

---

## **The Gift of Education: How Indigenous Knowledges Can Transform the Future of Public Education**

**Michelle M. Jacob  
Leilani Sabzalian  
Joana Jansen  
Tary J. Tobin  
Claudia G. Vincent  
Kelly M. LaChance  
University of Oregon  
U. S. A.**

**ABSTRACT:** This article advocates for the necessity of Indigenous Knowledges in furthering Indigenous self-determination in public schools, as well as furthering the broad aims of public education. Drawing attention to past efforts across the United States to transform the public school curriculum and analyzing data from testimonies given at Oregon State Legislature Hearings, we argue that Indigenous Knowledges offer an important resource for educating all students responsibly and improving relationships within and across communities. Framing these ideas as gift-giving logic, we argue that if educators and policy-makers are open, they can learn a great deal from Indigenous Knowledges and advocacy efforts.

**KEYWORDS:** Indigenous Knowledges, culture, curriculum policy, Indian education, relationships

**Culturally Sustaining/Revitalizing Pedagogies  
The Value of Indigenous Knowledges in Educational Research  
A History of Advocacy for Indigenous Knowledges in Public Education  
An Analysis of the Testimony for SB 13  
Indigenous Knowledges as a Gift  
Notes  
References  
Author Contact  
Appendix A**

---

“We used to be good neighbors at one time...”

Valerie Switzler, Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs elder, Tribal Council member,  
language educator and Culture and Heritage Department Director

When Valerie Switzler, a Warm Springs elder, Tribal Council member, and educator, addressed the Oregon Senate Education Committee, she framed her testimony in terms of relationships. More specifically, she reminded the Committee that the communities around Warm Springs and her community used to be “good neighbors,” an understanding of relationships that encompassed a mutual sense of responsibility. Switzler was one of many Native elders, educators, and allies who testified that day on behalf of Senate Bill (SB) 13, legislation that would support the development and mandated implementation of curriculum that emphasizes Tribal history and sovereignty written from the perspectives of the nine federally recognized Tribal nations in Oregon. It was a fitting day for such testimony—February 9<sup>th</sup>, Tribal Government Day at the State Capitol. Like others, Switzler advocated for public education that would affirm her peoples’ inherent rights. But she also advocated for a better education for *all* students in Oregon, another example of her relational view of education. SB 13 was not just for Native students; it was necessary so that all of our children and our communities could be in that “good neighbor relationship” again.

Valerie Switzler offered a gift to the Committee that day—knowledge that can support better relationships within schools and between communities. Drawing from oral and written testimony on behalf of SB 13, this article illustrates the fact that Tribal elders and educators are a crucial resource in supporting more respectful and responsible public education systems. Transforming the future of public education will require being more attentive to Indigenous peoples and the knowledges they bring, listening to those who have longstanding relationships with particular places within the lands upon which schools are built.

We argue that Indigenous Knowledges (IK), or Indigenous Knowledge Systems, can also generate new visions and practices of public education. We intentionally use the plural form *Knowledges* to recognize the diversity and plurality of Indigenous Knowledges and to capture a “nuanced and holistic consideration of Indigenous Knowledges as entire systems” (Brayboy & Maughan, 2009, p. 4). Indigenous Knowledges are as diverse as Indigenous peoples themselves (Battiste, 2002; Brayboy & Castagno, 2008; Brayboy, Fann, Castagno, & Solyom, 2012; Brayboy & Maughan, 2009). Moreover, Indigenous Knowledges are heterogeneous, not just *across* Indigenous communities but even *within* them:

Within any Indigenous nation or community, people vary greatly in what they know. There are not only differences between ordinary folks and experts, such as experienced knowledge keepers, healers, hunters, or ceremonialists, there are also major differences of experiences and professional opinion among the knowledge holders and workers, as we should expect of any living, dynamic knowledge system that is continually responding to new phenomena and fresh insights. (Battiste, 2002, p. 12)

We recognize, however, that in making a connection between the value of Indigenous Knowledges and this issue’s theme—“Multicultural Education: Using Our Past to Build Our Future”—it might appear that we are positioning Indigenous peoples and Indigenous Knowledges in the past. We recognize this risk is heightened in light of hegemonic framings of Indigenous people as historic and

vanishing and in light of research documenting that “86.66% of the state-level US and state history standards dictate the teaching of Indigenous Peoples in the context of pre-1900 US history” (Shear, Knowles, Soden, & Castro, 2015, pp. 81-82). However, we hold a dynamic view of Indigenous Knowledges (Battiste, 2002; Brayboy & Maughan, 2009), a view that recognizes both continuity and change.

Given Indigenous peoples’ longstanding relationships with place as well as Indigenous peoples’ resilience within assimilative education systems (Lomawaima & McCarty, 2006), we argue that Indigenous Knowledges can provide important direction for the future of education. To situate this discussion, we draw from the literature on culturally sustaining (Paris, 2012; Paris & Alim, 2014) and culturally sustaining/revitalizing pedagogies (McCarty & Lee, 2014).

### **Culturally Sustaining/Revitalizing Pedagogies: From Problem to Rights, Resource, and Relationality**

A shift has occurred in the literature on culturally responsive/relevant pedagogy (Gay, 2010; Ladson-Billings, 1995), a shift that Paris (2012) has termed *culturally sustaining pedagogy* (CSP), which “seeks to perpetuate and foster—to sustain—linguistic, literate, and cultural pluralism as part of the democratic project of schooling” (p. 95). CSP demands “explicitly pluralist outcomes that are not centered on White-middle class, monolingual/monocultural norms” (Paris & Alim, 2017, p. 12; see also Paris & Alim, 2014). McCarty and Lee (2014) have extended CSP to discuss *culturally sustaining/revitalizing pedagogy* that emphasizes Indigenous self-determination by “transforming legacies of colonization” (p. 103). In order to facilitate educational practices that affirm and sustain Indigenous Knowledges, a paradigm shift for educational policy is needed.

Advocating for a paradigm shift within the context of language planning and policy development, Richard Ruíz (1984) outlined three orientations “toward language and its role in society”—*language-as-problem*, *language-as-right*, and *language-as-resource* (p. 15). These orientations frame bilingualism and the heritage languages of students as *problems* to be overcome, basic human *rights* to be protected and upheld, or *resources* that enrich the language speaker and society. Indigenous languages carry Indigenous Knowledges; our purpose here is to demonstrate that Indigenous Knowledges can be framed similarly within educational policy and practice.

As an example, “viewing the language as a problem (not a resource) is to see it as something that should be eliminated” (Ruíz, 2010, p. 166). Similarly, educational policy has long framed Indigenous Knowledges as problems to be taken care of by schooling—i.e., the “Indian problem” in which the Indigenous Knowledges embodied by Native children were to be erased and replaced with more civilized, Western forms of knowledge (Lomawaima & McCarty, 2006). Rooted in a “logic of elimination” (Wolfe, 2006, p. 387), settler colonial educational practices have been premised on policies and practices of Indigenous erasure—

removing Indigenous children to attend boarding schools, erasing Indigenous languages and cultures via assimilation, or minimizing Indigenous Knowledges as primitive.

But Indigenous Knowledges—which encompass the complex, intergenerational, and “cumulative experiences and teachings of Indigenous peoples” (Battiste, 2002, p. 2)—are not *problems* to be overcome or addressed by schooling. It is rather the educational status quo that is the problem. Indigenous Knowledge Systems are the inherent and protected *rights* of Indigenous peoples (Battiste, 2002). Indigenous peoples have the right to embody and impart Indigenous Knowledges across generations and have drawn from federal Indian (Calderón, 2009) and international law (United Nations, 2007) to assert their rights to educational self-determination and sovereignty.<sup>1</sup> As Article 31 of the United Nations Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) states,

Indigenous peoples have the right to maintain, control, protect and develop their cultural heritage, traditional knowledge and traditional cultural expressions, as well as the manifestations of their sciences, technologies and cultures, including human and genetic resources, seeds, medicines, knowledge of the properties of fauna and flora, oral traditions, literatures, designs, sports and traditional games and visual and performing arts. They also have the right to maintain, control, protect and develop their intellectual property over such cultural heritage, traditional knowledge, and traditional cultural expressions. (United Nations, 2007, p. 11)

We advocate for this rights-orientation approach to supporting Indigenous Knowledges and argue that public schools must recognize and support the rights of children to maintain Indigenous Knowledges.

Further, we draw from Ruíz’s framework to argue that *Indigenous Knowledges-as-resource* provides an important paradigm shift for public education. Beyond framing Indigenous Knowledges as the rights of Indigenous peoples, Indigenous Knowledges are also *resources* that can educate and enrich all students, as well as society, more broadly (Battiste, 2002; Battiste, 2013; Battiste & Henderson, 2009; Cajete, 1994; Kanu, 2011). A parallel claim is repeatedly demonstrated in research documenting the effectiveness of ethnic studies and its value for all students (Dee & Penner, 2017; Sleeter, 2011; Cabrera, Milem, Jaquette, & Marx, 2014).

Indigenous Knowledges create “a new, balanced centre and fresh vantage point from which to analyze Eurocentric education and its pedagogies” (Battiste, 2002, p. 5). Indigenous Knowledges can also create “new perceptions” and open up “new possibilities” in education (Brayboy & Maughan, 2009, p. 18). As Battiste and Henderson (2009) write,

We know that when IK is naturalized in education programs, the learning spirit is nurtured and animated. Individually and collectively, Aboriginal people are able to decolonize themselves, their communities, and institutions, leading to transformation and change; and everyone benefits. Indeed, naturalizing IK creates potential for Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal

learners in trans-systemic ways that EK [Eurocentric Knowledge] alone cannot do. (p. 13)

We add to this paradigm of Indigenous Knowledges-as-resource Opaskwayak Cree scholar Shawn Wilson's (2008) notion of *relationality*, to include the Indigenous cultural teaching that education should attend to the importance of relationships. Inherent within this emphasis on relationships is an expectation that educators will value *processes* as much as (or perhaps more than) *products* (Jacob, 2013; Smith, 2012). Thus, orienting educational policy and practice toward recognizing Indigenous Knowledges as resources means enacting culturally sustaining/revitalizing curricula and pedagogies that affirm Indigenous Knowledges and that are enacted within a context of relationships with Indigenous families, communities, and nations.

Before moving on, a brief, but important, caveat must be emphasized: the language of resource risks being misunderstood within capitalist economies of exchange, or worse, extractive economies that position Indigenous Knowledges as a commodity and resource to be exploited by dominant society (Whitt, 2004). A more appropriate metaphor, drawing from Indigenous ontologies and epistemologies, is *gift* (Beavert, 2017; Jacob, 2013; Kuokkanen, 2007; Whitt, 2004). The "logic of the gift," according to Sami scholar Rauna Kuokkanen, is a process and practice rooted in principles of respect, responsibility, and reciprocity.

We also draw from scholars such as Richardson (2011), Kuokkanen (2007), and Lomawaima and McCarty (2014) who are concerned with the enclosure and containment of Indigenous Knowledges within education systems, a pattern that is amplified by the fact that "the 'practical' demands of curriculum and teaching combined with teachers' lack of knowledge about Native peoples facilitate the processes of 'containing' Indigenous epistemologies" (Richardson, 2011, p. 333; see also Kanu, 2005).<sup>2</sup> Nevertheless, we find promise in literature suggesting that Indigenous Knowledges offer generative values, philosophies, conceptual frameworks, and stories that can enrich all students and society more broadly (Battiste & Henderson, 2009; Kanu, 2011). While naturalizing Indigenous Knowledges in education will require intentional teacher preparation and systemic change (Kanu, 2005; 2011; Orr, 2004; Ottman & Pritchard, 2010), we maintain that Indigenous Knowledges should be afforded the same respect as Western knowledges, have a rightful place within schools, and be regarded as a generative resource and gift that can enrich public education.

Advocacy for Indigenous Knowledges in education is an international endeavor that emerges from a variety of contexts such as Australia and The Torres Strait Islands (Nakata, 2002), New Zealand (Smith, 2012), Canada (Battiste, 2002; Kanu, 2011), Africa/African Diaspora (Dei, 2011b; Adefarakan, 2011), and the United States (Brayboy & Maughan, 2009; Deloria & Wildcat, 2002) including Hawai'i (Meyer, 2001; Goodyear-Ka'ōpua, 2013; Tibbetts, Kahakalau, & Johnson, 2007) and Alaska (Barnhardt & Kawagley, 2010; Kawagley, 1995). There is a wide range (see Dei, 2011a) of international perspectives on Indigenous Knowledges and education; though informed by this range of scholarship, the project discussed here is specifically located within the United States.

We next draw attention to the growing Indigenous-led movement across states in the United States to develop a statewide curriculum that affirms Indigenous Knowledges. Then, we turn to the oral and written testimonies provided at Senate Education Hearings regarding Indian Education in Oregon, to illustrate how Indigenous elders and educators have offered important gifts that can enrich public schooling.

### **The Value of Indigenous Knowledges in Educational Research**

Indigenous communities in the United States have long advocated for integrating Indigenous Knowledges into instruction (Brayboy & Castagno, 2009; Brayboy, Faircloth, Lee, Maaka, & Richardson, 2015; Castagno & Brayboy, 2008; Chavers, 2000; Martinez, 2014; McCarty & Lee, 2014). Such advocacy has focused on (a) using Native languages and Indigenous Knowledges (Brayboy et al., 2015; Brayboy & Castagno, 2009); (b) increasing students' contact with elders at school and participation in Native traditions and customs (Castagno & Brayboy, 2008; Keeshig-Tobias, 2003; McCarty & Lee, 2014); and (c) providing historically accurate curricula on Native histories and the effects of colonialism and racism on Native peoples (Castagno & Brayboy, 2008; McCarty & Lee, 2014). Taken together, these recommendations emphasize that Indigenous Knowledges are foundational to curricula, pedagogies, and educational contexts created to support Indigenous educational self-determination.

A number of studies provide empirical evidence for these recommendations. For example, Smallwood, Haynes, and James (2009) evaluated the positive effect of a heritage language revitalization program, with Indigenous language instruction being associated with an increase in students' reading, science, and math scores. McCarty, Romero-Little, Warhol, and Zepeda (2009) studied the extent and impact of Indigenous language use on students' school performance, finding Indigenous students had context-specific linguistic expertise and pluriliteracies. Brayboy and Castagno's (2009) extensive literature review showed that the beneficial impact of exposure to Indigenous Knowledges in educational settings has been repeatedly demonstrated. At the same time, Brayboy and Castagno's findings indicated that exposure to Indigenous Knowledge is most beneficial if it is integrated with mainstream culture in a multilingual and multicultural learning environment. It is this integration that the authors identify as challenging due to existing mainstream educational practices, such as an emphasis on standardized testing, as well as the implicit racism ingrained in educational systems. Based on a number of case studies in schools serving Indigenous students, Brayboy and Castagno conclude that culturally responsive schooling is most likely to occur if local community and local knowledge is leveraged to develop and deliver curriculum aligned with academic standards.

The need for this alignment is driven home by research identifying negative relationships between the use of Indigenous Knowledges in the classroom and Native students' performance on standardized tests (e.g., Jesse, Meyer, & Klute,

2014; López, Heilig, & Schram, 2013). This counterintuitive negative relationship was further explored by Van Ryzin & Vincent (2017) who analyzed data from the 2011 National Indian Education Study and found that student achievement was moderated by family contexts, specifically the extent to which family members speak Native language and participate in Native ceremonies and gatherings. Students from families who practiced Native traditions and spoke Native language benefitted more from a curriculum that integrated Indigenous Knowledges into instruction. These findings suggest that cultural continuity between home and school benefits Native students. Careful attention to the relationships between students, their families, their teachers, and the curriculum to which they are exposed appears imperative. Contextualizing findings from large-scale quantitative datasets with qualitative results from small-scale and case studies appears necessary to generate accurate evidence to guide evidence-based policy and practice.

### **A History of Advocacy for Indigenous Knowledges in Public Education**

The research supporting the value of Indigenous Knowledges in education exists due to the longstanding advocacy of Indigenous elders, educators, and communities. What follows is an overview of several Indigenous-led statewide efforts to mainstream Indigenous Knowledges in schools and then a specific history of SB 13 in Oregon.

#### **Statewide Efforts to Integrate Indigenous Knowledges in Schools**

In the wake of No Child Left Behind and its emphasis on standardization and high stakes testing, the integration of culturally responsive education has decreased (Castagno & Brayboy, 2008; National Indian Education Association, 2005). Further, in 17 states, there are currently no federally recognized Tribal nations, due to the violence of colonization and Indigenous displacement.<sup>3</sup> Thus, some states do not consider a curriculum that reflects Indigenous histories and perspectives a necessity.<sup>4</sup> Recent national initiatives, such as the National Museum of the American Indian's (NMAI) "Native Knowledge 360°: Framework for Essential Understandings about American Indians" project, attempt to address this issue. For example, Native Knowledge 360° provides teaching resources that embed these essential understandings within current social studies, Common Core math and language arts, and STEM standards to "deepen and expand [the] teaching of history, geography, civics, economics, science, engineering, and other subject areas" (NMAI, 2017, p. 2). Such initiatives posit Indigenous Knowledges not as supplemental or extracurricular but as core knowledge for all students. Statewide efforts provide an important complement to this national initiative as each state has a unique Tribal history and Indigenous population.<sup>5</sup> These initiatives

establish place-based coalitions of Indigenous educators to develop curricula in those regions.

For example, Hawai'i's constitution mandates "the study of Hawaiian culture, history and language" throughout Hawaiian public schools (1978, Article X, § 4). Hawai'i has also developed six Nā Hopena A'o (HĀ) outcomes designed to "strengthen a sense of belonging, responsibility, excellence, aloha, total-wellbeing and Hawai'i ("BREATH") in ourselves, students and others" (Hawai'i Department of Education, 2015). Similarly, the Alaska Standards for Culturally Responsive Schools developed by the Alaska Native Knowledge Network (ANKN) (1998) were developed as a means to "document the indigenous knowledge systems of Alaska Native people, and to develop pedagogical practices and school curricula that appropriately incorporate indigenous knowledge and ways of knowing into the formal education system" (Alaska Department of Education & Early Development, 2012, p. 1). These cultural standards shifted "the focus in the curriculum from teaching/learning about cultural heritage as another subject to teaching/learning through the local culture as a foundation for all education" (ANKN, 1998, p. 3), a focus that also aimed to elevate the status of Indigenous Knowledges within public schools. As a third example, in Montana a collaborative effort between school leaders and Tribal leaders developed a curriculum titled *Essential Understandings Regarding Montana Indians*, one of the first steps in implementing the statewide Indian Education for All (IEFA). Although initially an unfunded mandate that was floundering and that did not change until challenged legally, IEFA has shown considerable academic, social, and cultural benefits to Indigenous and non-Indigenous students in Montana's public schools (Carjuzaa, 2012; Carjuzaa, Jetty, Munson, & Veltkamp, 2010). Educational resources were developed using place-based Native American knowledge through collaboration with local schools and Tribal elders in Montana (Johnson et al., 2014). When teachers partnered with Native parents, students developed positive attitudes about cultural diversity (Ngai & Koehn, 2016). Additional summaries of statewide efforts are noted in Appendix A.

### **Senate Bill 13 in Oregon: The Past Shapes the Future**

Statewide efforts to support Indigenous Knowledges in their public school curriculum are evidence of the past shaping the future and evidence of Indigenous activism insisting that Tribal histories, perspectives, and issues of Tribal sovereignty be included to bring about curricular transformation. Additionally, state policies influence each other, creating cross-state networks of support. These efforts have created a broader context to support Indigenous-led curriculum efforts in Oregon. Educators in Washington, such as Michael Vendiola (Swinomish/Lummi/Visayan), Program Supervisor for the Office of Native Education in Washington State, visited the SB 13 coalition of educators and advocates to share insights from the struggles and strengths of Washington's initiative. Like Washington's bill, noted in Appendix 1, Oregon's SB 13 *mandates*



the Department of Education to develop and implement a curriculum on Tribal history and sovereignty in Oregon's public schools and provide professional development for teachers to support such efforts. The curriculum is for Kindergarten-12<sup>th</sup> grades and relates to Tribal history, sovereignty, treaty rights, culture, and contemporary issues and is to be historically accurate, community-based, culturally relevant, and adaptable to the state standards (Senate Bill 13, 2017). Due to prior efforts that resulted in unfunded mandates, this bill also specifically included a \$2 million budgetary allocation to provide grants to each of the nine federally recognized Tribal nations in Oregon to develop curricula, along with funds for the state for curriculum and professional development for teachers.

SB 13 passed in July 2017 and is scheduled to be implemented in the 2019-2020 school year. Like other states' initiatives, discussed above, SB 13 has been a culmination of decades of advocacy and efforts from American Indian/Alaska Native (AI/AN) communities in Oregon. Tribal representatives, urban Indigenous communities, and state educators contributed to the development of three AI/AN state plans throughout the last three decades. The most recent State Plan, approved in 2015 by a diverse panel consisting of representatives from reservation and urban AI/AN programs as well as Tribal Education Directors from the nine federally recognized Tribal nations in Oregon, specifies eleven educational outcomes, one of which included the development of legislative language and an enrolled bill to mandate a curriculum on Tribal history and sovereignty through Oregon public schools (Oregon AI/AN State Plan, 2015). The AI/AN Advisory Panel is currently working on updating the State Plan for the next biennium. As a result of a long history of advocacy, as well as a long history of being ignored, many Indigenous elders, educators, and advocates showed up to testify to the Oregon legislature.

### **An Analysis of the Testimony for SB 13**

We analyze oral and written testimonies that provide insight into the importance of SB 13. Below we describe the data and our analysis plan that honors the importance of Indigenous Knowledges.

#### **Data**

A total of 34 people testified orally on SB 13 at the Senate Education Committee meetings in February and June 2017 in Salem, Oregon, the state capitol; twelve people provided written testimony. All written documents and a recording of the sessions were entered into the public record and serve as our data for this paper's analysis. While all data analyzed in our paper are publicly available, we requested permission for this study from those who provided testimony. This practice, grounded in the literature on Indigenous methodologies (Kovach, 2009;

Wilson, 2008), draws attention to our roles and responsibilities as scholars and public intellectuals working with Indigenous peoples and communities. We felt we should reach beyond institutional protocols, which are more concerned with liability, toward relational practices that draw attention to our responsibilities for the processes and consequences of our research. Those testifying represented a range of individuals calling for the Senate to pass the bill: Tribal representatives of some of the nine federally-recognized Tribes of Oregon, students, parents, grandparents, educators, Native and non-Native stakeholders, the Washington State Program Supervisor of the Indigenous Education curriculum.

Themes arising from the testimony reflect the inadequacy and harm of current educational practices, the role and importance of Tribal sovereignty and treaty rights in public education, and the benefits that Indigenous education provides for all those engaged in and affected by public education. We argue that a common theme throughout the testimony is a recognition of the importance of looking at the past to shape future educational policy—in this case, knowledge that emerges from a long view, since time immemorial, of what is now called Oregon, and the long history of Indigenous advocacy for education that respects and affirms Indigenous students and Indigenous Knowledges. We examine the major theme of “connecting past and present” using a framework adapted from Ruíz (1984) to analyze the data, identifying the ways in which those testifying claimed that the lack of Indigenous Knowledges within Oregon’s education system is the problem and that the inclusion of Indigenous Knowledges, such as that which will be provided under SB 13, is a right and a resource for Oregon students. As noted earlier, we add Wilson’s (2008) notion of relationality to this framework.

## **Problem**

Most K-12 schooling in Oregon reflects the erasure of Indigenous Knowledges, an erasure which stemmed from its being regarded as a problem. This has led to gaps in the education of all students. Written and oral testimony clearly points to this. For example, in written testimony, April Campbell, citizen of the Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde and also the Oregon Department of Education’s (ODE) Indian Education Advisor, argued in favor of SB 13 by acknowledging the importance of past legislative efforts: “The 1972 Indian Education Act was landmark legislation establishing a comprehensive approach to meeting the unique needs of American Indian and Alaska Native students” (SB 13, Campbell, 2017). Yet, Campbell stated that the 1972 Act clearly was not enough, pointing out that:

Oregon continues to fail to meet the needs of its American Indian students as reflected by high dropout rates at 56% and absenteeism rates at 70%. The state is missing a critical opportunity to fully leverage the strengths, assets, and contributions these students bring to their communities. The lack of accurate and complete curricula may contribute to the persistent

achievement and opportunity gaps between American Indian and other students. (SB 13, Campbell, 2017)

Campbell argued that there is indeed a problem in education, but the problem does not reside within American Indian students. Rather, policies and systems are failing American Indian students, their communities, and the state. Campbell clearly articulated that the missed opportunities go beyond American Indians, and indeed it is a state-wide problem for all Oregon students and educators:

American Indians lived in this great state long before it became Oregon. How can we teach youth about Oregon history without including the voice of Oregon's American Indian peoples? Over the course of a year, I have provided professional development to more than 1,500 educators around the state. One of the exercises offered during these trainings is asking participants to identify the 9 federally recognized Tribes in Oregon. The exercise was revealing in that less than 1 percent were able to identify all nine, and more than 95 percent could identify only 1-2 Tribes. This general lack of knowledge about Oregon Tribes extends to curricula. (SB 13, Campbell, 2017)

The oral testimony also eloquently addressed the failings of the current system to integrate Indigenous education, speaking to the negative impact on the children, particularly Native children, of Oregon. Laura John, parent of a Portland public school student, and her daughter, Larae Ellenwood (Nez Perce, Blackfeet, Seneca) connected past to present as they addressed harmful effects over generations. In her years of schooling, John had inconsistent inclusion of Indigenous education. Depending on the level and classroom, her educational experiences were at times supportive and at times not, and by mid-high school, she stated,

I didn't feel that my classmates or even my teachers understood, they didn't have a background to understand what I was presenting when I presented on the Boarding School era, for example. During my junior year, I made the decision to drop out of high school. I wasn't, I didn't feel connected, I felt invisible, I felt overlooked, and couldn't find a cultural anchor to keep me in school. (SB 13, John, 2017)

Her children grew up in Montana schools, which include the Indian Education For All curriculum. On returning to live in to Portland, her daughter Larae Ellenwood was confronted with the same sense of isolation and invisibility that her mother had experienced, as well inconsistency across classrooms in how she and other Native students are viewed and supported. Larae Ellenwood testified: "I moved back to Oregon last January from Montana, and Montana has Indian Education for All. And so coming here and attending school, I found that...it was very different to be a Native student in public schools, and it just has a very different feeling, because there is no cultural presence for Native students in school" (SB 13, Ellenwood, 2017).

Leilani Sabzalian (Alutiiq), an AI/AN State Advisory Board member, further spoke as a parent to the harm being done to Oregon youth by the stereotypes and reduction of what gets implemented in classrooms. She spoke for her children:

Our name in our own language is Sugpaiq, which means the real people. But it's hard for my children to feel like real people when what circulates in the curriculum are degrading caricatures. It's hard to feel like real people when Native life is reduced to loincloths and teepees. It's hard to feel like real people when your dynamic and complex history is ignored and you are just a footnote to the narrative of western progress and you disappear after the year 1900. It's hard to feel like real people when your culture is reduced to demeaning, even sacrilegious arts and crafts. It's hard to raise my sons as real human beings in a climate of dehumanization. (SB 13, Sabzalian, 2017)

The impact that culturally responsive schooling can have on cultural identity was underscored by the testimony of Deanie Smith of the Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs, a member of the Tribal Education Committee. She argued that the current curriculum and practices have not provided students with a sense of their identity, and gave an example of Native students on the Warm Springs reservation not raising their hands when the teacher asked who in the classroom was Native American:

Where does that come from? How do they not know they're Native? Because they're not taught that. It comes from a place where your parents grew up in the boarding school, you grow up and you're raised from a place of shame, where...you don't want to be who you are, and it's internal conflict that we grow up with. And it's hard to break down those barriers and it's hard to see light at the end of the tunnel. So it is really frustrating that we...continue to fight this battle. Let us teach, let us be who we are, let us do these kinds of things because...that's our reality, our kids don't even know who they are." (SB 13, Smith, 2017)

The testimonies also point to the power that the curriculum developed under SB 13 could have. Campbell linked several problems that SB 13 can address: low educational achievement among American Indians, inaccurate curricula, educators who have little or no knowledge of Tribes, even to the extent that nearly all educators could only name one or two Tribes in the state. SB 13's implementation supports the connection and belonging that Native students, John's children, felt in Montana schools where "they had the experience of being with classmates who understood who my children were, where they came from, and respected their cultural background" (SB 13, John, 2017). Sabzalian (2015) that argued it will provide dignity. Smith proposed that it can be transformative in "changing other people's perspective of who we are, changing our perspective of who we are, knowing who we are and where we came from. Because when you carry yourself in pride, you walk differently" (SB 13, Smith, 2017).

## Rights

Written and oral testimony speaks to how sovereignty and government-to-government relationships are being expressed in K-12 education and provides insight into the ways in which Indigenous education should be a right; that is, all students and educators should be knowledgeable about American Indians, Tribal sovereignty, and Indigenous history. Indigenous education as a right of Native students in particular was also a theme of the testimony, while recognizing that it is critical for all students to understand the history of Oregon and the contemporary legal and political status of sovereign Indian nations. For example, Bud Lane, the Vice-Chairman of the Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians, argued in written testimony:

The Siletz is one of the largest Tribes in Oregon, with over 5000 members. Our original reservation, established by Executive Order in 1855, encompassed 1.1 million acres of the Oregon Coast. Our Tribe is a confederation of 54 bands and Tribes from all over western Oregon, from the California border to the Columbia River, and to the crest of the Cascade Mountains on the east. There is not one story to tell, but many, even within just the Siletz Tribes. That is certainly a challenge for educators. The Siletz Tribe assists and supports a charter public school in the town of Siletz. So we know first-hand the challenge of distilling a complex history into a usable curriculum, across age groups even for our own children and neighbors.

It is critically important to include Tribal history alongside our modern presence and legal status and rights. For most schools, the story of Indians in Oregon is non-existent. Yet Oregon is home to nationally relevant events, like the Rogue Indian War and the flight of Chief Joseph and the Nez Perce. In Oregon, as anywhere in America, there are the untold stories of broken treaties, forced migration and confinement. Fostering a complete education of the history of this state and the people who lived here since time immemorial is a worthy enough goal. But how can Tribes in modern times function as governments alongside our federal, state and local governments if there is not a basic understanding of our place in that structure? So of course, the Siletz Tribe supports the State requiring school districts to adopt a Curriculum relating to the Native American experience in Oregon. (SB 13, Lane, 2017)

Education as a treaty right is not being upheld in the current educational system. Ervanna Little Eagle of the Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs compared the accountability the state has to the accountability she has as a licensed teacher:

That's something that we want to hold Oregon accountable to, that they have to teach the history and the knowledge of our people of this land, not

only for our kids, not only so my children can know, but that, in that broader perspective, that as citizens of Oregon you are gaining a better understanding, a better knowledge of what it means to have that government to government relationship with people who are sovereign, we are a sovereign nation here, we signed a treaty, my elders have told me about that treaty, and within that treaty, they made that agreement, that education was going to be a component of that treaty. (SB 13, Little Eagle, 2017)

Little Eagle further tied the knowledge and intention of the treaty signers to the state's obligations to Native American communities and students:

Now when they made that agreement, they didn't make that agreement thinking that they were giving up their own educational values. They had a strong understanding of what it meant to educate their children, through that language, through the culture, through the songs, through the understanding of the land, through that relationship of the land. (SB 13, Little Eagle, 2017)

Oregon State Representative Tawna Sanchez spoke of the benefits SB 13 can provide for Native students:

How amazing would it be, for all Native kids, and in particular, those kids who are from here, from this state, who don't hear anything about their own culture, how amazing would that be, for them to be able to hear about their culture, their contributions, the things they know about their own people. And again...that history can be hard, because everything wasn't always easy and wasn't always great. But it's going to be so very, very important, for them to know that...their ancestors had a huge part of making this country what it was, what it is." (SB 13, Sanchez, 2017)

In looking to the specifics of the curriculum that will be developed under SB 13, several speakers noted that it must be representative of each Tribal entity so that all Oregon educators and students know the basics of Oregon Tribal history and governmental structures. Elder Arlita Rhoan of the Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs informed those present,

You need to educate yourself about who we are, our teachers, our administrative people from our schools need to be educated before they enter into a public school to run the best education that they can for the students that will be in that school. (SB 13, Rhoan, 2017)

Bud Lane's written testimony argues that such an effort is necessary for students to have a "complete education" and links the importance of Tribal history with "modern presence and legal status and rights" (SB 13, Lane, 2017). Accurate curricula can be created, and it must be done, so that students are no longer ignorant of nationally relevant historical events and of the basic functions of Tribal governments that work alongside other government structures at the federal, state, and local levels.

## Resource/Relationality

Witnesses clearly argued that Indigenous cultures, histories, and languages are a rich resource for educational curricula. American Indian communities have always known this. Yet, too often, as we have shown in previous sections, these teachings are marginalized or non-existent in public schools. However, some Tribes are taking matters into their own hands and are reaching out to help facilitate these important teachings being shared with their non-Native neighbors. Such work provides evidence of the importance of efforts like SB 13, as we can see how smaller-scale work to Indigenize curricula and relationships has benefits for both AI/AN students and non-Native students who also live in Oregon.

For example, Elder Arlita Rhoan (Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs) spoke of the fact that while she is not a licensed teacher, she has a firm grounding in Indigenous Knowledges and this grounding surpasses licensure in its importance.

The only education I have is my language and I know everything about it, and how it had controlled my people's lives and how they lived by it and how we lived and learned by natural nature, all our ways and skills and all my people had. (SB 13, Rhoan, 2017)

She demonstrated that unique knowledge in testifying in her Indigenous language. The knowledge she brings to the class is something that no licensure program or teacher education program provides.

Modesta Minthorn, Director of Education for the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (CTUIR), and also an appointed member of the State Board of Education, was a witness on behalf of the Umatilla Tribes to support Senate Bill 13. In her testimony, Minthorn argued,

Since the 1970s, the Umatilla Tribes have worked to bring our history, language and culture into the surrounding school districts in eastern Oregon. Despite some real challenges over the years, we now have strong relationships with the Pendleton School District and other districts close by. In fact, last March, Governor Brown visited Pendleton's "Walk to Language" program. She learned to say a few words in the Umatilla language in a program that serves all kindergarten students in the city. It is a historic partnership between our Tribe, the State and the District. Years ago, we never imagined we would see a Governor practicing our language in a classroom in the Pendleton School District. But now that we know what can be done through collaboration, we are excited to work with the state to build on that progress through SB 13. I think we can all agree it is important to provide curriculum that is historically accurate. CTUIR is one of two treaty Tribes in the State of Oregon. Each of the nine federally recognized Tribes

in Oregon are a sovereign - with distinct languages, customs, values, beliefs and independent relationships with the state and federal government. And SB 13 provides an opportunity for each of us to educate Oregonians about who we are as a people. (SB 13, Minthorn, 2017)

Minthorn's testimony demonstrated how CTUIR's history, language, and culture are resources that enrich public schools and the educational experiences of American Indians and non-Natives. She pointed out that the state's governor's learning some of the Umatilla language helped raise awareness of the importance of the work between CTUIR and the neighboring school district. She discusses the work in terms of a "historic partnership" that spans three institutions: Tribal, State, and Education District. Minthorn argued this is evidence of the powerful ways that relationships can be respectfully built. CTUIR has been working on this partnership since the 1970s, and we can look at their example as a model for why SB 13 is needed, and how it will pay immediate benefits through enriching the curriculum and providing a pathway for respectful relationships.

Testimony further underscored the value of Indigenous education for increased student engagement. Robin Butterfield (Ho-Chunk and Anishinaabe), Program Supervisor of the Office of Native Education, spoke of her years as an educator and of making student observations when the language arts curriculum that included stories of Tribal members was implemented:

By far the engagement was improved when those cultural materials were used in the classroom. The kids were curious, they were interested....They just wanted to know about...the culture of these other groups. So, this type of curriculum is good for all kids. It can be engaging, it can be fun, it can be interesting...and so I think that is one of the most compelling reasons this curriculum is valuable, and I think Oregon could benefit immensely. (SB 13, Butterfield, 2017)

Testimony clearly expressed that Indigenous Knowledges are a gift to students, teachers, and classrooms, and can extend to building community and neighborly relations across Tribal boundaries. Lynn Anderson (Anishinaabe, Director of Indian Education program for Western Lane County) reflected on a conversation with a teacher she has worked with for 25 years, who expressed that when Indigenous perspectives were included—when Anderson worked with the class—"my classroom community becomes more stable, every time we do one of these presentations. They get healthier, because they are learning more about each other" (SB 13, Anderson, 2017). What happens in the classroom affects the broader school environment. Anderson argued that a curriculum such as that developed under SB 13 will improve relationships, "and when our students start to understand each other, the healthier the relationships are on the playground, in the cafeteria, and then it moves into the community" (SB 13, Anderson, 2017).

We heard from the testimony that it is in the best interest, not only of Indigenous students but for the expressed ideals of pluralism and democracy in the United States, that the curriculum reflect and sustain Indigenous Knowledges. It is in the best interest of classroom and school communities that Indigenous



students feel that they belong, have success, and contribute to the community. This requires that Indigenous educators lead such efforts and that Indigenous Knowledges become centered and normalized, not marginalized as objects of study (Ladson-Billings, 2014). It also requires that educators and policy-makers listen and “hear” (Brayboy, 2005, p. 440) what Indigenous educators have been saying. When tuned in, it becomes clear that Indigenous educators have a long history of providing recommendations to support not only *Indigenous* education, but democratic education projects that support Indigenous self-determination as well.

Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs elder, Council member, language educator and Culture and Heritage Department Director Valerie Switzler advocated for an education rooted in respect, reciprocity, responsibility, and caring relationships:

We used to be good neighbors at one time...the people around us, the communities around us, and...we could count on one another to help us through difficult times...and we would look to each other...but we've lost that, because we don't have that connection any more...the people, the communities around us don't know who we are as a Tribe...who Umatilla is as a Tribe, or who the other Tribes are.... We don't have that any more, and we go out to the root fields and we can't dig because it's blocked off and they don't recognize that we have certain rights we had reserved since time immemorial. And because the general knowledge of who we are as a people isn't there anymore...all of this is getting lost. And even with our own children it's getting lost. And so our kids don't know that over there, that's where you can go dig bear root and over there you can go dig biscuit root, and you can pick huckleberries up there and up the ways is a chokecherry patch. But you know we don't have that good neighbor relationship anymore, and so we need to educate, not only our own children, but all children of Oregon...to recognize who we are as people, who we are as...not a minority group...but as a distinct Nation upon ourselves...each and every one of us in the Nine Tribes. (SB 13, Switzler, 2017)

Switzler's advocacy linked education (or the lack of) to relationships: the respectful relationship between communities as neighbors, and the relationships between Warm Springs' children and the land. She also linked such mis/education to her peoples' inherent and treaty rights to gather traditional foods and medicine, to relate to and care for the land. Her advocacy also promoted education as a responsibility, not only in upholding her peoples' rights, but in what it means to be a “good” neighbor.

### **Indigenous Knowledges as a Gift**

For centuries, educational institutions have denigrated Indigenous Knowledges. Nevertheless, Indigenous elders, educators, and scholars have

continued to recognize and advocate for the inherent, social, and cultural value of Indigenous Knowledges. “The recognition and intellectual activation of Indigenous knowledge today,” Battiste (2002) notes, “is an act of empowerment by Indigenous people” (p. 4). Indigenous peoples have made concerted efforts to sustain Indigenous Knowledges, whether through after school programs, charter schools, or language immersion programs (Bang et al., 2014; Battiste, 2013; Goodyear-Ka’ōpua, 2013; Jacob, 2013; McCarty & Lee, 2014). Although effective and necessary models for Indigenous educational self-determination, these efforts are often carried out in “relatively small schools serving small minoritized student populations via charter and magnet structures” (McCarty & Lee, 2014, p. 117). Much of the research documenting successful models of Indigenous education is based on “Tribally owned, private, or charter schools that are characterized by relative flexibility, autonomy, and cultural homogeneity in their schools” (Dorer & Fetter, 2013, p. 7). Left unaddressed are a large number of Native students who attend low density K-12 public schools (NCES, 2012; Sabzalian, 2015). While not advocating a turn away from Indigenous community-based educational efforts, in this article we draw attention to the affordances of Indigenous Knowledges for the broader project of public education, and the responsibility of all educators and policy makers to support movements to sustain Indigenous Knowledges.

All public education takes place on Indigenous lands and so must necessarily foster respect for those lands, Indigenous peoples, and Tribal sovereignty. The legacy of colonialism in education against which Indigenous peoples resist is not an “Indigenous” issue. As Donald (2009) has emphasized, “If colonialism is indeed a shared condition, then decolonization needs to be a shared endeavor” (p. 5). We have pointed to the ways Indigenous elders and educators have addressed this shared legacy in public schools. The *problem*, they have argued, is not our children or the Indigenous Knowledges they embody, but the policies and practices that ignore and demean them. They also spoke to the *rights* of Indigenous students to educational self-determination, the right to an education that affirms Indigenous Knowledges and supports their rights as Tribal citizens. Finally, we illustrated how testimony makes clear the benefits Indigenous Knowledges offer all students, and how such an education fosters better relationships within the school and community. This emphasis on *resource* and *relationality*, we argue, is a gift.

### Notes

1. The Indian Education Act (1972), Indian Self-Determination and Education Act (1975) and the United Nations Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (2007) are examples that advocate for the rights of Indigenous educational self-determination and sovereignty.
2. Public education systems (or academies) must do more than include Indigenous Knowledges; they must rethink their very foundations in order to recognize and value Indigenous Knowledges on their own terms. This will

require, as Kuokkanen (2007) argues, that institutions “overcome and dismantle [their own] hegemonic forms of reason” (p. 155).

3. For a list of federally recognized Tribes, see the Bureau of Indian Affairs Federal Register: <https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2017/01/17/2017-00912/indian-entities-recognized-and-eligible-to-receive-services-from-the-united-states-bureau-of-indian>. We recognize that there are numerous Indigenous nations whose inherent sovereignty has been unjustly unrecognized, and who are currently fighting for federal recognition.
4. For example, McCoy (2005) reported that 11 states “lack any specific substantive laws on Indian Education” (p. 7) and that 39 states have some kind of law related to Indian Education, but these typically refer to the education of Native Americans, not the value of Indigenous Knowledges for all students.
5. We are not suggesting that NMAI’s national initiative is generic or universal. Indeed, it explicitly directs educators to recognize the local diversity of Native nations. The first key concept in Essential Understanding 1: American Indian Cultures, is that “There is no single American Indian culture or language” (NMAI, 2017, p. 3). This national initiative provides an important framework for Indigenous-led efforts in states through local land- and place-based specificity.

## References

- Adefarakan, T. (2011). (Re)conceptualizing ‘Indigenous’ from anti-colonial Black feminist theoretical perspectives: Living and imagining Indigeneity differently. In G. J. S. Dei (Ed.), *Indigenous philosophies and critical education* (pp. 34-52). New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Alaska Department of Education & Early Development. (2012). Guide to implementing the Alaska cultural standards for educators. Retrieved from [https://education.alaska.gov/standards/pdf/cultural\\_standards.pdf](https://education.alaska.gov/standards/pdf/cultural_standards.pdf)
- Alaska Native Knowledge Network. (1998). Alaska standards for culturally responsive schools. Retrieved from <http://www.ankn.uaf.edu/publications/standards.html>
- Bang, M., Curley, L., Kessel, A., Marin, A., Suzukovich III, E. S., & Strack, G. (2014). Muskrat theories, tobacco in the streets, and living Chicago as Indigenous land. *Environmental Education Research*, 20(1), 37-55.
- Barnhardt, R., & Kawagley, A. O. (2010). *Alaska native education: Views from within*. Fairbanks, AK: Alaska Native Knowledge Network, Center for Cross-Cultural Studies, University of Alaska Fairbanks.
- Battiste, M. (2013). *Decolonizing education: Nourishing the learning spirit*. Saskatoon, Canada: Purich Publishing Limited.

- Battiste, M. (2002). *Indigenous knowledge and pedagogy in First Nations education: A literature review with recommendations*. Ottawa: Indian and Northern Affairs Canada.
- Battiste, M., & Henderson, J. Y. (2009). Naturalizing Indigenous knowledge in Eurocentric education. *Canadian Journal of Native Education*, 32(1), 5-18.
- Beavert, V. R. (2017). *The gift of knowledge Ttnúwit Átawish Nch'inch'imamí: Reflections on Sahaptin ways*. Seattle, WA: University of Washington 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. M. J., & Castagno, A. E. (2008). Indigenous Knowledges and Native science as partners: A rejoinder. *Cultural Studies of Science Education*, 3(3), 787-791.
- Brayboy, B. M. J., & Castagno, A. E. (2009). Self-determination through self-education: Culturally responsive schooling for Indigenous students in the USA. *Teaching Education*, 20, 31-53.
- Brayboy, B. M. J., Faircloth, S. C., Lee, T. S., Maaka, M. J., & Richardson, T. (2015). Indigenous education in the 21st century. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 54, 1-9.
- Brayboy, B. M. J., Fann, A. J., Castagno, A. E., Solyom, J. A. (2012). Post secondary education for American Indian and Alaska natives: Higher education for nation building and self-determination. *ASHE Higher Education Report*, 37, 1–154. doi:10.1002/aehe.3705
- Brayboy, B. M. J., & Maughan, E. (2009). Indigenous knowledges and the story of the bean. *Harvard Educational Review*, 79(1), 1-21.
- Cabrera, N. L., Milem, J.F., Jaquette, O., & Marx, R.W. (2014). Missing the (student achievement) forest for all the (political) trees. *American Educational Research Journal*, 51(6), 1084-1118.
- Cajete, G. (1994). *Look to the mountain: An ecology of Indigenous education*. Durango, CO: Kivaki 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
- Carjuzaa, J. (2012). The positive impact of culturally responsive pedagogy: Montana's Indian Education for All. *International Journal of Multicultural Education*, 14(3), 1-17.
- Carjuzaa, J., Jetty, M., Munson, M., & Veltkamp, T. (2010). Montana's Indian Education for All: Applying multicultural education theory. *Multicultural Perspectives*, 12(4), 192-198.

- Castagno, A. E., & Brayboy, B. M. J. (2008). Culturally responsive schooling for Indigenous youth: A review of the literature. *Review of Educational Research, 78*, 941-993.
- Chavers, D. (2000). Indian teachers and school improvement. *Journal of American Indian Education, 39*, 1-18.
- Dee, T. S., & Penner, E. K. (2017). The causal effects of cultural relevance: Evidence from an ethnic studies curriculum. *American Educational Research Journal, 54*(1), 127-166.
- Dei, G. J. S. (2011a). *Indigenous philosophies and critical education: A reader*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Dei, G. J. S. (2011b). Revisiting the question of the 'Indigenous.' In G.J.S. Dei (Ed.), *Indigenous philosophies and critical education: A reader* (pp. 21-33). New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Deloria, V., & Wildcat, D. R. (2001). *Power and place: Indian education in America*. Golden, CO: Fulcrum Publishing.
- Donald, D. T. (2009). Forts, curriculum, and Indigenous Métissage: Imagining decolonization of Aboriginal-Canadian relations in educational contexts. *First Nations' Perspectives, 2*(1), 1-24.
- Dorer, B., & Fetter, A. (2013). *Cultivated ground. Effective teaching practices for Native students in a public high school*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Native American Program. Retrieved from <http://www.mn-indianed.org/docs/CultivatedGround.pdf>
- Gay, G. (2010). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research and practice* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Teachers College Press
- Goodyear-Ka'ōpua, N. (2013). *The seeds we planted: Portraits of a native Hawaiian charter school*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Hawai'i Department of Education. (2015). Nā hopena a'ō statements: Hā: Breath. Retrieved from <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/DOE%20Forms/NaHopenaAoE3.pdf>
- HI Const. art. X, § 4.
- Jacob, M. M. (2013). *Yakama rising: Indigenous cultural revitalization, activism, and healing*. Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press.
- Jesse, D., Meyer, S. J., & Klute, M. (2014). *Understanding factors related to American Indian and Alaska Native student achievement in reading and mathematics: Limited distribution report for the Native American Education Research Alliance*. Centennial, CO: Regional Educational Laboratory Central.
- Johnson, A. N., Sievert, R., Durglo, M. Sr., Finley, V., Adams, L., & Hofmann, M. H. (2014). Indigenous knowledge and geoscience on the Flathead Indian

- Reservation: Implications for place-based and culturally congruent education. *Journal of Geoscience Education*, 62, 187-202.
- Kanu, Y. (2005). Teachers' perceptions of the integration of Aboriginal perspectives into the high school curriculum. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 51(1), 50–68.
- Kanu, Y. (2011). *Integrating Aboriginal perspectives into the school curriculum: Purposes, possibilities, and challenges*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.
- Kawagley, A. (1995). *A Yupiaq worldview: A pathway to ecology and spirit*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.
- Keeshig-Tobias, L. (2003). Of hating, hurting, and coming to terms with the English language. *Canadian Journal of Native Education*, 27, 89-100.
- Kovach, M. (2009). *Indigenous methodologies: Characteristics, conversations and contexts*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.
- Kuokkanen, R. (2007). *Reshaping the university: Responsibility, indigenous epistememes, and the logic of the gift*. Vancouver, BC: University of British Columbia Press, 2007.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 32, 465–491.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (2014). Culturally relevant pedagogy 2.0: A.k.a. the remix. *Harvard Educational Review*, 84(1), 74–84.
- Lomawaima, K. T., & McCarty, T.L. (2006). *"To remain an Indian": Lessons in democracy from a century of Native American education*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Lomawaima, K., & McCarty, T. (2014). Introduction to the special issue examining and applying safety zone theory: Current policies, practices, and experiences. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 53(3), 1-10.
- López, F. A., Heilig, J. V., & Schram, J. (2013). A story within a story: Culturally responsive schooling and American Indian and Alaska Native achievement in the National Indian Education Study. *American Journal of Education*, 119(4), 513-538.
- Martinez, D. (2014). School culture and American Indian educational outcomes. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 116, 199-205.
- Meyer, M.A. (2001). Our own liberation: Reflections on Hawaiian epistemology. *Contemporary Pacific*, 13(1), 124-148.
- McCarty, T., & Lee, T. (2014). Critical culturally sustaining/revitalizing pedagogy and Indigenous education sovereignty. *Harvard Educational Review*, 84(1), 101-124.

- McCarty, T. L., Romero-Little, M. E., Warhol, L., & Zepeda, O. (2009). Indigenous youth as language policy makers. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 8(5), 291-306.
- McCoy, M. (2005). *Tribalizing Indian education: Compilation of state Indian education laws*. Boulder, CO: Native American Rights Fund. Retrieved from <http://www.narf.org/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/blue.pdf>
- Nakata, M. (2002). Indigenous knowledge and the cultural interface: Underlying issues at the intersection of knowledge and information systems. *International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions Journal*, 28(5-6), 281-291.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2012). *National Indian Education Study 2011: The educational experiences of American Indian and Alaska Native students at grades 4 and 8*. (NCES 2012-466). Washington, D.C.: Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.
- National Indian Education Association. (2005). *Preliminary report on No Child Left Behind in Indian Country*. Washington, DC: NIEA.
- National Museum of the American Indian. (2017). *Native Knowledge 360°: A national education initiative: Framework for essential understandings about American Indians*. National Museum of the American Indian Education Office. Retrieved from <http://nmai.si.edu/nk360/understandings.cshtml>
- Ngai, P. B., & Koehn, P. H. (2016). Teacher / family partnerships for student learning: Lessons from Indian Education for All in Montana. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 55, 23-48.
- Oregon American Indian/Alaska Native state education plan. (2015). Retrieved from [http://www.ode.state.or.us/opportunities/grants/nclb/title\\_vii/2015-final-oregon-american-indian-alaska-native-state-plan.pdf](http://www.ode.state.or.us/opportunities/grants/nclb/title_vii/2015-final-oregon-american-indian-alaska-native-state-plan.pdf)
- Orr, J. (2004). Teaching social studies for understanding First Nations issues. In A. Sears & I. Wright (Eds.), *Challenges and prospects for Canadian social studies* (pp. 164-175). Vancouver, BC: Pacific Educational Press.
- Ottmann, J., & Pritchard, L. (2010). Aboriginal perspectives and the social studies curriculum. *First Nations Perspectives*, 3(1), 21-46.
- Paris, D. (2012). Culturally sustaining pedagogy: A needed change in stance, terminology, and practice. *Educational Researcher*, 41, 93-97.
- Paris, D., & Alim, H. (2014). What are we seeking to sustain through culturally sustaining pedagogy? A loving critique forward. *Harvard Educational Review*, 84(1), 85-100.
- Paris, D., & Alim, S. H. (2017). *Culturally sustaining pedagogies: Teaching and learning for justice in a changing world*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

- Richardson, T. (2011). Navigating the problem of inclusion as enclosure in Native culture-based education: Theorizing shadow curriculum. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 41(3), 332-349.
- Ruíz, R. (1984). Orientations in language planning. *NABE: The Journal for the National Association for Bilingual Education*, 8(2), 15-34.
- Ruíz, R. (2010). Reorienting language-as-resource. In J. E. Petrovic (Ed.), *International perspectives on bilingual education: Policy, practice, and controversy* (pp. 155-172). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Sabzalian, L. (2015). *Beyond "business as usual": Using counterstorytelling to engage the complexity of urban Indigenous education*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest. (10006359).
- SB 13: Hearings before the Oregon State Legislature, House Committee On Education, 79<sup>th</sup> Oregon Legislative Assembly (June 12, 2017). (Testimony of Larae Ellenwood). Retrieved from [http://oregon.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?view\\_id=6&clip\\_id=23930](http://oregon.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?view_id=6&clip_id=23930)
- SB 13: Hearings before the Oregon State Legislature, Senate Committee On Education, 79<sup>th</sup> Oregon Legislative Assembly (February 9, 2017). (Testimony of Arlita Rhoan). Retrieved from [http://oregon.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?clip\\_id=492af24a-4642-4e26-abd2-13a094f19572&meta\\_id=f707c400-12b1-415c-a9eb-29c851ba712f](http://oregon.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?clip_id=492af24a-4642-4e26-abd2-13a094f19572&meta_id=f707c400-12b1-415c-a9eb-29c851ba712f)
- SB 13: Hearings before the Oregon State Legislature, Senate Committee On Education, 79<sup>th</sup> Oregon Legislative Assembly (February 9, 2017). (Testimony of Deanie Smith). Retrieved from [http://oregon.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?clip\\_id=492af24a-4642-4e26-abd2-13a094f19572&meta\\_id=f707c400-12b1-415c-a9eb-29c851ba712f](http://oregon.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?clip_id=492af24a-4642-4e26-abd2-13a094f19572&meta_id=f707c400-12b1-415c-a9eb-29c851ba712f)
- SB 13: Hearings before the Oregon State Legislature, Senate Committee On Education, 79<sup>th</sup> Oregon Legislative Assembly (February 9, 2017). (Testimony of Ervanna Little Eagle). Retrieved from [http://oregon.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?clip\\_id=492af24a-4642-4e26-abd2-13a094f19572&meta\\_id=f707c400-12b1-415c-a9eb-29c851ba712f](http://oregon.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?clip_id=492af24a-4642-4e26-abd2-13a094f19572&meta_id=f707c400-12b1-415c-a9eb-29c851ba712f)
- SB 13: Hearings before the Oregon State Legislature, Senate Committee On Education, 79<sup>th</sup> Oregon Legislative Assembly (February 9, 2017). (Testimony of Laura John). Retrieved from [http://oregon.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?clip\\_id=492af24a-4642-4e26-abd2-13a094f19572&meta\\_id=f707c400-12b1-415c-a9eb-29c851ba712f](http://oregon.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?clip_id=492af24a-4642-4e26-abd2-13a094f19572&meta_id=f707c400-12b1-415c-a9eb-29c851ba712f)
- SB 13: Hearings before the Oregon State Legislature, Senate Committee On Education, 79<sup>th</sup> Oregon Legislative Assembly (February 9, 2017). (Testimony of Leilani Sabzalian). Retrieved from [http://oregon.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?clip\\_id=492af24a-4642-4e26-abd2-13a094f19572&meta\\_id=f707c400-12b1-415c-a9eb-29c851ba712f](http://oregon.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?clip_id=492af24a-4642-4e26-abd2-13a094f19572&meta_id=f707c400-12b1-415c-a9eb-29c851ba712f)



- SB 13: Hearings before the Oregon State Legislature, Senate Committee On Education, 79<sup>th</sup> Oregon Legislative Assembly (February 9, 2017). (Testimony of Lynn Anderson). Retrieved from [http://oregon.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?clip\\_id=492af24a-4642-4e26-abd2-13a094f19572&meta\\_id=f707c400-12b1-415c-a9eb-29c851ba712f](http://oregon.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?clip_id=492af24a-4642-4e26-abd2-13a094f19572&meta_id=f707c400-12b1-415c-a9eb-29c851ba712f)
- SB 13: Hearings before the Oregon State Legislature, Senate Committee On Education, 79<sup>th</sup> Oregon Legislative Assembly (February 9, 2017). (Testimony of Robin Butterfield). Retrieved from [http://oregon.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?clip\\_id=492af24a-4642-4e26-abd2-13a094f19572&meta\\_id=f707c400-12b1-415c-a9eb-29c851ba712f](http://oregon.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?clip_id=492af24a-4642-4e26-abd2-13a094f19572&meta_id=f707c400-12b1-415c-a9eb-29c851ba712f)
- SB 13: Hearings before the Oregon State Legislature, Senate Committee On Education, 79<sup>th</sup> Oregon Legislative Assembly (February 9, 2017). (Testimony of Tawna Sanchez). Retrieved from [http://oregon.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?clip\\_id=492af24a-4642-4e26-abd2-13a094f19572&meta\\_id=f707c400-12b1-415c-a9eb-29c851ba712f](http://oregon.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?clip_id=492af24a-4642-4e26-abd2-13a094f19572&meta_id=f707c400-12b1-415c-a9eb-29c851ba712f)
- SB 13: Hearings before the Oregon State Legislature, Senate Committee On Education, 79<sup>th</sup> Oregon Legislative Assembly (February 9, 2017). (Testimony of Valerie Switzler). Retrieved from [http://oregon.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?clip\\_id=492af24a-4642-4e26-abd2-13a094f19572&meta\\_id=f707c400-12b1-415c-a9eb-29c851ba712f](http://oregon.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?clip_id=492af24a-4642-4e26-abd2-13a094f19572&meta_id=f707c400-12b1-415c-a9eb-29c851ba712f)
- SB 13: Hearings before the Oregon State Legislature, Senate Committee On Education, 79<sup>th</sup> Oregon Legislative Assembly (February 9, 2017). (Testimony of April Campbell, document 96531). Retrieved from <https://olis.leg.state.or.us/liz/2017R1/Downloads/CommitteeMeetingDocument/96531>
- SB 13: Hearings before the Oregon State Legislature, Senate Committee On Education, 79<sup>th</sup> Oregon Legislative Assembly (February 9, 2017). (Testimony of Bud Lane, document 96976). Retrieved from <https://olis.leg.state.or.us/liz/2017R1/Downloads/CommitteeMeetingDocument/96976>
- SB 13: Hearings before the Oregon State Legislature, Senate Committee On Education, 79<sup>th</sup> Oregon Legislative Assembly (February 9, 2017). (Testimony of Modesta Minthorn, document 96529). Retrieved from <https://olis.leg.state.or.us/liz/2017R1/Downloads/CommitteeMeetingDocument/96529>
- Senate Bill 13. (2017). Oregon Department of Education. 79<sup>th</sup> Oregon Legislative Assembly. Retrieved from <https://olis.leg.state.or.us/liz/2017R1/Downloads/MeasureDocument/SB13>
- Shear, S. B., Knowles, R. T, Soden, G. J., & Castro, A.J. (2015). Manifesting destiny: Re/presentations of Indigenous peoples in K–12 U.S. history standards. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 43(1), 68-101.

- Sleeter, C. E. (2011). *The academic and social value of ethnic studies: A research review*. Washington, DC: National Education Association.
- Smallwood, B. A., Haynes, E. F., & James, K. (2009). *English language acquisition and Navajo achievement in Magdalena, New Mexico: Promising outcomes in heritage language education*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Smith, L. T. (2012). *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples* (2nd ed.). London: Zed Books.
- Tibbetts, K. A., Kahakalau, K., & Johnson, Z. (2007). Education with Aloha and student assets. *Hūlili: Multidisciplinary Research on Hawaiian Well-Being*, 4(1), 147-181.
- United Nations. (2007). *United Nations Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples*. United Nations. Retrieved from [http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/documents/DRIPS\\_en.pdf](http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/documents/DRIPS_en.pdf)
- Van Ryzin, M. J., & Vincent, C. G. (2017). Use of native language and culture (NLC) in elementary and middle school instruction as a predictor of mathematics achievement. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 56(2), 3-33.
- Whitt, L.A. (2004). Biocolonialism and the commodification of knowledge. In A. Waters (Ed.), *American Indian thought: Philosophical essays* (pp.188-213). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Wilson, S. (2008). *Research Is ceremony: Indigenous research methods*. Halifax, Canada: Fernwood Publishing.
- Wolfe, P. (2006). Settler colonialism and the elimination of the native. *Journal of Genocide Research*, 8(4), 387-409.

### Author Contact

Michelle M. Jacob: [mjacob@uoregon.edu](mailto:mjacob@uoregon.edu)

Leilani Sabzalian: [leilanis@uoregon.edu](mailto:leilanis@uoregon.edu)

Joana Jansen: [jjansen@uoregon.edu](mailto:jjansen@uoregon.edu)

Tary J. Tobin: [ttobin@uoregon.edu](mailto:ttobin@uoregon.edu)

Claudia G. Vincent: [clavin@uoregon.edu](mailto:clavin@uoregon.edu)

Kelly M. LaChance: [kellyl@uoregon.edu](mailto:kellyl@uoregon.edu)

University of Oregon, 1585 E. 13<sup>th</sup> Ave. Eugene, Oregon 97403

## Appendix A

### Brief Summary of Sample Statewide Indigenous Curriculum Initiatives

<b>State (Number of Tribal Nations)</b> <i>Title of Initiative</i> Key Dates   Central Aims Resources	
<b>Montana (7)</b> <i>Indian Education for All (IEFA)</i>	
1999: IEFA passes as unfunded mandate 2004: Montana Quality Education Coalition sues state 2000: Indian educators create the Essential Understandings 2005: State legislature funds IEFA	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Recognize the unique cultural heritage of American Indians.</li> <li>2. Every Montanan, whether Indian or non-Indian, learn about the heritage of American Indians.</li> <li>3. All educational personnel work cooperatively with Montana Tribes.</li> <li>4. All school personnel have an understanding and awareness of Indian Tribes.</li> </ol>
<i>For more information on IEFA:</i> <a href="http://montanatribes.org/files/IEFA-Law.pdf">http://montanatribes.org/files/IEFA-Law.pdf</a> <a href="http://opi.mt.gov/programs/indianed/IEFA.html">http://opi.mt.gov/programs/indianed/IEFA.html</a> <a href="http://opi.mt.gov/pdf/IndianEd/TimeLine.pdf">http://opi.mt.gov/pdf/IndianEd/TimeLine.pdf</a>	
<b>North Dakota (4)</b> <i>North Dakota Native American Essential Understanding (NDNAEU)</i>	
2014: Indian Education Summit held 2015: Elders meet to determine the understandings about Native Americans in North Dakota. Educational materials are developed, sent to all schools and posted online 2016-2017: Workshops for teachers. 2017: Funding for professional development is incorporated into state budget	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. All students become better, more informed citizens, and have more knowledge of Native American culture and history.</li> <li>2. Graduation rates for Native American students improve.</li> <li>3. Teachers have a better understanding of Native American students.</li> <li>4. The ultimate goal of this document is to increase learning, understanding and well-being among all North Dakota students, educators and communities.</li> </ol>
<i>For more information on NDNAEU:</i> <a href="https://www.nd.gov/dpi/SchoolStaff/IME/IndianEducation/NDLegislation/">https://www.nd.gov/dpi/SchoolStaff/IME/IndianEducation/NDLegislation/</a> <a href="https://teachingsofourelders.org/">https://teachingsofourelders.org/</a>	

<b>Oregon (9)</b> <i>Senate Bill 13</i>	
<p>1991: 1<sup>st</sup> AI/AN State Plan created                      2006: 2<sup>nd</sup> AI/AN State Pan created                      2015: 3<sup>rd</sup> AI/AN State Plan created which included developing a legislative concept and Enrolled Bill (SB 13)                      2017: SB 13 passed                      2019-2020: Curriculum to be implemented in Oregon public schools</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Develop and require implementation of curriculum relating to the Native American experience in Oregon that is inclusive of including tribal history, sovereignty issues, culture, treaty rights, government, socioeconomic experiences and current events</li> <li>2. Ensure the curriculum is historically accurate, culturally relevant, community-based, contemporary and developmentally appropriate.</li> <li>3. Ensure that federally recognized Tribes in Oregon are consulted with and provided funds to support such collaboration.</li> <li>4. Make the curriculum available to school districts and provide professional development to teachers and administrators relating to the curriculum.</li> </ol>
<p><i>For more information on SB 13:</i>  <a href="https://olis.leg.state.or.us/liz/2017R1/Downloads/MeasureDocument/SB13">https://olis.leg.state.or.us/liz/2017R1/Downloads/MeasureDocument/SB13</a>  <a href="https://www.yesonsb13.com/">https://www.yesonsb13.com/</a></p>	

<b>South Dakota (9)</b> <i>Indian Education Act</i>	
<p>2007: Indian Education Act passed and curriculum work begins                      2008-2015: Initial funding and curriculum work begin                      2012: Indian Education Act revised                      2016: Funding provided for a specialist to work with up to three schools for three years and for para-educators to go to school. Programs scheduled to be implemented in Fall 2019.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Disseminate <i>Oceti Sakowin: Essential Understandings and Standards (EUS)</i>.</li> <li>2. Implement the WoLakota project, which involves mentoring for teachers.</li> <li>3. Improve outcomes for Native American students a few schools at a time.</li> <li>4. Students and public school instruction staff become aware of and gain an appreciation of South Dakota's unique American Indian culture.</li> </ol>
<p><i>For more information on the SD Indian Education Act, Oceti Sakowin, and the WoLakota Project:</i>  <a href="https://indianeducation.sd.gov/IEact.aspx">https://indianeducation.sd.gov/IEact.aspx</a> <a href="https://indianeducation.sd.gov/ocetisakowin.aspx">https://indianeducation.sd.gov/ocetisakowin.aspx</a>  <a href="http://www.wolakotaproject.org/">http://www.wolakotaproject.org/</a></p>	

<b>Washington (29)</b> <i>House Bill 1495 and Senate Bill 5433</i> <i>Basic Education Act</i>	
<p>2005: House Bill 1495, which “encourages” districts to teach Washington tribal history, culture, and government passes</p> <p>2007: Since Time Immemorial (STI) curriculum developed</p> <p>2015: SB 5433, which “mandates” curriculum on tribal history, culture, and government, is signed by the Governor</p> <p>2016-17: Mandate goes into effect and the state, Tribal nations, and private organizations provide funding</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Create and integrate <i>Since Time Immemorial (STI): Tribal Sovereignty in Washington State</i> curriculum into current and newly-adopted social studies or history curricula</li> <li>2. Collaborate with federally recognized Indian Tribes within or neighboring district boundaries.</li> </ol>
<p><i>For more on Senate Bill 5433 and STI:</i>  <a href="https://legiscan.com/WA/text/SB5433/2015">https://legiscan.com/WA/text/SB5433/2015</a>  <a href="http://www.k12.wa.us/IndianEd/">http://www.k12.wa.us/IndianEd/</a>  <a href="http://www.k12.wa.us/IndianEd/TribalSovereignty/">http://www.k12.wa.us/IndianEd/TribalSovereignty/</a></p>	

<b>Wyoming (2)</b> <i>Indian Education for All</i>	
<p>2014-2015: Social studies content and performance standards relating to the study of American Indian Tribes are developed</p> <p>2016: House Bill 76 /House Enrolled Act 119 passes the legislature's Select Committee on Tribal Relations</p> <p>2017: Governor signs the bill. No specific funding allocated, but Governor previously allocated funds for tribal liaison</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Educate all Wyoming students about American Indian Tribes of the region, including the Northern Arapaho and Eastern Shoshone Tribes.</li> <li>2. Consult with Tribes of the region</li> <li>3. Review existing state social studies content and performance standards to ensure the cultural heritage, history and contemporary contributions of American Indians are addressed.</li> <li>4. Hold community input meetings as part of this review</li> <li>4. Make available materials and resources on the department's official web site to assist school districts in meeting social studies benchmarks within Wyoming social studies content and performance standards relating to the study of American Indian Tribes.</li> </ol>
<p><i>For more on Indian Education for All:</i>  <a href="http://legisweb.state.wy.us/2017/Enroll/HB0076.pdf">http://legisweb.state.wy.us/2017/Enroll/HB0076.pdf</a>  <a href="https://edu.wyoming.gov/in-the-classroom/native-american/">https://edu.wyoming.gov/in-the-classroom/native-american/</a>  <a href="http://windriveredu.org/">http://windriveredu.org/</a></p>	