CONCLUSION

Interventions for Urban Indigenous Education

> This is what we know about our stories. They go to work on your mind and make you think about your life. Maybe you've not been acting right. Maybe you've been stingy. Maybe you've been chasing after women. Maybe you've been trying to act like a Whiteman. People don't *like* it! So someone goes hunting for you—maybe your grandmother, your grandfather, your uncle. It doesn't matter. Anyone can do it.
>
> So someone stalks you and tells a story about what happened long ago. It doesn't matter if other people are around—you're going to know he's aiming that story at you. All of a sudden it *hits* you! It's like an arrow, they say. Sometimes it just bounces off—it's too soft and you don't think about anything. But when it's strong it goes in *deep* and starts working on your mind right away. No one says anything to you, only that story is all, but now you know that people have been watching you and talking about you. They don't like how you've been acting. So you have to think about your life.
>
> *(Nick Thompson, as cited in Basso, 1984, pp. 41–42)*

Nick Thompson used a hunting metaphor to describe a Western Apache theory of storytelling to anthropologist Keith Basso. When an individual isn't acting right, he said, someone stalks them with a story, an act that may cause that person "anguish" by thrusting that person into "periods of intense critical self-examination" (Basso, 1984, p. 43). Historical tales are valuable. They "make you think hard about your life," and often, if a story goes to work on someone, the individual emerges more "determined to 'live right'" (p. 43). Importantly, this Apache conception of storytelling is not only the work of individuals, but also an integral feature of the Apache landscape. "Mountains and arroyos step in symbolically for grandmothers and uncles," and "[j]ust as the latter have 'stalked' delinquent individuals in the past, so too particular locations continue to 'stalk' them in the present" (p. 43). Places are pedagogical. As Basso observes of this

Apache worldview, "surveillance is essential, because 'living right' requires constant care and attention, and there is always a possibility that old stories and their initial impact, like old arrows and their wounds, will fade and disappear" (p. 43).

While Thompson was referencing historical Apache stories, I would like to respectfully draw from this hunting metaphor and offer this book as a practice of research that has stalked the mainstream educational practices in public schools that continue to underserve Indigenous students and undermine Indigenous self-determination and sovereignty. As Castagno and Brayboy (2008) note in their comprehensive literature review of culturally responsive schooling for Indigenous youth, despite a wealth of scholarship and case studies available to make education more meaningful, engaging, and supportive of Indigenous students, "educators and policy makers have not taken the suggestions seriously and have continued schooling in a 'business as usual' fashion" (p. 981). In response, these stories were told as an intervention into the normalizing logics of Eurocentric educational practices (Moreton-Robinson, 2016). They were written to "go to work" on the subtle ways colonialism surfaces in "a nice field" like education (Ladson-Billings, 1998). As a collective, these stories support evidence that colonization continues to structure (though not overdetermine) Native students' experiences in public schools (Brayboy & Castagno, 2009; Castagno & Brayboy, 2008; Goodyear-Ka'ōpua, 2013; Martinez, 2010). They make visible the marginalization of Indigenous education and Indigenous students in public schools and the persistent disregard for Indigenous studies scholarship, highlighting the ways that schools play a role in "perpetuating and refreshing colonial relationships among people, practices, and land" (Patel, 2016, p. 12). Visibility, however, relies on a theory of change designed to raise awareness, an approach some critical race scholars argue has done little to challenge structural racism and stratification (Vaught & Castagno, 2008). Consequently, these stories are not just designed to raise teachers' awareness; they also designed to place teachers in relationship with institutions and practices that reproduce erasure, as well as the impossible subject positions of working within and against such structures.

Some stories stalked the particularly stubborn educational practices I have seen educators use that explicitly harm Indigenous students and tokenize Indigenous education—curriculum that privileges Eurocentric histories or relegates Indigenous peoples to the past, Native American units which caricaturize and commodify Native culture, the token inclusion of Native guest speakers, or the disregard for Indigenous students' knowledge and perspectives. More globally this book stalks the commonsense assumption that colonization is a historic event, and that Indigenous education is someone else's responsibility. Drawing from Indigenous theories of storytelling, my aim was to tell stories in such a way that "the story became a teacher" (Ellen White, 1993, as cited in Archibald, 2008, p. 138). These stories aren't intended to tell educators *what* to think or feel; rather I wrote them with the goal of "*giving them the space to think and feel*" (as cited in Archibald, 2008, p. 134, emphasis added). "A good story," notes Lorna Mathias (1992), "can reach

into your heart, mind and soul, and really make you think hard about your relationship to the world" (as cited in Archibald, 2008, p. 140). I hope these stories invite teachers to think hard about their relationships to place, to Indigenous students and families, to settler colonialism, to self-determination and sovereignty. I hope they invite teachers to think hard about their relationship to teaching and the history of schooling. I hope they provide teachers an opportunity to reflect and wonder: "Could I have been overlooking something all along?" (Delgado, 1989, p. 2440).

As colonialism is constantly "shape shifting" (Corntassel, 2012), there is no discrete set of knowledge, no one conceptual frame, no single book or research study, that can account for its varied mechanisms. Educators need to become practiced at recognizing how colonialism surfaces. This is not something that can easily be distilled into a workshop, a single course, or even a teacher preparation program (though a central argument of this book is that Native studies must become requisite teacher knowledge, and so, should be required coursework within teacher education programs and, dare I say, K-12 curriculum). Drawing from the Apache theory of surveillance and theories of haunting (Basso, 1984; Morrill, Tuck, & the Super Futures Haunt Qollective, 2016), these stories infuse the persistent threat of colonialism and Indigenous erasure into the landscapes of schools, reminding educators that the architecture, curriculum, pedagogy, and policy of schooling is embedded with Eurocentrism, racism, and settler colonialism. Teachers must learn to anticipate and critically read these landscapes.

Like other forms of critical forms of narrative research (Chang & Rosiek, 2003; Dibble & Rosiek, 2002; Sconiers & Rosiek, 2000), these survivance stories sought to illuminate the sociocultural and political contexts of teacher knowledge. However, in a slight divergence from aims to develop more "culturally responsive" approaches to teaching (Chang & Rosiek, 2003; Sconiers & Rosiek, 2000), these stories are intended to cultivate teachers' "sensibilities" (Wilson, 2006) to detect colonialism and anti-Indianism (Cook-Lynn, 2001) in practice. More than awareness, this is a practice of cultivating teachers' *anticolonial literacy*, the ability to critically read and counter Eurocentric and colonizing educational discourses and practices. These stories purposefully did not attend to Indigenous students' culture and how to better support their cultural difference in the classroom. I am indebted to the rigorous and robust base of research conducted by Indigenous and allied scholars on culturally responsive/culture-based education,[1] and I find this work extremely valuable in Indigenous contexts. However, I have grown weary of teachers' narrow use of "culture" (Hermes, 2005a; 2005b) and am skeptical that increasing educators' understanding of culture will be sufficient to intervene into settler colonial contexts of mainstream public schools, at least those in which this research took place. Indeed, as some of these chapters demonstrated, colonial understandings of culture mediated the ways educators tried to support Indigenous students as "Other," reproducing settler colonial relational dynamics. Thus, these survivance stories aimed specifically to make visible the ways *colonialism* (not culture) mediates students' educational experiences and teachers' professional knowledge landscapes (Clandinin & Connelly, 1995).

While a substantial portion of this book was critical, I also sought to illuminate the types of knowledge and practices that might help educators support Native students and support the aims of self-determination and sovereignty. As hooks (1992) offers, "There is power in looking … Not only will I stare. I want my look to change reality" (pp. 115–116). Like hooks, my looking has been "a way to know the present and invent the future" (hooks, 1992, p. 131). These stories have been my attempt to critically look at educational policy and practice as it is lived in one particular district, looking not only for the ways that settler colonialism surfaced, but also for moments or curricular and pedagogical pathways that were overlooked, missed, or made impossible because of the discursive frames from which educators or schools operated. By reading into the stories theories and tools from Native Studies scholarship, literature, and my own experiences, I centered Indigenous knowledges and analytics. These analytics and knowledge should be essential to theorizing and enacting more responsible practices of integrating Native studies, serving Native students, and furthering Indigenous aims of self-determination and sovereignty. My aim was to sensitize educators to the nuanced dynamics that Native students, families, and educators artfully negotiate, offering a contrapuntal reading (Said, 2012) of education, a practice of reading and writing back (Smith, 2012) that reflected not only experiences of colonialism within schools, but also desire, hope, and possibility.

Together, these chapters demonstrate that despite our supposed progress beyond the eras of physical and cultural genocide, schools and institutions are clearly still engaged in more veiled forms of erasure, and that some of these erasures are encoded in (and even endorsed as) educational practices within schools. It is also clear that Native students, families, and educators are often knowledgeable about these dynamics, and engage in practices of "resistance to Western cultural assimilation" (Lee, 2011, p. 289). In short, as much as this book bears witness to colonialism, it is also a testament to Native survivance. Educators must learn to critically read the ways coloniality surfaces; they must also learn to read for survivance.

While most instances of Indigenous erasure described in this book were not intentional in any obvious ways, *they were also not incidental*. Indigenous erasure is central to the structure of settler colonialism. It is not incidental, for example, that most mainstream educators have little knowledge of Indigenous life (Dion, 2008), cannot name the Native nations in their state, and have little knowledge of Native community events in their area. Both society and schools are often structured to produce such ignorance (Calderón, 2011). As Lee (2011) notes, teachers' "misperceptions largely stem from a lack of direct experience with Native communities and families and from misunderstandings about the nature of the political relationship that Native Nations hold with the federal government" (p. 278). But teachers can work against this, and being Native is not a prerequisite for doing so.

Because settler colonialism is a structure, and surfaces and circulates in commonsense and everyday ways, efforts to further anticolonial and Indigenous education require, as Maori scholar Linda Tuhiwai Smith (2008) argues, "multiple

layers of struggles across multiple sites" (p. 117). In considering how to challenge whiteness in schools, Castagno (2014) argues that approaches must be "systemic and systematic." Similarly, contesting colonialism must entail equivalent and complementary systemic and systematic efforts.

Although I sincerely believe that stories and storytelling are, as Peter Cole offers, "a way of experiencing the world rather than imposing decontextualized denotative 'truth' claims" (as cited in Million, 2014, p. 37), I also recognize that in the current context of educational reform, providing direct recommendations—even if they risk being decontextualized—can be useful. Some of these recommendations are difficult and disheartening to write, as many of my suggestions were proposed by Indigenous scholars decades earlier; *some were proposed nearly a century ago*. That Native people should be seen as "'real time' beings" in schools and curriculum is agonizing to repeat nearly 30 years after Creek educator Floy Pepper did in 1990 (Pepper, 1990). To recommend that more honest and accurate histories be taught in schools is painful to write, as my recommendation nearly replicates the argument Seneca scholar Arthur C. Parker made in 1916 (Parker, 1916).

I situate my recommendations within this longstanding stream of Indigenous scholars who have made similar recommendations as a performative gesture, an invitation for educators to question why these insights and recommendations have been ignored for so long. This pattern of erasure is part of the problem. I also hope that by situating the practical knowledge, insights, theories, and conceptual tools *within* the context of stories, educators will reflect on and revisit their own practices in light of these insights, a process that hopefully sensitizes educators to hear these recommendations more clearly today.

What follows are recommendations geared toward individuals, institutions, educational policy, and educational research. These are recommendations for teachers, teacher education programs, educational policies, and research practices to better support Indigenous students and to support educational self-determination and sovereignty. Within each domain, I draw attention to concrete and conceptual knowledge, and well as relational practices that will support such efforts.

Developing Teachers' Concrete Knowledge

While I do not wish to individualize the scope of the problem (i.e., this is an issue for individual teachers to address), I do believe developing a more robust conception of teacher knowledge that includes Indigenous studies is nevertheless imperative. Said differently, teachers' professional knowledge landscapes (Clandinin & Connelly, 1995) should be accountable to Indigenous peoples given their formation on Indigenous lands.

Survivance stories point to a variety of practical information and concrete knowledge that teachers could have drawn upon to more effectively engage Indigenous education in this district. While I am not delineating *the* knowledge base (as I believe no such discrete knowledge base exists), I will outline

various forms of knowledge from these stories that would have helped educators better support Indigenous education. This includes an awareness of resources in the school, district, and community to support Indigenous education, basic knowledge of Native studies concepts and the history of Indigenous education, and the ability to detect bias in curriculum.

All teachers should be aware of (and consciously seek out) resources in the district and community to support Native students and families specifically, as well as to support their efforts to teach Indigenous studies. In the territory where I am writing, there are two longhouses that actively support a vibrant Native community through weekly potlucks, community events, seminars, guest speakers, memorials, Waashat services, sjima and stick game tournaments, and a summer bridge program for Native high school youth, among other activities. There are also two other Indian Education programs in adjacent districts (relevant to support families as they move between districts), a Native listserv and calendar that detail important community events, and a program Facebook page that communicates relevant events and opportunities for students and families. Educators aware of these resources can help families connect to academic, cultural, and social opportunities. Moreover, educators aware of the vibrant Native community would be hard pressed to continue teaching antiquated myths premised on Native disappearance. Recreating longhouses as elementary curriculum with no attention to their contemporary use in the community would likely feel strange to educators who knew of the active Longhouse communities in the area.

The stories in this book also point to a general knowledge base in Native studies that educators need to support Native students and teach Native studies. This base must minimally include a recognition of the diversity and contemporary presence of Indigenous peoples, accurate historical information to ground curriculum, and a working knowledge base of Native citizenship, nationhood, and sovereignty. With this knowledge of Native diversity, for example, teachers should no longer feel comfortable teaching about Pilgrims and generic "Indians." The term Indian—now coded into the landscape of curriculum as a construction of whiteness—should trigger in educators an uneasy feeling. Like Kanaka Maoli scholar Julie Kaomea's (2005) experience of Hawaiian Studies curriculum that purported to "foster appreciation for the Native people of Hawai'i," yet degraded Hawaiian life, my hope is that educators similarly experience "'odd'—'queer'—'wrong'—'strange'—'fishy'" feelings (p. 26) when they encounter generic Indians in curriculum. Though Indian may be an appropriate self-referent for Indigenous peoples, generic Indians as curriculum should be seen as colonial construction and an erasure.

Teachers also need basic information about history that is accurate. *One hundred years ago*, Seneca scholar Arthur C. Parker (1916) wrote:

> No race of men has been more unjustly misrepresented by popular historians than the American Indian. Branded as an ignorant savage, treacherous, cruel,

> and immoral in his inmost nature, the Indian has received little justice from the ordinary historian whose writings influence the minds of school children … The Indians have a right to know that their name as a people is not hidden forever from its place among the nations of the earth. They have a right to ask that the false statements and the prejudice that obstructs historic justice be cast aside. They have a right to ask that their children know the history of their fathers and to know that the sins and savagery of their race were no worse than those of other races called great for bravery and conquest. (pp. 261–262)

In the 1930s, Luther Standing Bear (Oglala Sioux) wrote, "No longer should the Indian be dehumanized in order to make material for lurid and cheap fiction to embellish street-stands … Rather, a fair and correct history of the native American should be incorporated in the curriculum of the public school" (as cited in Lyons, 2000, p. 465). Native people have long been saying history should be more accurate and honest. I draw from this scholarship a century earlier to highlight the resistance (whether explicit or tacit) toward critically revising the historical myths that educators often teach as facts. The material needed to critically engage these histories is there, much of it written by Native people trying to re-right and rewrite (Smith, 2012) historical wrongs. Without such histories, Native students learn that Native peoples were colonization's "helping hand," undermining Indigenous resistance and perspectives embedded in Native counterstories.

Teachers also need to understand and explicitly disrupt stereotypes in curriculum. Native studies curriculum is not the reproduction of stereotypes: Native people are not generic bodies made Indian when the familiar set of cultural markers are added, and Native content does not mean gluing feathers to a sign, or inviting students to make masks, kachinas, tipis, or totem poles. Teachers need knowledge, skills, and practice to detect bias, racism, and anti-Indianism (Cook-Lynn, 2001) in the curriculum. Bias surfaces in numerous ways—invisibility, stereotypes, imbalance/selectivity, unreality, fragmentation/isolation, linguistic bias, or shiny/cosmetic bias (Sadker, 2009). And while racism is institutional and structural (Leonardo, 2004) and should not be reduced to interpersonal exchanges between individuals, it is also locatable in student-teacher interactions. It was clear that the curriculum reinforced particularly harmful "ways of knowing" that weren't explicitly racist, but reflective of more "deep structures" (Grande, 2015) of colonialism. Nevertheless, there were multiple instances where teachers failed to detect or interrupt bias or racism.

Some of this racism reflects what Robertson (2015) has termed "legitimized racism." That educators are still allowed to use *Sign of the Beaver* despite its routine use of the word squ★w and despite widespread critiques (Lambert & Lambert, 2014; Reese, 2007; Slapin & Seale, 2003) is unacceptable. Subjecting students to degrading language such as squ★w and the "Tonto talk" in *Sign of the Beaver* positions Native students at risk of

internalizing those demeaning and dehumanizing representations. If Native students are conscious of the overt and latent prejudice in either curricular material or their peers' comments, they are faced with myriad decisions including quietly withstanding the hostility or choosing to address the bias, a choice Zeik made that was fortunately met with no resistance, but a choice other families have made and were met with resistance and feelings of marginalization and retaliation as a result.[2]

Teachers must also recognize the reproduction of essentialized and one-dimensional caricaturizations of Indigenous peoples. Talking about Indigenous peoples as "circular thinkers" who may like to "gather in circles" rather than stand in lines is a form of racism. More subtly, the relentless tokenization of Native culture through the guise of appreciating diverse cultures demonstrates this legitimized racism and anti-Indianism. Though only several stories addressed the practice of tokenizing Indigenous life, it was pervasive throughout the district: Thanksgiving murals featuring Indians prominently displayed on the walls, worksheets for November with little Indians adorned in feathers, or huge mural displays in schools titled "*What's Your Spirit Animal?*" that depicted Native "totems." These are but a few of the ways racism was reproduced and legitimized in schools. As these stories have shown, these are not problematic solely because they are degrading stereotypes and caricatures, but also because they socialize students in particular ways toward Indigenous people. Beyond the consequence of dehumanizing representations, these practices reinforce particular sorts of "looking relations" (hooks, 1992) and investments. As Leonardo (2004) argues,

> There is the other half of domination that needs our attention: white investment. To the extent that racial supremacy is taught to white students, it is pedagogical. Insofar as it is pedagogical, there is the possibility of critically reflecting on its flows in order to disrupt them. The hidden curriculum of whiteness saturates everyday school life and one of the first steps to articulating its features is coming to terms with its specific modes of discourse. (p. 144)

Such representations are not just stereotypes, but are investments that can be linked to the dispossession of Indigenous lands and the erosion of tribal sovereignty (Corntassel & Witmer, 2008). Speaking in the context of Hawaiian sovereignty, Kanaka Maoli scholar Lisa Kahaleole Hall (2005) writes, "making Hawaiian-ness seem ridiculous, kitsch functions to undermine sovereignty struggles in a very fundamental way" (p. 409). She continues, "A culture without dignity cannot be conceived of as having sovereign rights, and the repeated marketing of kitsch Hawaiian-ness leads to non-Hawaiians' misunderstanding and degradation of Hawaiian culture and history" (p. 409).

Finally, educators need basic information about Native citizenship, nationhood, and sovereignty. As I have argued here and elsewhere (Sabzalian & Shear, 2018), mainstream curriculum and pedagogy will more productively serve Indigenous peoples by framing Indigenous peoples and nations through the political lens of citizenship, nationhood, and sovereignty (rather than a cultural lens of multiculturalism). Identifying

as Cherokee or Haida, for example, is not just a word choice, and not just a cultural identity; it is also a way to privilege one nationality over the other, placing the US identity as a secondary status (Turner, 2006). This entails understanding that Native students have cultural, racial, *and political* identities, and that Native nations aren't just cultural communities: "Native Americans are nations of people within a nation" (Brayboy & Morgan, 1998, p. 348). Like the federal government and the states within it, Native nations are sovereign entities, despite their "domestic dependent" status and their location as nations within the geopolitical confines of the US (Grande, 2015).[3] Native students need to learn about their rights, treaties, systems of governance, and roles and responsibilities as citizens in order to uphold those rights, roles, and responsibilities.

A vast base of scholarship attests to the ways discourses of multiculturalism undermine Indigenous sovereignty (Lomawaima, 1995; Calderón, 2009; Cook-Lynn, 2001; Tuck & Yang, 2012; St. Denis, 2011). As Cook-Lynn (2001) argues, "the age of diversity" has been "the most recent weapon used against us in education," one which denies Indigenous peoples as "citizens of Indian nations" (p. 152). Cook-Lynn considers this framing a form of anti-Indianism. This book contributes to this scholarship by arguing that curriculum, instead of framing Indigenous peoples through the anthropological lens of culture, should include the study of Native citizenship and nationhood within the political realm of *civics education*. Again, the information needed to address Native citizenship, nationhood, and sovereignty is there.[4] I recognize that Native nations are not "impervious to reinforcing the violence of normativities" (Brandzel, 2016, p. 9). Native feminist scholars in particular have courageously drawn attention to the ways colonialism has "silenced Native peoples about the status of their women and about the intersections of power and domination that have also shaped Native nations and gender relations" (Goeman & Denetdale, 2009, p. 10; see also Barker, 2005; Denetdale, 2006). While citizenship and nationhood can be limiting frameworks, they nevertheless remain important conceptual interventions into the widespread ignorance about Native sovereignty. Teachers should have knowledge to teach about Native citizenship and nations, that Native people are often dual citizens, and even why some Indigenous peoples adamantly tried to refuse the "gift" of US citizenship (Bruyneel, 2007)

Developing Teachers' Conceptual knowledge

The previous disucssion of the nuances of Native citizenship underscores a more conceptual knowledge base teachers need to inform their practice. For example, the idea that Indigenous people are not artifacts of the past but contemporary peoples is a concrete understanding that can lead to more constructive efforts to support Native students and teach Native content. However, as the story "The Wax Museum" demonstrated, providing space for Native people to be "real time beings" (Pepper, 1990, np) is not without complications.

This Indigenous present is personally and politically complicated. It doesn't lend itself to a simple or easy pan-Indigenous prescription. Not all Native people are alike. The assumption that they are leads to stereotypes, but the alternative is not a single correct view of Indigeneity or Indigenous peoples. Instead, teachers need to recognize differences among Indigenous nations in their region, as well as the differences between individual Indigenous peoples (Montana Office of Public Instruction, 2012). This orientation toward recognizing and affirming difference would lend itself to an appreciation of the diversity of even those local experiences that are marked by geographic locations (urban, rural, etc.) or political experiences (being terminated or confederated, etc.), among other dynamics.

I don't presume that this section will delineate *the* conceptual knowledge base educators need in order to more responsibly serve Native students and teach Native curriculum. Nevertheless, I have identified several conceptual themes that merit conversation and more sustained focus by educators. As my discussion will show, conceptual knowledge will lead to more concrete and practical knowledge, an iterative process of learning as knowledge is disrupted, deepened, or expanded, a process that generates new possibilities for teacher practices and commitments. For example, as teachers understand the ways discourses of authenticity or culture serve to frame Indigenous peoples in the past or as objects of study, this conceptual knowledge base will provide grounds for new concrete knowledge and teacher practices.

Conceptual knowledge takes time for teachers to develop, as it will likely involve an excavation of deeply rooted assumptions some teachers have about Native students and issues. Below I will offer a discussion of several of these concepts, and where relevant, I offer practical examples of the knowledge and practices this might generate.

Recognize the ongoing marginalization and erasure of Indigenous peoples

Perhaps the most important concept teachers need is a recognition of the marginalization and erasure of Indigenous life. Educational contexts have long been inhospitable to Indigenous peoples (Stewart-Harawira, 2013), and no time soon will the marginalization of Indigenous students in schools be ended. As a result, teachers must lean in to the understanding that the erasure of Indigenous life is built into the institutions in which they work. These programs do not need non-Native teachers who are fascinated with Native culture (a dynamic that circulates broadly in settler society, but has also trailed the Indian Education program in particular); rather, they need educators who are aware of the ways Indian Education programs and Native communities more generally have been marginalized, and who offer their support and skills to assist the program- or community-designed goals. These programs need educators who recognize that active efforts have been made on behalf of the federal government to erase Indigenous presence,

to dispossess Native people both physically and ideologically (Calderón, 2014), and that even slight acts of erasure or the negation of Indigenous presence are contemporary iterations of this history. Educators must be made aware, not only of the violent history of extermination, dispossession, and assimilation, but also of the ways these erasures continue to structure encounters (and non-encounters; Veracini, 2011) between settler society and Indigenous peoples. With knowledge of the erasure and marginalization of Native life, an educator might see that any curriculum, pedagogy, or program necessarily works within and against that context, and will thus work to make these practices and process of erasure visible to administrators or other educators. In so doing, they work to amplify and make visible the issues, concerns, and needs of Native programs, communities, or even nations, in order to hold schools and districts accountable.

Move beyond individuality to a relational understanding of subjectivity

The education of Indigenous peoples has been explicitly framed throughout history as a mode of (often violent) assimilation. In light of this history, educators should move beyond viewing themselves solely as individuals (a privileged position and practice of whiteness), and instead understand they act as educators within that stream of institutional history that informs patterns of interactions and experiences today. This means that educators must not only develop a "sociocultural consciousness" that recognizes the ways society is stratified or that schools often reproduce that stratification (Villegas & Lucas, 2002); teachers must also develop a relational awareness of their subject positions as educators within assimilative institutions. Non-Indigenous educators can enhance their effectiveness with Native students by developing a relational awareness of their positionality and learning about the "history, culture, and current circumstances of their students" (Hermes, 2005a). As Lyons (2000) prompts, teachers should "think carefully about their positions, locations, and alignments: the differences and connections between sovereignty and solidarity" (467).

For example, the literature on culturally responsive education calls on educators to have affirming views of diverse students (Villegas & Lucas, 2002), an important intervention into deficit framings of students by positioning students' cultural knowledge, values, and practices as valid, and positioning education as an important site for sustaining the rich cultural and linguistic diversity students bring (Paris, 2012). Yet educators must also recognize the widespread and longstanding fascination non-Indigenous peoples have had and continue to have with Native culture (Green, 1988; Deloria, 1998) so that such affirmations do not get coopted by practices of whiteness and lapse into appropriations. The teacher Sharon's negation of Celeste's concern, described in Chapter 2 is continual with a social pattern of white women denying the concerns and issues specific to Native women (Moreton-Robinson, 2000). But her fascination with Native culture

illustrates another extractive relationship that non-Indigenous peoples have with Indigenous communities and cultures.

Complicate conceptions of culture

"Culture" as it was used in practice by educators often referred to cultural products rather than cultural processes (Pepper et al. 2014), and anthropological categories that mirrored Edward Curtis's framework (dwellings, weapons, dress, food, etc.). This abstraction and extraction of Native culture perpetuate the idea that "Native Americans are people of the past or creatures of fantasy," a belief which supports "continued aggression against Native peoples" (Hirschfelder, Molin, & Wakim, 1999, p. 76).

Throughout this book, when I did attend to Native culture, I tried to offer glimpses of Native culture as constant and continual, rooted and mobile (Castagno & Brayboy, 2008). In the story "Education on Border of Sovereignty," Melvina and I shared the work of Native artists who use traditional ways to make sense of current issues. We were careful to emphasize that traditions aren't static, but dynamic. In "Little Anthropologists," I shared how Indigenous cultural rights are intimately connected to political struggles for sovereignty. Moreover, I also shared that when my son taught his classmates a song, the cultural values he embodied were as much the act of sharing and teaching as they were the song itself.

Additionally, I tried to recast institutional practices as also cultural, rather than a set of values and practices specific to Native or other nonwhite people. I did this by highlighting the "cultural work" of Eurocentric curriculum and teaching. Implementing a Native American unit that commodifies Katsina Friends, totem poles, masks, and Native technologies and frames them as cultural crafts to be imitated, for example, not only encompasses stereotypes and bias, but reflects a deep-seated, settler colonial cultural practice of dehumanizing Indigenous peoples (LaRocque, 2010) and reinforcing dialectics of Indigenous absence and presence (Calderón, 2014b). The Native American unit as a whole might be viewed as an extension of a longstanding American cultural project that Yup'ik scholar Shari Huhndorf (2001) has termed "going Native." Going Native in this instance does not describe an anthropologist's attempt to understand a culture more objectively by "going Native" (immersing himself in the language, values, and customs of those he studies, for example). Rather, this curriculum "goes Native" as a whole through its continual erasure, rewriting Native peoples as part of US history and engaging in activities that nostalgically recuperate the life that was "lost." As Huhndorf (2001) states, "European Americans rewrote [their] history in a self-justifying manner by redefining Native Americans as part of their own past." This rewrite enabled European America to "go native" "by claiming Indianness as part of its own collective identity" (p. 15). This cultural pattern not only masks colonial violence, but by reproducing Indians as part of the past, and Indianness as a part of "Americanness," it also reinforces "the racial hierarchies it claims to destabilize" (p. 3). These "tourist approaches" (Derman-Sparks & the A.B.C. Task Force, 1989) to multicultural education

allow children to "'visit' non-White cultures and then 'go home' to the daily classroom, which reflects only the dominant culture" (p. 5). This is a cultural practice of commodifying and then consuming cultural difference (hooks, 1992) and leaving Eurocentric foundations of curricula unexamined. In this cultural pattern and practice, Natives remain historic, marginal, and Other, while non-Native subjectivities and identities are supposedly enriched, a practice legitimized by liberal multiculturalist discourses that ignore the power and politics of difference.

Educators would benefit from more nuanced theories of culture, including theories that politicize the context of cultural inclusion, such as Lomawaima and McCarty's (2006) theory of "the safety zone." Informed by such theories, educators might recognize the pattern of inviting Native students to drum or make dreamcatchers, yet resisting Native desires to wear regalia to graduation, are continual with a history of domesticating "dangerous" forms of Indigenous cultural difference. Even Indian Education program language, when taken up uncritically, positions culture as a "unique" need designed to help educators "*meet the same challenging State student academic achievement standards as all other students are expected to meet*" (20 U.S. C. § 6102(b), emphasis added). Thus, Native students' cultures are framed as a means to attain dominant cultural knowledge. Recent reauthorization of Indian Education under the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) (2015) contests this safety zone by infusing two new amendments of purpose:

> (2) to ensure that Indian students gain knowledge and understanding of Native communities, languages, tribal histories, traditions, and cultures; and
> (3) to ensure that teachers, principals, other school leaders, and other staff who serve Indian students have the ability to provide culturally appropriate and effective instruction and supports to such students. (20 U.S. C. § 6102(b))

Whereas the prior purpose to help students meet state standards is retained, this amended purpose leans toward an additive, even restorative, theory of schooling—Native students should *gain* knowledge of their languages, histories, traditions and cultures. Moreover, this amended purpose places responsibilities on educators and administrators to enact this approach. It remains an open question whether this new purpose will be absorbed into the safety zone, and culture and tribal histories interpreted and recast by educators and curriculum in innocuous ways. But there is an opening here, a moment of "interest convergence" (Bell, 1980) for educators versed in the politics of culture and assimilative schooling, to use this legal language in service of Native self-determination and sovereignty.

Learn from rather than about Indigenous peoples

"To speak of Indigeneity," states Mohawk scholar Audra Simpson (2007), "is to speak of colonialism and anthropology, as these are means through which Indigenous people have been known and sometimes are still known" (p. 67). The

educational contexts I witnessed were structured to "know" Indigenous peoples in particular ways, which I connected to longstanding ways of knowing the Indigenous other. In "Little Anthropologists," I described how the Native American unit the teachers developed framed Native people as historic objects of study. This positioning not only denies Native peoples the chance to be "real time beings" (Pepper, 1990) discussed in the previous section, but reaffirms Eurocentric viewpoints as natural, normal, and central. It reproduces the "positional authority" (Said, 1978) of students to "know" the Native Other. It became clear to me throughout working with teachers in this district that the aphorisms Melvina and I used to guide educators—start with contemporary Indigenous peoples, or begin with local Indigenous nations and communities—were useful interventions into the ways curriculum often framed Indigenous peoples as historic or as typically living elsewhere, but the sayings also did little to disrupt the ways schools were structured to know Native peoples as objects of study.

In several stories, I provided examples of our attempts to move the study of Indigenous peoples from curricular objects to pedagogical subjects, hoping that such a positioning would invite educators to learn *from* rather than learn *about* Native peoples. In other examples, I offered conceptual frameworks for curriculum, such as sovereignty, that steered the lens away from learning *about* Native peoples. Instead of studying Native people, I argued that studying the current issues Indigenous peoples and nations are facing, such as Apache resistance against encroachment on their territory, or the Hopi nation's advocacy to repatriate their sacred Katsina Friends, might be more generative approach. In another example, I drew on the work of Dion (2008) to suggest that students could study the biography of their relationship to Indigenous peoples, an attempt to disrupt the "perfect stranger" subjectivity many teachers (and likely the students they teach) presume. These interventions were intended to disrupt curriculum that authorized students to know and narrate Native Others and Otherness.

Understand that Indigenous identities are complex

Educators should also recognize the complexity of Indigenous identities. I take seriously Quechua scholar Sandy Grande's (2015) caution that the "current obsession with questions of identity and authenticity obscures the sociopolitical and material conditions of American Indian communities," and "suggests to the non-Indian world that the primary struggle of American Indians is the problem of forging a 'comfortable modern identity,'" displacing the "real sites of struggle (sovereignty and self-determination)" and "the real sources of oppression—colonialism and global capitalism" (p. 138). Moreover, as Corntassel (2003) argues, "The question of 'who is indigenous?' is best answered by indigenous communities themselves" (p. 75). Nevertheless, educators should recognize that Indigenous peoples use diverse justifications to assert their identities, including self-identification, legal, biological, or cultural frameworks (Garroutte, 2003),[5]

or by foregrounding land, relationships, and responsibilities (Grande, San Pedro, & Windchief, 2015). The point here is not to define Indigeneity, as the question of Indigeneity is complex and taken up by numerous scholars (Doerfler, 2015; Forte, 2013; Garroutte, 2003; Grande, San Pedro, & Windchief, 2015; Lawrence, 2004; Lyons, 2010; Sturm, 2002), but educators should understand that the question "who is Indigenous" is complex, that the stakes of that question are high for Native individuals and tribal nations, and that the question itself is underwritten by power (Forte, 2013).

Indigeneity is much more complex than the invitation to check a box on an enrollment form suggests. Native identity claims are made within a long and violent history of physical and cultural genocide and erasure. These claims are often a testament to tribal nations' and Native communities' longstanding efforts at restoration, renewal, and resurgence (Curry-Stevens, Cross-Hemmer, & Coalition of Communities of Color, 2011). For some families, the invitation to fill out a form for Indian Education may be welcome and seen as a way to connect them to community; for others, it may be a burden, inviting histories of resistance or resentment, of authenticity, or of the social, personal, cultural, or emotional costs of such questions. Educators must have a basic understanding of Indigenous identity: the diverse ways Native people claim their identities; what it means to be a citizen or descendant; and how Indigenous identity is both racial and political. They should be familiar with what it means for a tribal nation to be federally recognized or unrecognized; understand the ways blood quantum can legitimize or delegitimize Indigeneity, and be aware of how those discourses circulate among Indigenous peoples. Educators should also appreciate the complex bureaucracy, time, and money it can take people to establish or maintain their citizenship (e.g., for some families, especially those who are highly mobile, maintaining enrollment cards and records can be challenging and the cost of original documents needed in order to reapply for one's tribal membership ID prohibitive).

At a classroom level, educators should recognize that Native students negotiate and develop their identities against a backdrop of whiteness and dominant discourses of Indianness. As the survivance stories illustrate, Indigenous students' sense of their identities varies widely and can also change across contexts. Even when students are enrolled in their nation or feel confident in their cultural knowledge and identities, for example, they often must negotiate discourses of authenticity, or navigate the ignorance of peers, their teachers, or curriculum, as did Erin and Zeik. As the story "Halloween Costumes and Native Identity" illustrates, even Indigenous educators like myself can miss moments when Native students struggle with discourses of authenticity. Assertions of identity can also be complex. When a student exclaims "I'm part Native American!" this can be seen as both a statement of pride, and simultaneously an expression of a colonial metric of Indigeneity. When educators tune into these dynamics, they will also learn to listen for the survivance stories of Indigenous families and communities that contest these metrics—"Which 'part' specifically? Your arm? From your elbow to

your wrist maybe?" one student was taught to respond by his grandmother to the statement of being "part" Native.

At a broader level, educators should examine how definitions of Indigeneity are linked to resource allotment. Indian Education program enrollment criteria, for example, include students who are enrolled tribal citizens or the children or grandchildren of enrolled members. But what are educators' responsibilities toward Native students from unrecognized nations? And how do educators explain to Native students who were eligible for Indian Education programs through their grandparents' status as enrolled tribal citizens, that the program will not consider their future children eligible for the program? Educators must see this waning pattern of trust responsibility as connected to the settler colonial method of Indigenous erasure.

The conceptual knowledge about Indigenous identity can help orient educators to the ways schools, curriculum, and pedagogies intersect with these identity dynamics in complex and unexpected ways. These are not necessarily issues for educators to resolve; they are dynamics to be read so that educators can support Indigenous students and families as they navigate, resist, and contest them.

Recognize and nurture Native survivance

Native people have, as Tuck (2009) adeptly noted, been framed through lenses of pathology and "damage," so much so that at times we have occasionally come to see our own experiences through these pathologies and "damage-centered" lenses. Educators attuned to stories and acts of Native survivance, however, locate Native assertions of "presence" within constraining discourses as more than resistance, more than survival, and definitely more than pathology. This perspective helps educators avoid blaming students for whatever predicament they may be in, and avoid viewing them solely as victims of such circumstances. Seeing Indigenous students through "desire-based" frameworks can support educators in acknowledging pain or oppression, while also seeing the courage and wisdom in their lives (Tuck, 2009).

I tried to model how to tune into Native stories and acts of survivance. In the story "The Wax Museum," for example, Erin's reach for buckskin to look more "Native American-y" was not simply the ignorant reach of a child for stereotypical representation of Indianness, nor was it the mere social reproduction of those discourses. Rather, through a lens of survivance, I wrote about how Erin's actions reflected the purposeful refusal of a young child to be erased by being made to look like everyone else. The markers Erin reached for—the buckskin and the crystal wand—may have been shaped in part by dominant discourses of Indigeneity, yet her reach to assert a distinct difference was also a nuanced, albeit complicated, form of youth resistance. Similarly, Celeste's proposal in her social (in)justice art class to address cultural appropriation was also a form of survivance. So too were the ways she processed with her peers, the care and consideration she offered her teacher despite being shut down, and her commitment to that project (that she

eventually completed on her own time). Zeik, the 2nd grader who raised his hand in response to the ways Native people were represented in a book used by his teacher, and who drew himself as a brown-skinned Pilgrim, was also enacting survivance as he created social and discursive space within in the curriculum. Each of these small acts reflects Native students' survivance as they lived in creative contradiction with assumptions embedded in dominant culture and their teachers' practices.

Recognize and affirm sovereignty and self-determination

While sovereignty is *inherent* as well as *political* (Lomawaima, 2008), (and a concrete form of teacher knowledge I argued earlier that educators should be versed in), educators should also have a conceptual knowledge base around sovereignty. Sovereignty as a principle is too vast and complex to discuss in one paragraph, and a definition and project that is not without disagreement; nevertheless, Native studies scholars and communities continue to contest, define, and wield the concept in service of Indigenous peoples and Indigenous futures (Barker, 2005; Teves, Smith, & Raheja, 2015).[6] And while I argued earlier that educators should understand and teach about the rights and principles of political sovereignty, "rhetorical sovereignty" (Lyons, 2000) can also be a meaningful guiding principle for practice. Lyons offers rhetorical sovereignty as "the inherent right and ability of *peoples* to determine their own communicative needs and desires in the pursuit of self-determination" (p. 462). Students like Celeste want to pursue questions and projects that are meaningful to them.

Supporting those desires can contribute to what Lyons (2000) terms, the "American Indian publics." We tried to support this form of "public literate action" (Wells, as cited in Lyons, 2000, p. 465) in our own small way in the youth group with the letter we wrote to Spirit Halloween store. But teachers should create spaces for this sort of public literacy and action within the school day. Native youth, when supported, have effectively wielded public literacy in service of sovereignty and self-determination. Recent campaigns such as *More than that* by Native youth at Todd County High School, Earth Guardians and Rising Youth for a Sustainable Earth, or *Rezpect Our Water* DC all exemplify the power of Native youth to engage in collective, public action.[7] Whether making videos, writing letters to the President, and running 2,000 miles from Standing Rock to Washington, these activities demonstrate possibilities Native youth could generate, possibilities that are too often stifled in public schools and classrooms. However, just as schools can be sites of reproduction of dominant discourses, they can also be sites of survivance and self-determination. With educators equipped to hear and support Indigenous students' "communicative needs," schools can become strategic sites to develop public intellectuals. Again, being Native isn't necessarily a prerequisite for this work. The teacher at Todd County High School who supported Native youth in creating the video "More than that" as a response to Diane Sawyer's 20/20 special Hidden America: Children of The Plains which pathologized Indigenous peoples, wasn't Native; she listened

and followed the lead of Native students at her school who wanted to speak back to Sawyer's damage-based lens (Tuck & Yang, 2014b).

Citing two recent public victories for Native rights—a Supreme Court decision to uphold Native hunting and fishing rights on ceded lands, and federal trademark trial to appeal the Washington Redsk*ns trademark—Lyons (2000) argues,

> These victories were won by Native people who learned how to fight battles in both court and the culture-at-large, who knew how to read and write the legal system, interrogate and challenge cultural semiotics, generate public opinion, form publics, and create solidarity with others … Shouldn't the teaching of (American Indian) rhetoric be geared toward these kinds of outcomes? (p. 466)

Educators versed in the concept of rhetorical sovereignty would be more inclined to support such critical knowledge and skills with their students, and better positioned to support them in using their knowledge and skills to support Indigenous publics.

Finally, sovereignty, beyond a curricular framework to further respect for Indigenous nations, and beyond a rhetorical framework to support Indigenous aims and aspirations *is always what is at stake with Indigenous education.* This is not the work of tribally controlled schools alone. Teachers in urban and suburban public schools are also educating the next generation of Native leaders who can strengthen their nations. Whether they eventually return home, or engage in assisting their nations from afar, Indigenous education is always, in a sense, a project of Native sovereignty, self-determination, and "nation-building" (Brayboy et al., 2012).

Beyond Teacher Knowledge: A Relational Practice of Care, Commitment, Courage, and Connectedness

Teachers versed in the types of concrete informational and conceptual knowledge previously discussed are likelier to responsibly and generatively support Indigenous students and teach Native studies. However, this study and my own experiences tell me that information and concepts alone won't enable teachers to equitably and ethically support Indigenous students; they will be necessary, but insufficient, resources. Such knowledge is inadequate as the ways in which colonial violence and erasure manifest in schools is constantly changing, constantly "shape-shifting" (Corntassel, 2012). No one piece of knowledge or conceptual frame provides sufficient guidance for navigating these dynamics. As Tsianina Lomawaima (1995) states,

> The search for a single teaching method or learning style that best serves or typifies a racially, linguistically, ethnically, or economically defined subgroup of U.S. society is like the search for the Holy Grail. It risks becoming a sacred calling that consumes resources in the search for an illusory panacea for complex social and educational ills. (p. 342)

Because of this, there is no recipe for when one particular piece of knowledge or a particular concept will be relevant. This work takes place in a context of uncertainty, and with high stakes. There are institutional forces at work that counter the interests of these students. Making decisions in this shifting and always uncertain terrain will ultimately be based not on deduction from prior principles, but on judgments made in motion, influenced by affect, values, and imperfect estimations of possible consequences, and always with an ongoing responsibility for our decisions. This will require teachers to be involved in a way that is not just conceptual. This kind of teaching, in other words, is ultimately a form of relational practice, as much about ethics and politics as epistemology. In what follows, I offer that beyond the suggested forms of knowledge I surveyed, teachers will also need to develop a relational practice of care, commitment, courage, and connectedness.

Care

Caring has been asserted as an important relational orientation in the literature on culturally responsive schooling for Indigenous youth (Castagno & Brayboy, 2008; Demmert & Towner, 2003; Deyhle & Swisher, 1997; Powers, 2006). In their examination of Native youth who stay in school and succeed, Deyhle and Swisher (1997) draw on a wealth of research to state that "caring teachers are critical to their success" (p. 167). "We know," they later state, "that caring teachers make a difference in the decisions students make to persist or leave school before graduation" (p. 182).

One prominent theory of education comes from feminist educational theorist Nel Noddings (1984) who theorized teaching as a relational practice of care. Rather than an "aesthetical" form of caring, which she offers as "caring about things and ideas" (p. 21), Noddings argues that teachers should strive for a relational and reciprocal "ethics of care" in which teachers are attentive and receptive to students' lives and needs. Ethical care, Noddings (2002) states, "is always aimed at establishing, restoring or enhancing the kind of relation in which we respond freely because we want to" (pp. 13–14).

Noddings' theory of care provided an important intervention into "the proclaimed universialism and narrow rationalism of androcentric ethical and educational theories" at the time (Thompson, 1998, p. 528), but scholars have also critiqued the inattention to race and whiteness within such theories (Rolón-Dow, 2005; Thompson, 1998). Angela Valenzuela (1999), for example, draws from "Noddings' (1988) concept of authentic caring" (p. 61), but situates caring theory within the racialized and political landscape of schooling for immigrant and US-born Mexican youth. As Valenzuela argues,

> The overt request [that youth "care about school" in order to be cared for] overlies a covert demand that students embrace a curriculum that either dismisses or derogates their ethnicity and that they respond caringly to school officials who often hold their culture and community in contempt. (pp. 24–25)

Thus, Valenzuela's theory of care, *educación*, draws attention to the subtractive and assimilative contexts of schooling in which caring relationships are forged or foreclosed.

Others, like Thompson (1998), have drawn explicit attention to whiteness within dominant theories of care, arguing that they remain "colorblind" when they "proclaim a commitment to diversity," but "fail to acknowledge and address the whiteness of their political and cultural assumptions" (p. 525). By theorizing "caring as if it were synonymous with the home or the private sphere," these theories ignore the fact that the home "has not been the protected site for African American women that it has been for White, middle-class women" (p. 532). Thompson's examples—that even safe and loving homes haven't protected African Americans from racism and poverty, from "the effects of low wages … the burning of crosses on the front yard, invasion from lynch mobs, sexual harassment on the job, or joblessness due to racism" (p. 532)—ring true for Native families who, despite providing loving homes for their children, haven't necessarily protected them from the theft of their homelands, languages, or traditions, or from the blatant and subtle racism/colonialism they experience in society or schools.

Caring as a relational practice, then, can be undermined without critique of underlying power dynamics. "Caring," for example, was a driving force of assimilative schooling practices. "Caring" educators and policy makers were convinced their methods were less violent than warfare or policies of Indian removal. As Jacobs (2009) notes, citing anthropologist Ann Laura Stoler, "'the politics of compassion was not an oppositional assault on empire, but a fundamental element of it'; the 'production of harnessing of sentiment' comprised a key 'technology of the colonial state'" (pp. 25–26). Teachers must recognize the limits of "false empathy" (Delgado, 1996), and realize that "despite teachers' good intentions, love and caring can be racist, limiting, and oppressive" (Bartolomé, 2008, p. 3).

Teachers must develop a "critical care praxis" (Rolón-Dow, 2005), or "critical position of care" (MacGill, 2016, p. 242) in which they recognize their "ethic of care is not neutral, but is located within race, class and gender structures and is expressed through either nuclear or community models of care" (p. 239). For Rolón-Dow (2005), this means developing a practice of critical caring that is "grounded in a historical and political understanding of the circumstances and conditions faced by minority communities," "seeks to expose how racialized beliefs inform ideological standpoints," and "translates race-conscious historical and ideological understandings and insights from counternarratives into authentic relationships, pedagogical practices, and institutional structures that benefit Latino/a students" (p. 104). For Thompson (1998) this means countering the colorblindness in care theories and developing specifically antiracist curriculum and practices of care. This is important because "African American students cannot trust teachers who (wittingly or unwittingly) lie to them about racism, ignore Black achievements, gloss over slavery and segregation, or confine the study of Black history and culture to Black History Month" (p. 540).

Similarly, Indigenous students need teachers who care for them by working to "ensure that Indigenous students are successful in school while developing *as Indigenous peoples*" (Goulet & Goulet, 2014, p. 5), that help Indigenous students pursue their personal and communal educational aspirations (e.g., rhetorical sovereignty), and that are committed to disrupting colonization, in all of its forms. Among other things, this critical practice of caring requires commitment and courage.

Commitment and courage

Dealing with dynamics of power requires commitment and courage. When schools are structured in ways to ignore, erase, or demean Indigenous students' lives, educators need courage to speak back to those institutions. Melvina embodied this courage and commitment as she navigated bureaucratic and ideological roadblocks to serving Native students. Courage and commitment manifest in subtler ways as well. Equally as significant as speaking up is the courage educators demonstrate through critical self-reflection and vulnerability. That vulnerability can be personal, demonstrated through a willingness to look at oneself critically, and in light of traits, values, or histories one might not want to see. This sort of courage entails turning toward one's ignorance, for example, a practice some educators avoided. Ms. Carter, the 5th grade teacher who designed the wax museum project, turned toward her ignorance by recognizing gaps in her own knowledge and reaching out for help. This was not only evident in her admitted ignorance of any contemporary Native leaders, but also in her thoughtful reflections on the ways her curriculum had positioned Native people in the past, or entailed the study of cultural objects outside of their cultural contexts.

Native students, families, and educators routinely demonstrate courage and commitment by showing up in institutions that often deny and degrade their existence. Educators must recognize this, and embody equivalent practices of courage and commitment in order to advocate for and stand in solidarity with the students and communities they are there to serve. Importantly, forming relationships and connections with Native students and families is an effective way to continually reflect on and renew one's commitments.

Connectedness

The concepts of care and courage are not solely personal. Courage, for example, is not just a self-conscious practice of a teacher replacing bad ideas with good ones, leaving an enlightened teacher in tact as the moral authority; it also requires the courageous practice of relinquishing authority. Beyond these personal commitments, teachers and schools need to foster connections with Indigenous peoples, communities, and nations, placing themselves within a matrix of relationships and responsibilities.

This connectedness can be inter/personal as teachers foster relationships with Native students and parents. Ms. Carter worked to foster connections to the programs, evident in her commitment to bringing her class to the Center, the only teacher in her school that has made that effort so far. Sharon and her partner teacher Kelly also worked to create connections between their course and the Native community by inviting Native people to their class and giving them the authority to speak on issues important to them. However, the story "Education on the Border of Sovereignty" also demonstrates what a broader commitment to connection entails.

Because the US Forest Service had institutionalized a tribal liaison as a structural commitment to ensuring its "trust responsibility" to Native nations and lands, Sharon and Kelly's class were required to negotiate with the tribal liaison and representatives regarding the representation of Indigenous life in the mural. This also involved a practice of relinquishing pedagogical, epistemic, and representational authority. Though restrictive in the sense that the range of potential mural designs was limited, I argued that this connection to the tribal liaison and representative was actually generative of respect and new learning. While Sharon's individual practices of self-reflection (despite the stubbornness of discourses) might be thought of as courageous (i.e., her admitting to her students she had a lot to learn), I suggested that Sharon's ability to reflect on her actions came not from internal cognitive processes, but from a formalized and structured connection to the tribal liaison and Native nations premised on the recognition of tribal sovereignty. Fortunately, new tribal consultation requirements under ESSA (2015) will support Native nations' partnerships with districts. This process of partnership and consultation will support tribal authority and control (Charleston, 1994; Executive Office of the President, 2014) as a necessary intervention into Indigenous education.

What Institutions Can Do to Support Indigenous Education

While the previous section addressed issues of teacher knowledge to better support Indigenous education, the professional development to support such knowledge must be institutionalized. What follows are concrete, conceptual, and relational recommendations for districts and schools, teacher education programs, state level educational policy, and research.

Districts and schools

Districts should apply for and support Indian Education programs systematically by circulating information about such programs to all administrators, teachers, and office staff, orienting each new employee to the program's location, purpose, and services. Districts should have administrators (e.g., the Director of Elementary Education) who can provide basic training to administrators and teachers to detect

and eliminate stereotypes from curricula that create hostile climates for students. They should also acquire and disseminate culturally relevant materials for school and teacher use. Beyond this practical knowledge, districts should utilize equity analyses to evaluate educational policies and practices. Districts might even begin to evaluate such policies and practices through an anticolonial/self-determination/sovereignty lens, reflecting on how such practices support or undermine Native sovereignty. Districts should also intentionally recruit and support the hiring of Native teachers, a recommendation echoed in much of the literature (Beulieu & Figueira, 2006). Moreover, districts and schools should support ongoing professional development for teachers regarding Indigenous education. To do this, districts could develop teacher learning communities (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1999; Grossman, Wineburg, & Woolworth, 2001) and support site leaders at schools that could work with teachers within their building on localized professional development. As an example, I recently worked with a dedicated group of 4th grade teachers who, after training on how to detect colonial bias in curriculum, met over the summer to revise and map out 4th grade curriculum for the year. These teachers then worked specifically with the grade level teams at their respective schools to train and support the other teachers in their building on implementing the revised curriculum. This process was possible because the district's Equity Director received a grant to support these teacher leaders to educate themselves and then undertake the labor to revise the curriculum. Districts can find ways to support this train the trainer model so that Indigenous studies literacy becomes a shared knowledge base.

Beyond knowledge, districts can facilitate relationships between schools and Indian Education programs. They should also assume collective responsibility for the support of Indian Education and education of Native students. This might mean providing administrative, financial, or personnel support. Some districts, recognizing the limited funds of Indian Education programs, offset costs by providing FTE to support additional personnel. It is not enough to be "in relationship" with programs; it must also mean being responsible for providing sufficient support. Districts and schools should also foster relationships with families and Native parent committees, as well as provide various venues—public and private, informal and formal—for Native students and families to share their experiences within schools. Finally, districts should develop formal relationships with nearby Native nations. Premised on a recognition of and respect for tribal sovereignty, districts should develop tribal-district partnerships that can assist the district's support of those nations' tribal members, and the implementation of more responsible Native content. This could be implemented through a tribal advisory board, the establishment of "tribal education codes" (Charleston, 1994), a memorandum of understanding, or by following the US Forest Service's example, through institutionalizing trust responsibility through a tribal liaison.

Teacher education programs

Teacher education programs can support Indigenous education in a variety of ways. Beyond providing preservice teachers with the concrete knowledge to support Native students articulated earlier, all future teachers should have knowledge of the history of schooling within a context of genocide and colonialism. This knowledge is foundational for understanding the ways schools continue to be structured as systems that erase, marginalize, or assimilate Native students. As Lee (2011) argues,

> For teaching about Native peoples, teacher education should support critical inquiry into the scholarship, multimedia representations, and historical positioning of Native peoples. Teachers must be prepared with inclusive and accurate portrayals of who Native people are today and their unique cultural and political sovereignty over their lands in addition to their distinct political relationships with the United States. (p. 277)

Teacher education programs should provide a range of opportunities for preservice teachers to develop conceptual knowledge. Just as most college and universities require "diversity" or "multicultural" courses, teacher education programs should require that each and every teacher take an Indigenous studies course. Indigenous studies as a discipline has provides substantial conceptual tools to critique colonialism and recognize and affirm Native survivance. Such courses could provide educators with conceptual tools to understand and enact theories of culture, identity, knowledge, land, language, and community that further, rather than undermine, Native survivance, self-determination, and sovereignty. This is in addition to foundational knowledge these programs should provide educators regarding critical theories of race, whiteness, and other structures and discourses of oppression. Following the work of Dion (2007; 2008), teacher education programs can also help educators develop critical self-awareness of their subjectivities in relation to Indigenous peoples and to discourses and practices of colonialism, disrupting the "perfect stranger" positioning that enables educators to continually disregard Indigenous peoples and issues. As I have argued in this book, counterstorytelling, critical narrative research, and case study approaches can be effective in developing teacher knowledge (Atwood & López, 2014; Chang & Rosiek, 2003; Clandinin & Connelly, 1995; Connelly & Clandinin, 1999; Connelly, Clandinin, & He, 1997; Dibble & Rosiek, 2002; Rosiek & Atkinson, 2007; Sconiers & Rosiek, 2000; Shulman, 1986; Shulman, 2004; Solórzano & Delgado Bernal, 2001; Solórzano & Yosso, 2002). Critical case studies and counterstories provide context-rich narratives to examine experiences shaped by macrosocial discourses, and material through which student teachers can begin to appreciate the discursive dynamics Native students, communities, and service providers navigate in the education process. Finally, teacher education programs should

promote the hiring of Indigenous professors. To support the development of preservice teachers, teacher education programs must have professors with the capacity to address issues of colonization and survivance in education. Though arguably all professors within the program should be versed in Indigenous studies, there are already educators versed in the politics of Indigenous knowledge, issues, and representation. Policies and practices should be developed to promote the hiring of Indigenous teacher educators who might already be versed in such knowledge, or are implementing research agendas that engage Indigenous studies and support Indigenous peoples.

Beyond building knowledge, teacher education programs should develop relationships with Native programs and Native nations, providing a model for educators as they transition into their work. This might include developing relationships with Indian Education programs/Native-serving schools so that students gain practical experience in these settings. This might also include tribal-teacher education programs which support the recruitment and licensure of Native students, and support Native communities' needs for highly qualified Native teachers. Created in partnership with Oregon's nine federally recognized tribal nations, the University of Oregon provides a model for such collaboration through the Sapsik'wałá Teacher Education Program which aims to prepare Native teachers who are committed to teaching in Native-serving schools upon graduation. Following the work of projects such as the Harvard Project on American Indian Economic Development and the recent publication *Universities and Indian Country* (Norman & Kalt, 2015), teacher education programs could also design action-research courses aimed to further tribal sovereignty, nation-building, and self-determination through developing partnerships between students and tribal communities. Such partnerships would gear student coursework and projects to directly address tribal nations' needs and goals, while also developing teacher practical knowledge.

Educational policy

There are a variety of ways educational policy can support statewide efforts and school districts. Educational policy can support the development of concrete information regarding local Native nations, and support the circulation of such materials. Conceptually, educational policy as it relates to supporting Indigenous students should not only consider issues of equity, access, and social justice, but should also support Native students' unique aims of self-determination and sovereignty. The Oregon Department of Education, for example, drafts documents that advocate for Native students' rights to wear regalia at graduation ceremonies. Policy should also be written to support the development of curriculum that supports tribal sovereignty. Further, following the lead of states like Washington, Montana, and New Mexico, states should develop policies to mandate Native studies curriculum statewide. Oregon recently passed Senate Bill

13: Tribal History/Shared History, which funds, mandates, and supports the development of curriculum on tribal history, governance, and sovereignty to all students in K-12 public schools in Oregon. These initiatives should be the norm, not exceptions.

As a relational practice, states should engage in meaningful consultation with Native nations. Through Executive Order 96–30, the State of Oregon formalized these state/tribal government-to-government partnerships, and later, created "clusters" to focus on specific areas of policy. Oregon's government-to-government education cluster, for example, "focuses on areas of partnership that expand along the education spectrum from early childhood to college" (Oregon Department of Education, 2014, p. 2). Beyond consultation, states can institutionalize tribal liaisons, advisors, Indian Education directors, or other such positions, to support districts in implementing Indigenous education.

Research

Research can support Indigenous education in a variety of ways. Providing descriptive statistics on Native graduation, achievement, discipline, and attendance rates, for example, can support states, districts, and institutions in being accountable for Indigenous students' success. Such research should explicitly attend to the erasures embedded in demographic data collection and reporting processes that often erase Native students through categories such as "Hispanic/Latino," "two or to more races," or "multiracial." Although these categories were designed to more effectively capture the racial and ethnic diversity of students, they often times recast Native students as students of color (erasing their Indigeneity and reframing them as multicultural settlers). Surveys should also be designed and developed to better understand what teachers know and don't know about Indigenous students' lives and Indigenous education in order to guide professional development.

Following the call from Castagno and Brayboy (2008; see also Brayboy & Castagno, 2009), research should conceptually continue to explore the intersections of education and colonization, and foreground Native knowledge, theories, and experiences. As Lee (2011) argues,

> For Indigenous peoples, research on teacher education must take a stronger stance to address the marginalization of Native peoples in curriculum, content, and pedagogy in order to ignite SCR education on behalf of Native peoples. This type of research agenda allows for reclamation of what it means to be Native. It includes authentic representations of Native peoples and acknowledgement of their contemporary lived experiences. It also contributes to the dearth of academic knowledge in teacher education regarding SCR education for and about Native peoples. (p. 288)

Research is also needed that looks at how teachers engage the colonial contexts of schools in a constructive fashion and with attention to complexity. This

research could support teachers working in schools through the development of teacher-research collaboratives (see Sconiers & Rosiek, 2000), while also providing meaningful content for preservice and in-service professional development.

Relationally, and as articulated by a vast body of scholarship in Indigenous research methodologies (Brayboy, 2005; Chilisa, 2012; Hart, 2010; Kovach, 2009; Rigney, 1999; Smith, 2012; Steinhauer, 2002; Weber-Pillwax, 2001; Wilson, 2008), research should not solely be geared to learn *about* Native students' lives and communities, but should be actively committed to improving them. This means teacher education research must be "of use" (Fine & Barreras, 2001) and "be relevant and address problems of the community" (Brayboy, 2005, p. 440). To know what is of use to communities, educational researchers must utilize methodologies that respect the lives, needs, and aspirations of Indigenous communities, and adapt research agendas accordingly. Indigenous studies scholars provide critical approaches for theorizing research that attends to the colonizing histories and ongoing extractive practices of researchers and institutions (Simpson, 2007; Tuck, 2009; Tuck & Yang, 2014a; 2014b). Teacher education programs should consider the ways their faculty research agendas can directly support school districts in implementing more effective forms of Indigenous education in their own backyard, as well as provide direct support for Indigenous education programs already engaging in that work. Research is also needed that supports Native teachers' and community efforts at survivance, recognizing the ways that survivance is often improvisational, using the resources at hand to support Native students and families despite, at times, dire circumstances.

Maintaining Hope Despite Hardship

In keeping with this observation, and in recognition that critical narrative educational research that attends to colonization and survivance is an important, yet insufficient educational intervention, I conclude this book with a final survivance story. This story resonates with a quote by critical pedagogue Paolo Freire:

> If education could do all or if it could do nothing, there would be no reason to speak about its limits. We speak about them, precisely because, in not beign able to do everything, education can do something. As educators … it behooves us to see what we can do so that we can competetently realize our goals. (as cited in Brayboy & McCarty, 2010, p. 197)

It resonates, too, with words Kanaka Maoli scholar Emalani Case (2017) delivered to a graduating class of seniors at Kanu o ka ʻĀina, a Hawaiian focused public charter school on Hawai'i island. She was disheartened in her Pacific Studies university class when a student of hers "had lost her ability to dream good dreams, to have hope, to be radical, to fight even if and when she may lose just because it's the right thing to do." This student felt that "car[ing] so much about something she could not change was a waste of time, a waste of energy." Emalani

Case felt disheartened, but reflected upon her visit with the senior class at Kanu o ka ʻĀina who were "bold and brave dreamers":

> Yes, it does indeed take a lot of effort to care about something you may not be able to change: to stop sea levels from rising, to prevent destruction and desecration, to end genocide. But these haumāna were willing to care anyway: to care for the potential, for the possibility, for the chance of hulihia. (n.p.)

Reflecting on the courage of these Hawaiian students, and sharing a story of the Hawaiian prophet Kapihe, who dared to voice an unpopular prophecy for which he was criticized—"What is up shall come down. What is below shall rise."—Case told the students:

> In other words, there is always the possibility of change, even when you think you are helpless, even when you think your people are doomed, even when you think that your efforts and energies are wasted on dreams. His words teach us to dream anyway.

Case left the graduating class with a charge: "take up the task to maintain hope" (n.p.). This story, too, represents a community effort to maintain hope and attempt "to see what we could do" to address the violence against Indigenous women. Our efforts, as this story will show, did not stop physical assaults on Indigenous women; and yet, they were also not useless. This story of our effort addresses the impossible positions we are put in as educators, positions we must face, no matter how meaningless our efforts may feel at times. I hope this story inspires educators to "take up the task to maintain hope," even when our struggles may not result in the justice and change we hope for. We must dare to dream and struggle anyway.

Native Love

The pow wow had ended a few hours back. Somehow every year, we forget the immense amount of work it takes to put on a community event like this. There was only a handful of us left to pack up, put away the chairs, and clean the gym. Upon finishing, a group of Native youth were in a group talking, some on the ground, some sitting on the rail, one dangling from a tree. At once, they all started laughing. The laughter in that moment was medicine, infectious, the type of laughter that penetrates your chest and that often come from delirium. Some of the youth had been there since 9 p.m. and it was probably nearing midnight. For a fleeting moment as I looked at them, it was as if the last two years of our work together was right there, vivid, spilling out of their giggles and chiding remarks as they treated each other like siblings. For that moment, I was

overwhelmed with joy and goodness, convinced that some of our efforts were leading to what Vine Deloria Jr. had hoped for education: the creation of "good people" (as cited in Demmert & Towner, 2003, p. 1).

In that moment as I listened to their laughter, I had a sensation that paralleled my experience of entering motherhood—my sense of self had expanded. These students—once strangers—now felt like kin. Their joy was my joy, their being was entangled with my own. I was sensing the relational network we had fostered; the connections between us all. Ojibwe writer Louise Erdrich once wrote, "Every Native American is a survivor, an anomaly, a surprise on earth. We were all slated for extinction before the march of progress. But surprise, we are progress" (as cited in Keene, 2014, p. 1). Overjoyed at the moment, I wanted to shout "*You* are what this work is about! *You* are miracles!" But I held back. I marveled at the ways these teenagers from three different high schools in the district could act like family, especially with all the drama in their lives. I didn't need to say anything to them because they didn't need me to affirm them in that moment; they had each other.

One of the youth was drawing on the white board we had used for our project that day. At this year's pow wow, I had asked some of the youth to help me with a photo project called Native Love, a project developed by the National Indigenous Women's Resource Center (NIWRC) designed to "raise awareness and help end violence against Native youth by empowering them to redefine Native Love" (NIWRC website, http://nativelove.niwrc.org/). With our camera, a white board, and dry erase marker, we walked around the pow wow explaining the project and asking people if they would like to participate. Underneath the words #NativeLoveIs … we asked folks to provide their own definitions of love. We then took their picture as they held the white board. Nearly one hundred youth and elders, men and women, responded to the question. To see grown men and teenage boys answer with words like community, acceptance, family, and respect was a blessing, a "bendición" as one young man answered. Tradition. Fry Bread. Family. Heritage. Mom. Beautiful. Culture. Togetherness. Love. Nature. Kindness. Ceremony. Water. Children. Involvement. It was Native Love I was experiencing as those youth giggled, embodying and reflecting positive and healthy relationships.

It felt so hopeful and promising to witness these loving affirmations, and to be able to offer those beautiful words and images back to the community in a photo collage. With our limited budget, social media was the only way to share these images, but this "desire-based" project (Tuck, 2009), a chance for our community to develop "positive representations" of ourselves (Keene, 2015), circulated through likes, shares, and positive comments throughout the community.

My reflections on the project were complicated, however. Watching the young man doodle on the board as the youth talked to each other reminded me of the meaningful work we did. It felt important, for example, to walk around with a teenage boy and prompt him to explain the project to others. It felt

important to spend time with a young girl as she listened to elders define love in empowering ways: appreciation, togetherness, the river, respect, my sons. There was wisdom in those words and I know it meant something for us to be a part of it. Yet that evening, I was also humbled. Troubled.

I had just taken a break from the project to help with honoring the graduates. The parent committee had just gifted the high school students their Pendleton stoles for graduation, an honor I hoped they would carry with them to their graduations, as the parent group fought hard for those rights. The community had just sat down after congratulating them in an honor song and everyone marveled at the tiny tots dancers who took the floor.

There was joy in the room. I sat on the outskirts of the dance floor, watching the tiny tots dance. I began talking with one mother who asked about my white board when I noticed her face was deeply bruised. As we both watched her daughter dance, she told me of the violent relationship she was in and was trying to escape. She was fearful, but strong for her daughter. He had recently crossed a line, she told me, and she was determined to leave him. She was staying at a friend's house, but looking for more support. I gave her my cell and told her about shelters and resources in the area. We were both crying. I held my white-board, and looked down at the words "Native Love is …" I felt the weakness of the project crumble under the lived and real violence it was supposed to address. The children had finished dancing and her daughter approached us from the dance floor. The mother told her daughter about my project and her daughter said that she wanted to write something. The little girl, perhaps 5 years old, took the whiteboard from my hands and underneath the words "Native Love Is …," in slow and purposeful childlike letters, she wrote, "my mama."

Notes

1 See Castagno & Brayboy's (2008) literature review, or the introduction for examples.

2 See Oyate's "Living Stories" for examples that occurred in this area, including Raven's story and Qala's story (http://oyate.org/index.php/resources/45-resources/living-stories).

3 Hawai'i is still an unceded sovereign Hawaiian kingdom, illegally annexed by the US (Goodyear-Ka'ōpua, 2013; Silva, 2004). Other unrecognized Native nations, such as the Muwekma Ohlone in California, or the Duwamish Tribe or Chinook Indian Nation in Washington, also argue that their lands remain unceded territory within the United States.

4 Washington's "Since Time Immemorial" Tribal Sovereignty Curriculum, or "Montana's Indian Education for All" curriculum are two online sites that provide a wealth of information and curriculum about Native sovereignty. With the passage of Senate Bill 13: Tribal History/Shared History the state of Oregon is hoping to be among those that emphasize tribal sovereignty as core knowledge in public schools.

5 One's citizenship in a tribal nation is based in law; an ancestral claim to Indigeneity establishes a connection through blood; a cultural claim may be justified through one's knowledge of Indigenous languages or ceremonies; or one may simply assert one's Indigeneity as a form of personal self-identification. These rationalizations might also overlap, as citizenship in a tribal nation (political/legal) may require demonstrated

ancestry (biological); or recognition by the federal government may need to be justified through ancestry (biological) and/or a nation's distinctiveness as a community (culture).

6 Some scholars argue that legal and political understandings of sovereignty, despite their limits, have and continue to be an effective form of advocacy for Native rights (Barker, 2005; Deloria, 1998; Wilkins, 1997). Others are concerned that sovereignty foregrounds Western constructions of nationhood and recognition (Alfred, 1999; Coulthard, 2014), opting instead to theorize practices of Indigenous cultural resurgence and notions of peoplehood (Alfred, 1999; Alfred & Corntassel, 2005; Corntassel, 2012; Holm, Pearson, & Chavis, 2003). Some have worked thoughtfully to "detach and *dethink* the notion of sovereignty from its connections to Western understandings of power and relationship and base it on indigenous notions of power" (Grande, 2015, p. 70), theorizing sovereignty as a spiritual, pedagogical, intellectual, and relational project that centers Indigenous families', lands, and knowledges (Grande, 2015; Teves, Smith, & Raheja, 2015). Still others have theorized the ideological and representational dimensions of sovereignty, such as "intellectual sovereignty" (Warrior, 1992), "American Indian intellectualism" (Cook-Lynn, 1996), "rhetorical sovereignty" (Lyons, 2000), or "visual sovereignty" (Raheja, 2010), among others.

7 See the following websites for examples of youth action: More than that (https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FhribaNXr7A); Earth Guardians (http://www.earthguardians.org/xiuhtezcatl/); and *Rezpect Our Water* (https://www.youtube.com/channel/UC4Xfw9SHGin9Eb-cQh4T1IQ).

References

20 U.S.C. § 6102(b). (2015). Every Student Succeeds Act (2015) Retrieved from https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/BILLS-114s1177enr/pdf/BILLS-114s1177enr.pdf.

Alfred, G. (1999). *Peace, power, righteousness: An indigenous manifesto*. Don Mills, ON: Oxford University Press.

Alfred, T., & Corntassel, J. (2005). Being Indigenous: Resurgences against contemporary colonialism. *Government and Opposition*, 40(4), 597–614.

Archibald, J. A. (2008). *Indigenous storywork: Educating the heart, mind, body, and spirit*. Vancouver: UBC Press.

Atwood, E. & López, G. R. (2014). Let's be critically honest: Towards a messier counterstory in critical race theory. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 27 (9), 1134–1154.

Barker, J. (2005). *Sovereignty matters: Locations of contestation and possibility in indigenous struggles for self-determination*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

Bartolomé, L. I. (2008). Authentic cariño and respect in minority education: The political and ideological dimensions of love. *International Journal of Critical Pedagogy*, 1(1), 1–17.

Basso, K. H. (1984). "Stalking with stories": Names, places, and moral narratives among Western Apache. In E. Bruner (Ed.). *Text, play, and story: The construction and reconstruction of self and society* (pp. 19–55). Washington, DC: American Ethnological Society.

Beulieu, D., & Figueira, A. M. (2006). *The power of Native teachers: Language and culture in the classroom*. Tempe, AZ: The Center for Indian Education. Arizona State University.

Bell, D. (1980). Brown v. Board of Education and the Interest-Convergence Dilemma. *Harvard Law Review*, 93(3), 518–533.

Brandzel, A. (2016). *Against citizenship: The violence of the normative*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

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. M. J., & McCarty, T. L. (2010). Indigenous knowledges and social justice pedagogy. In T. K. Chapman & N. Hobbel (Eds.), *Social justice pedagogy across the curriculum: The practice of freedom* (pp. 184–200). New York, NY: Routledge.

Brayboy, M. E., & Morgan, M. Y. (1998). Voices of Indianness: The lived world of Native American women. *Womens Studies International Forum*, 21(4), 341–354.

Brayboy, B. M. J., Fann, A. J., Castagno, A. E., & Solyom, J. A. (2012). *Postsecondary education for American Indian and Alaska Natives: Higher education for nation building and self-determination*. San Francisco, CA: Wiley Subscription Services.

Bruyneel, K. (2007). *The third space of sovereignty: The postcolonial politics of U.S.-indigenous relations*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Byrd, J. A. (2011). *The transit of empire: Indigenous critiques of colonialism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Calderón, D. (2009). Making explicit the jurisprudential foundations of multiculturalism: The continuing challenges of colonial education in US schooling for Indigenous education. In A. Kempf (Ed.), *Breaching the colonial contract: Anti-colonialism in the U.S. and Canada* (pp. 53–77). New York, NY: Springer.

Calderón, D. (2011). Locating the foundations of epistemologies of ignorance in normative multicultural education. In N. Jaramillo & E. Malewski (Eds.), *Epistemologies of ignorance in education* (pp. 105–127). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Pub.

Calderón, D. (2014a). Speaking back to manifest destinies: A land education-based approach to critical curriculum inquiry. *Environmental Education Research*, 20(1), 24–36.

Calderón, D. (2014b). Uncovering settler grammars in curriculum. *Educational Studies: Journal of the American Educational Studies Association*, 50(4), 313–338.

Case, E. (2017). A gift of dreams: For the senior class of Kanu o ka ʻĀina. Retrieved from https://hewahipaakai.wordpress.com/tag/mauna-kea/.

Castagno, A. E. (2014). *Educated in whiteness: Good intentions and diversity in schools*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Castagno, A. E., & Brayboy, B. M. K. J. (2008). Culturally responsive schooling for Indigenous youth: A review of the literature. *Review of Educational Research*, 78(4), 941–993.

Chang, P., & RosiekJ. (2003). Anti-colonial antinomies: A case of cultural conflict in the high school biology curriculum. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 33(3), 251–290.

Charleston, M. G. (1994). Toward true Native education: A treaty of 1992. Final report of the Indian Nations at Risk Task Force. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 33(2), 7–56.

Chilisa, B. (2012). *Indigenous research methodologies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Clandinin, D., & Connelly, M. (1995). *Teachers' professional knowledge landscapes*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Cochran-Smith, M. & Lytle, S. L. (1999). Relationships of knowledge and practice: Teacher learning in communities. *Review of Research in Education*, 24, 249–273.

Connelly, F., & Clandinin, J. D. (1999). *Shaping a professional identity: Stories of educational practice*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Connelly, F. M., Clandinin, D. J., & He, M. F. (1997). Teachers' personal practical knowledge on the professional knowledge landscape. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 13 (7), 665–674.

Cook-Lynn, E. (1996). American Indian intellectualism and the new Indian story. *American Indian Quarterly*, 20(1), 57–76.

Cook-Lynn, E. (2001). *Anti-Indianism in North America: A voice from Tatekeya's earth*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Corntassel, J. (2003). Who is Indigenous? Peoplehood and ethnonationalist approaches to rearticulating Indigenous identity. *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics*, 9(1), 75–100.

Corntassel, J. (2012). Re-envisioning resurgence: Indigenous pathways to decolonization and sustainable self-determination. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education, & Society*, 1(1), 86–101.

Corntassel, J., & Witmer, R. C. (2008). *Forced federalism: Contemporary challenges to indigenous nationhood* (American Indian law and policy series). Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.

Coulthard, G. (2014). *Red skin, white masks: Rejecting the colonial politics of recognition*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Curry-Stevens, A., Cross-Hemmer, A. & Coalition of Communities of Color. (2011). *The Native American community in Multnomah County: An unsettling profile*. Portland, OR: Portland State University.

Delgado, R. (1989). Storytelling for oppositionists and others: A plea for narrative. *Michigan Law Review*, 87, 2411–2441.

Delgado, R. (1996). Rodrigo's eleventh chronicle: Empathy and false empathy. *California Law Review*, 84(1), 61–100.

Deloria, P. (1998). *Playing Indian*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Demmert, W., & Towner, J. (2003). *A review of the research literature on the influences of culturally based education on the academic performance of Native American students*. Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Education Laboratory.

Denetdale, J. N. (2006). Chairmen, presidents, and princesses: The Navajo Nation, gender, and the politics of tradition. *Wicazo Sa Review*, 21(1), 9–28.

Derman-Sparks, L., & the A.B.C. Task Force. (1989). *Anti-bias curriculum: Tools for empowering young children*. Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children.

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.

Dibble, N., & Rosiek, J. (2002). White-out: A connection between a teacher's white identity and her science teaching. *International Journal of Education and the Arts*, 5(3). Retrieved from www.ijea.org/v3n5/.

Dion, S. D. (2007). Disrupting molded images: Identities, responsibilities and relationships—teachers and indigenous subject material. *Teaching Education*, 18(4), 329–342.

Dion, S. D. (2008). *Braiding histories: Learning from Aboriginal peoples' experiences and perspectives*. Vancouver, BC: UBC Press.

Doerfler, J. (2015). *Those who belong: Identity, family, blood, and citizenship among the White Earth Anishinaabeg*. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State Press.

Executive Office of the President. (2014). *Native youth report*. Washington, DC: Executive Office of the President. Retrieved from https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/docs/20141129nativeyouthreport_final.pdf.

Fine, M., & Barreras, R. (2001). To be of use. *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy*, 1(1), 175–182.

Forte, M. (2013). *Who is an Indian?: Race, place, and the politics of indigeneity in the Americas*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York, NY: Seabury Press.

Garroutte, E. (2003). *Real Indians identity and the survival of Native America*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Goeman, M., & Denetdale, J. (2009). Guest editors' introduction: Native feminisms: Legacies, interventions, and Indigenous sovereignties. *Wicazo Sa Review*, 24(2), 9–13.

Goodyear-Ka'ōpua, N. (2013). *The seeds we planted: Portraits of a native Hawaiian charter school*. Minneapolois, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Goulet, L., & Goulet, K. N. (2014). *Teaching each other: Nehinuw concepts and Indigenous pedagogies*. Vancouver: UBC Press.

Grande, S. (2004). *Red pedagogy: Native American social and political thought*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Grande, S. (2015). *Red pedagogy: Native American social and political thought* (2nd ed.) Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Grande, S., San Pedro, T., & Windchief, S. (2015). Indigenous peoples and identity in the 21st century: Remembering, reclaiming, and regenerating. In E. P. Salett, & D. R. Koslow (Eds.), *Multicultural perspectives on race, ethnicity, and identity* (105–122). Washington, DC: National Association of Social Workers Press.

Green, R. (1988). The tribe called Wannabee: Playing Indian in America and Europe. *Folklore*, 99(1), 30–55.

Grossman, P., Wineburg, S., & Woolworth, S. (2001). Toward a theory of teacher community. *Teachers College Record*, 103(6), 942–1012.

Hall, L. (2005). "Hawaiian at heart" and other fictions. *The Contemporary Pacific*, 17(2), 404–413.

Hart, M. (2010). Indigenous worldviews, knowledge, and research: The development of an Indigenous research paradigm. *Journal of Indigenous Voices in Social Work*, 1(1), 1–16.

Hermes, M. (2005a). Complicating Discontinuity: What About Poverty? *Curriculum Inquiry*, 35(1), 9–26.

Hermes, M. (2005b). "Ma'iingan is just a misspelling of the word wolf": A case for teaching culture through language. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 36(1), 43–56.

Hirschfelder, A., Molin, P. F., & Wakim, Y. (1999). *American Indian stereotypes in the world of children: A reader and bibliography* (2nd ed.). Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press.

Holm, T., Pearson, D. J., & Chavis, B. (2003). Peoplehood: A model for the extension of sovereignty in American Indian studies. *Wicazo Sa Review*, 18(1), 7–24.

hooks, b. (1992). *Black looks: Race and representation*. Boston, MA: South End Press.

Huhndorf, S. (2001). *Going native: Indians in the American cultural imagination*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Jacobs, M. (2009). *White mother to a dark race: Settler colonialism, maternalism, and the removal of indigenous children in the American West and Australia, 1880–1940*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

Kalt, J. P., & Norman, D. K. (2015). *Universities and Indian country: Case studies in tribal-driven research*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Kaomea, J. (2005). Indigenous studies in the elementary curriculum: A cautionary Hawaiian example. *Anthropology Education Quarterly*, 36(1), 24–42.

Keene, A. (2014). *"College pride, Native pride" and Education for Native nation building: Portraits of Native students navigating freshman year* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Harvard University, Cambridge, MA.

Keene, A. (2015). Representations matter: Serving Native students in higher education. *Journal Committed to Social Change on Race and Ethnicity*, 1(1), 101–111.

Kovach, M. (2009). *Indigenous methodologies: Characteristics, conversations and contexts*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1998). Just what is critical race theory and what's it doing in a nice field like education? *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 11(1), 7–24.

Lambert, V. & Lambert, M. (2014). Teach our children well: On addressing negative stereotypes in schools. *American Indian Quarterly*, 38(4), 524–540.
LaRocque, E. (2010). *When the other is me: Native resistance discourse, 1850–1990*. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press.
Lawrence, B. (2004). *"Real" Indians and others: Mixed-blood urban Native peoples and indigenous nationhood*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.
Lee, T. S. (2011). Teaching Native youth, teaching about Native Peoples: Shifting the paradigm to socioculturally responsive education. In A. F. Ball & C. A. Tyson (Eds.), *Studying diversity in teacher education* (pp. 275–293). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
Leonardo, Z. (2004). The color of supremacy: Beyond the discourse of "white privilege". *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 36(2), 137–152.
Lomawaima, K. T. (1995). Educating Native Americans. In J. A. Banks & C. A. M. Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (pp. 331–347). New York: Macmillan.
Lomawaima, K. T. (2008). Tribal sovereigns: Reframing research in American Indian education. In M. Villegas, S. R. Neugebauer, & K. R. Venegas (Eds.), *Indigenous knowledge and education: Sites of struggle, strength, and survivance* (pp. 183–203). Cambridge, MA: Harvard Educational Review.
Lomawaima, K. T., & McCarty, T. L. (2006). *"To remain an Indian": Lessons in democracy from a century of Native American education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
Lyons, S. R. (2000). Rhetorical sovereignty: What do American Indians want from writing? *College Composition and Communication*, 51(3), 447–468.
Lyons, S. R. (2010). *X-Marks*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
MacGill, B. (2016). A paradigm shift in education: Pedagogy, standpoint, and ethics of care. *International Journal of Pedagogies and Learning*, 11(3), 238–247.
Martinez, G. (2010). *Native pride: The politics of curriculum and instruction in an urban public school*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
Million, D. (2014). There is a river in me: Theory from life. In A. Simpson & A. Smith (Eds.), *Theorizing Native Studies* (pp. 31–42). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
Montana Office of Public Instruction. (2012). *Essential understandings regarding Montana Indians*. Indian Education Division. Retrieved from http://montanateach.org/resources/essential-understandings-regarding-montana-indians/.
Moreton-Robinson, A. (2000). *Talkin' up to the white woman: Aboriginal women and feminism*. St. Lucia, Qld: University of Queensland Press.
Moreton-Robinson, A. (2016). *Critical indigenous studies: Engagements in first world locations*. Tucson, AZ: The University of Arizona Press.
Morrill, A., Tuck, E., & the Super Futures Haunt Qollective. (2016). Before dispossession or surviving it. *Liminalities: A Journal of Performance Studies*, 12(1), 1–20.
Noddings, N. (1984). *Caring: A feminine approach to ethics & moral education*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
Noddings, N. (2002). *Educating moral people: A caring alternative to character education*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
Noddings, N. (2005). *The challenge to care in schools: An alternative approach to education*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
Norman, D. K., & Kalt, J. P. (2015). *Universities and Indian country: Case studies in tribal-driven research*. Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press.
Oregon Department of Education. (2014). *State of Oregon Government to Government Agency Education Cluster Meeting Manual*. Retrieved from www.ode.state.or.us/opportunities/grants/nclb/title_vii/g2g-ed–cluster-meeting-manual-final-2014.pdf.

Paris, D. (2012). Culturally sustaining pedagogy: A needed change in stance, terminology, and practice. *Educational Researcher*, 41, 93–97

Parker, A. (1916). The social elements of the Indian problem. *American Journal of Sociology*, 22(2), 252–267.

Patel, L. (2016). *Decolonizing educational research: From ownership to answerability*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Pepper, F. (1990). *Unbiased teaching about American Indians and Alaska Natives in elementary schools*. Charleston, WV: ERIC Digest.

Pepper, F.Oregon Department of Education, Fuller, J., & Butterfield, R. (2014). *Indians in Oregon today: Oregon middle school—high school curriculum*. Salem, OR: Oregon Dept. of Education, Division of Special Student Services, Federal Programs.

Powers, K. M. (2006). An exploratory study of cultural identity and culture-based educational programs for urban American Indian students. *Urban Education*, 1, 20–49.

Raheja, M. (2010). *Reservation reelism: Redfacing, visual sovereignty, and representations of Native Americans in film*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

Reese, D. (2007). The word "squaw" in SIGN OF THE BEAVER [Web log post]. October 27. Retrieved from http://americanindiansinchildrensliterature.blogspot.com/2007/10/word-squaw-in-sign-of-beaver.html.

Rifkin, M. (2014). *Settler common sense: Queerness and everyday colonialism in the American Renaissance*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Rigney, L. (1999). Internationalization of an Indigenous anticolonial cultural critique of research methodologies: A guide to Indigenist research methodology and its principles. *Wicazo Sa Review*, 14(2), 109–121.

Robertson, D. W. (2015). Invisibility in the color-blind era: Examining legitimized racism against Indigenous peoples. *American Indian Quarterly*, 39(2), 113–153.

Rolón-Dow, R. (2005). Critical care: A color(full) analysis of care narratives in the schooling experiences of Puerto Rican girls. *American Educational Research Journal*, 42(1), 77–111.

RosiekJ., & Atkinson, B. (2005). Bridging the divides: The need for a pragmatic semiotics of teacher knowledge research. *Educational Theory*, 55(4), 231–266.

RosiekJ., & Atkinson, B. (2007). The inevitability and importance of genres in narrative research on teaching practice. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 13(4), 499–521.

Sabzalian, L., & Shear, S. (2018). Confronting colonial blindness in civics education: Recognizing colonization, self-determination, and sovereignty as core knowledge for elementary social studies teacher education. In S. Shear, C. M. Tschida, E. Bellows, L. B. Buchanan, & E. E. Saylor (Eds.), *Making controversial issues relevant for elementary social studies: A critical reader*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Press.

Sadker, D. (2009). Some practical ideas for confronting curricular bias. Retrieved from www.sadker.org/curricularbias.html.

Said, E. (1978). *Orientalism* (1st ed.). New York, NY: Pantheon Books.

Said, E. (1993). *Culture and imperialism* (1st ed.). New York, NY: Knopf.

Sconiers, Z., & Rosiek, J. (2000). Historical perspective as an important element of teacher knowledge: A sonata-form case study of equity issues in a chemistry classroom. *Harvard Educational Review*, 70(3), 370–404.

Shulman, L. (1986). Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. *Educational Researcher*, 15(2), 4–14.

Shulman, L. (2004). Just in case: Reflections on learning from experience. In L. Shulman & S. M. Wilson (Eds.), *The wisdom of practice: Essays on teaching, learning, and learning to teach* (1st ed.) (pp. 463–482). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Silva, N. (2004). *Aloha betrayed: Native Hawaiian resistance to American colonialism*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Simpson, A. (2007). On ethnographic refusal: Indigeneity, "voice," and colonial citizenship. *Junctures*, 9, 67–80.

Simpson, L. (2011). *Dancing on our turtle's back: Stories of Nishnaabeg re-creation, resurgence and a new emergence*. Winnipeg: Arbeiter Ring Pub.

Slapin, B., & Seale, D. (1998). *Through Indian eyes: The native experience in books for children*. Los Angeles, CA: American Indian Studies Center, University of California.

Slapin, B., & Seale, D. (2003). *Through Indian eyes: The Native experience in books for children*. Berkeley, CA: Oyate.

Smith, L. T. (2012). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples*. (2nd ed.) London: Zed Books.

Smith, L. T. (2008). On tricky ground: Researching the native in the age of uncertainty. In N. Denzin, & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The landscape of qualitative research* (pp. 113–143). Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications.

Solorzano, D. G., & Bernal, D. D. (2001). Examining transformational resistance through a Critical Race and LatCrit Theory framework: Chicana and Chicano students in an urban context. *Urban Education*, 36(3), 308–342.

Solórzano, D. G., & Yosso, T. J. (2002). Critical race methodology: Counter-storytelling as an analytic framework for education research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 8, 23–44.

St. Denis, V. (2011). Silencing Aboriginal curricular content and perspectives through multiculturalism: "There are other children here." *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies*, 33(4), 306–317.

Steinhauer, E. (2002). Thoughts on an Indigenous research methodology. *Canadian Journal of Native Education*, 26(2), 69–81.

Stewart-Harawira, M. (2013). Challenging knowledge capitalism: Indigenous research in the 21st century. *Socialist Studies: The Journal of the Society for Socialist Studies*, 9(1), 39–51.

Sturm, C. (2002). *Blood politics: Race, culture, and identity in the Cherokee Nation of Oklahoma*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Teves, S. N., Smith, A., & Raheja, M. H. (2015). *Native studies keywords*. Tucson, AZ: The University of Arizona Press.

Thompson, A. (1998). Not the color purple: Black feminist lessons for educational caring. *Harvard Educational Review*, 68(4), 522–554.

Tuck, E. (2009). Suspending damage: A letter to communities. *Harvard Educational Review*, 79(3), 409–428.

Tuck, E., & Yang, K. W. (2012). Decolonization is not a metaphor. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education and Society*, 1, 1–40.

Tuck, E., & Yang, K. W. (2014a). R-words: Refusing research. In D. Paris & M. T. Winn (Eds.), *Humanizing research: Decolonizing qualitative inquiry with youth and communities* (pp. 223–248). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Tuck, E., & Yang, K. W. (2014b). Unbecoming Claims. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 20(6), 811–818.

Turner, D. A. (2006). *This is not a peace pipe: Towards a critical indigenous philosophy*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Valenzuela, A. (1999). *Subtractive schooling: U.S.-Mexican youth and the politics of caring*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Vaught, S. E., & Castagno, A. E. (2008). "I don't think I'm a racist:" Critical Race Theory, teacher attitudes, and structural racism. *Race, Ethnicity and Education*, 11(2), 95–113.

Veracini, L. (2011). On settlerness. *Borderlands e-journal*, 10(1), 1–17.

Villegas, A. M., & Lucas, T. (2002). Preparing culturally responsive teachers: Rethinking the curriculum. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 53(1), 20–32.

Warrior, R. A. (1992). Intellectual sovereignty and the struggle for an American Indian future. *Wicazo Sa Review*, 8(1), 1–20.

Weber-Pillwax, C. (2001). What is Indigenous research? *Canadian Journal of Native Education*, 25, 166–174.

Wilkins, D. (1997). *American Indian sovereignty and the U.S. Supreme Court: The masking of justice*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Wilson, W. A. C. (2006). Burning down the house: Laura Ingalls Wilder and American Colonialism. In D. T. Jacobs (Ed.), *Unlearning the language of conquest: Scholars expose anti-Indianism in America* (pp. 66–80). Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Wilson, S. (2008). *Research is ceremony: Indigenous research methods*. Black Point, NS: Fernwood Pub.

Wolfe, P. (2006). Settler-colonialism and the elimination of the native. *Journal of Genocide Research*, 8(4), 387–409.