). New York: NY: Routledge.
- Thorndike, E. (1931). *Human learning* (Century psychology series (Appleton-Century-Crofts, inc.)). New York, London: The Century.
- Tomlinson, C. (2005) Traveling the road to differentiation in staff development. *Journal of Staff Development*, 26 (8), 8-12.
- Treaty with the Oneida, Etc, 1794. Retrieved from [http://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th\\_century/one1794.asp](http://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/one1794.asp).

- Treaty with the Western Cherokee, May 6, 1828. Retrieved from <http://digital.library.okstate.edu/kappler/vol2/treaties/che0288.htm>.
- Tuck, E., & Yang, K. W. (2012). Decolonization is not a metaphor. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education and Society*, 1, 1-40.
- U.S. Department of Education. (2015). Title VII: Indian, Native Hawaiian, and Alaska Native Education. (20 U.S.C. § 7201). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office. Retrieved September 2015 from <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/pg104.html#sec7201>
- Valencia, R. (1997). *The evolution of deficit thinking : Educational thought and practice* (Stanford series on education and public policy ; 19). London; Washington, D.C.: Falmer Press.
- Valencia, R. (2012). Activist Scholarship in Action: The Prevention of a Latino School Closure. *Journal of Latinos and Education*, 11(2), 69-79.
- Valenzuela, A. (1999). *Subtractive Schools: US-Mexican youth and the politics of caring*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Wallace Foundation. (2004). *Cultural Competency Summit Proceedings*. Salem: Oregon Department of Education. Retrieved from <http://www.ode.state.or.us/news/ccfullrprt.pdf>.
- West, T. R. (2002). *Signs of struggle: The rhetorical politics of cultural difference*. New York: SUNY Press.
- Woodson, C. (1933). *The mis-education of the Negro*. Washington, D.C.: Associated.
- 4 AAC 04.200. Professional content and performance standards. Retrieved from <http://www.touchngo.com/lglcntr/akstats/aac/title04/chapter004/section200.htm>.
- 70<sup>th</sup> Oregon Legislative Assembly—1999 regular session. Enrolled Senate Bill 103-A. Retrieved at <http://ode.state.or.us/policy/state/sb103.aspx>