



Native Education Collaborative

Making Native Education Our Shared Priority



Teachers and Leaders

Teachers and Leaders

The National Comprehensive Center

The National Comprehensive Center (NCC) is one of 20 technical assistance centers supported under the U.S. Department of Education’s Comprehensive Centers program from 2019 to 2024. The NCC focuses on helping the 19 Regional Comprehensive Centers and state, regional, and local education agencies throughout the country to meet the daunting challenge of improving student performance with equitable resources.

Acknowledgements: Dr. Iris PrettyPaint, Kauffman & Associates, Inc. (KAI); Dr. Janet Gordon, KAI; Amanda Cantrell, KAI; Yvette Journey, KAI; Anna Morgan, KAI; Josephine Keefe, KAI

This publication is in the public domain. While permission to reprint is not necessary, reproductions should be cited as:

Reinhardt, M.J., Moses, T., Arkansas, K., Ormson, B., Ward, & G.K. (2020). *Teachers and Leaders*. Rockville, MD: National Comprehensive Center at Westat.

The contents of this publication were developed under a grant from the Department of Education. However, the contents do not necessarily represent the policy of the Department of Education, and you should not assume endorsement by the federal government.

A copy of this publication can be downloaded from www.nationalcompcenter.org

Table of Contents

Introduction	4
Teachers and Leaders	4
Preparing and Recruiting Native Teachers and Educational Leaders	5
Preparing Native Educators and Leaders	5
Recruiting Native Educational Leaders	5
Knowledge of Native Culture and History in All Teacher Preparation	8
Social Justice through Education	9
Principles for Effective Culture-based Education Programs	9
Place-based Literacy	10
Native Knowledge 360° and Statewide Efforts	11
Development of Culturally Responsive Skills	11
State Legislation	11
Native Community Partners.....	12
Certification of Tribal Speakers and Culture Experts to Teach	13
Funding for Cultural Programming	14
State Support	14
References	16

Introduction

The National Center assembled a panel of experts in the field of American Indian and Alaska Native education from a broad constituency base to help determine current needs and interests in the field. Interviews conducted with the panel produced the following primary thematic categories:



Native culture and language



College and career readiness and access



Tribal consultation and sovereignty



Physical and behavioral health



Teachers and leaders



Promising programs and practices

The National Center’s American Indian and Alaska Native Education Project developed the following briefs for each category to positively impact the learning lives of Native children and youth. These briefs are meant to enhance the effectiveness of state education agencies’ work on Native education. Though tribal communities are very diverse, for the purposes of these briefs, the terms *American Indian and Alaska Native*, *Native*, *indigenous*, and *tribal* are used to refer to Native communities.

Teachers and Leaders

Learning across the disciplines (e.g., mathematics, science, art) can be enhanced for all students by grounding learning in historical and cultural (Western and Native) knowledge and context. The survival of Native knowledge in the United States depends on the leadership and teaching skills of many traditional and non-traditional educators. The Native knowledge systems that were in place and thriving in a pre-colonial context produced the great thinkers and problem solvers that were well suited to cultures and geographies of Native peoples. Though these systems have since been disrupted, Native knowledge is resilient and continues to provide theories, methodologies, and philosophies that remain relevant. Within this context, this brief explores ways in which state education agencies, local education agencies, tribal education departments, schools, and educator preparation programs can support teachers and leaders to preserve Native culture, knowledge, and language to improve the lives of Native children and youth. Specifically, this brief reviews:

- preparing and recruiting Native teachers and educational leaders;
- developing an Native knowledge educator preparation program curriculum and professional learning for current teachers; and
- certifying tribal speakers and culture experts to teach in schools.

Preparing and Recruiting Native Teachers and Educational Leaders

Establishing Native people as teachers and educational leaders involves complex efforts. Fox (2000) asserts, “A great deal of professional development and reformed teacher preparation programs are required to provide teachers of Indian students with the skills necessary to meet the new standards” (p. 10). Measures include increasing the representation of Native teachers and leaders in schools and districts that serve Native students, and providing training in culturally responsive curricula and pedagogy. In addition, White, Bedonie, de Groat, Lockard, and Honani (2007) note the need to increase interest in entering education careers for Native students, as “many students of color are attracted to fields outside of education where recruiting is more effective, and where monetary rewards and prestige are higher” (p. 72).

Preparing Native Educators and Leaders

Castagno (2012) discusses tribal critical race theory to make sense of particular efforts in Native education (p. 3). She points out a clear need to prepare Native teachers and leaders to share Native knowledge against a backdrop of colonialization and assimilation. Castagno (2012) notes that federally funded Native teacher preparation programs housed at predominantly white universities require significant work to ensure they are advancing tribal sovereignty and self-determination (p. 3).

Recommendations for institutional systematic reform (Castagno, 2012, pp. 16-17):

- “Prepare Indigenous teachers with culturally responsive curricula driven by the goal of self-determination and centered around Indigenous knowledge systems;
- Provide programs that “are led and directed by Indigenous faculty and community members; and
- Provide programs that “are supported with hard-money funding sources.”

Recruiting Native Educational Leaders

Similarly, more focus is needed on programs to recruit Native educational leaders. As many scholars note, the presence of Native role models in a school has a significant impact on Native youth’s academic achievement and college and career readiness. For example, Christman, Guillory, Fairbanks, and Gonzalez (2008) state, “Currently, some American Indian children in the state of New Mexico likely will go through the entire public school system without ever having an American Indian administrator” (p. 56), which has implications for these children’s futures. Existing teacher and leader preparation programs for Native educators can provide models for others and opportunities for further research. The following programs have shown promise for preparing Native educational leaders.¹

¹ Many factors when considered in determining which programs to include, to ensure this brief provides a variety of resources that are representative of the diversity of American Indians and Alaska Natives. This brief focuses on

Hopi Teachers for Hopi Schools

White et. al. (2007) recommend programs that focus on increasing the number of culturally responsive Native teachers through tribal-university partnerships and evaluating what is working within those programs (pp. 72-73). The authors discuss Hopi Teachers for Hopi Schools (HTHS), a program formed from a partnership among Northern Arizona University, the Hopi Division of Education, the Hopi Jr./Sr. High School Board, and Northland Pioneer College that aims to train teachers to implement collaborative, culturally respectful teaching approaches. HTHS is one of hundreds of programs that have been funded through the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Indian Education’s Professional Development grant program (<https://www2.ed.gov/programs/indianprofdev/index.html>) This program was designed to prepare and train Native students to serve as teachers and school administrators. It is an elementary-level program that nurtures “‘teacher-scholars’ whose practice is based on critical and reflective inquiry and who recognize, understand, and effectively negotiate the complexities of multiple cultural communities in constant pursuit of educational practices to maximize all children’s learning and development” (White et. al, 2007, p. 74). To strengthen their initial plan, the collaborators included red pedagogy into the university coursework.

The commitments of red pedagogy (White et. al, 2007, p. 76):

- “the quest for sovereignty and the dismantling of global capitalism as its political focus;
- “Indigenous knowledge as its epistemological foundation;
- “the Earth as its spiritual center; and
- “tribal and traditional ways of life as its sociocultural frame of reference.”

This program featured multiple summer institutes where program participants and the mentor teachers shared their work with national and international educators, supported three Diné dual language workshops annually (p. 78), and made it possible for participants to successfully complete their degrees.

The AILP Program

The Pennsylvania State University (PSU) American Indian Leadership Program (AILP) is “the nation’s longest continuously operating educational leadership program for American Indians and Alaska Natives [AI/ANs] (<https://ed.psu.edu/eps/edldr/ailp>). Since 1970, the AILP has graduated nearly 215 American Indian/Alaska Native students. These graduates have earned master’s and doctoral degrees in educational administration/leadership and special education and have gone on to assume leadership positions at a variety of levels.” (Penn State College of Education, n.d.).

programs that are specific to Native populations that have demonstrated success. Only programs from trusted and known sources are included.

The MAISA Program

Through the Model of American Indian School Administrators (MAISA) program, Native students earn master's degrees to become licensed school principals and educational leaders. Christman et al. (2008) assert that the MAISA program may reduce high turnover rates among administrators in public schools with significant Native populations, as Native education leaders may have higher vested interest in Native communities, serve only in a symbolic capacity providing no real leadership to faculty or students, may be near retirement, and who often leave after serving a year or less. Often, this lack of consistent leadership leaves these schools and school districts in disarray and affects faculty morale, reinforcing the implication that these schools are not worth the time and effort. (p. 56)

Additionally, the MAISA program offers courses "at locations convenient to the students via interactive television and on-site, face-to-face instruction from university faculty. In the summers during the program, students enrolled full-time at the main campus, taking nine hours each summer with face to-face instruction" (Christman et al, 2008). Program components included "university coursework, field-based experiences, tribal mentorship, and professional development throughout the program, including a final year of induction. Coursework revolved around four components: school context; curriculum and instruction using a Native paradigm; culture and language; and assessment" (p. 59). Upon successful completion of the MAISA program, students receive a Master of Arts in educational administration.

Indian Leadership Education and Development Project

A third educational leadership program is the Indian Leadership Education and Development project (I LEAD) at Little Bighorn Tribal College and Montana State University (<https://www.montana.edu/education/ilead/>). As a result of the I LEAD program, Henderson, Ruff, and Carjuzaa (2015) note that the number of Native school leaders in Montana increased from 12 in 2006 (p. 77), to over 70 by 2015 (p. 75). The authors explain that I LEAD began "as a school improvement project slowing the revolving door of school leaders, especially in Indian country, enough for school improvement efforts to be implemented and providing educational access to graduate education for educators living in remote communities" (Henderson et al., 2015, p. 75). However, the authors shared their realization that, for I LEAD to successfully support their students and the schools serving them, it needed a shared vision. I LEAD now has "a vision for social justice and this shared vision is deeply embedded into the fabric of the larger context of the Educational Leadership program" (Henderson et al., 2015, p. 82).



I LEAD participants work to complete master’s degrees in educational leadership and participate in semi-annual retreats featuring prominent Native scholars and leaders. These retreats are designed to “facilitate essential and deep understanding of the educational leadership issues of American Indian communities” (Henderson et al., 2015, pp. 83-84). Through I LEAD, each candidate learns:

- about the inherent complexities and contradictions between American schooling as deculturalizing and the policy of self-determination for Native communities;
- how to reconcile the conflict between cultural identity and assimilation pressures in schools with being accountable for the requirements of Every Student Succeeds Act; and
- how to create a climate within school systems that enhances and celebrates all students’ identities and achievements (Henderson et al., 2015, pp. 83-84).

Knowledge of Native Culture and History in All Teacher Preparation

It is important that all teachers of Native students receive training in Native culture and history. There is much discussion over how to effectively develop these preparation programs so teachers can better meet the needs of their students and have meaningful interactions with them. According to Jacob et al. (2018), “public schools must recognize and support the rights of children to maintain Indigenous Knowledges” (p. 160). They use the plural to emphasize the wide diversity of Native knowledge systems across and within communities. Jacob et al (2018) explain that knowledge systems can “generate new visions and practices of public education,” (p. 158). The authors suggest, “Indigenous Knowledges are also resources that can educate and enrich all students, as well as society, more broadly” (p. 160).

“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.”
(Jacob et al, 2018, p. 161)

Social Justice through Education

Writer (2008) discusses the multicultural education (MCE) movement, which she says exists within a continuum between superficial and social justice approaches (p. 4). She asserts that the MCE movement “promised much and delivered little because it was often presented and practiced superficially” (p. 4). However, educators who aim for the social justice side of the continuum may truly address the impact of colonization on Native students and their communities (p. 11). Teacher preparation programs that focus on social justice through MCE can help teachers address damaging silences, inaccuracies, and stereotypes for Native communities.

The careful preparation of pre-service and in-service teachers within a MCE as social justice framework promises to extend a deepened and socially just education to students...and ultimately our citizenry. Teachers in the field must be challenged within their professional development to teach appropriate and accurate representations of Indigenous Peoples. The ripples from this have potential to eventually affect public policy and public practice. (Writer, 2008, p. 8)

Principles for Effective Culture-based Education Programs

Demmert (2011) writes of integrating the Center for Research on Education’s Diversity & Excellence (CREDE) standards for effective pedagogy into culturally based education (CBE).

The seven CREDE principles (Demmert, 2011):

- **Teachers and students work together**—Provide joint productive activities.
- **Develop language and literacy across the curriculum**—Develop the languages of instruction and the content areas, which is the meta-goal of all instruction.
- **Connect lessons to students’ lives**—Contextualize teaching and curriculum in students’ existing home, community, and school experiences.
- **Engage students with challenging lessons**—Maintain challenging standards for student performance; design activities to advance understanding to more complex levels.
- **Emphasize dialogue over lectures**—Instruct through teacher-student dialogue, especially through academic, goal-directed, small-group conversations (known as instructional conversations), rather than lectures.
- **Learn through observation**—Provide demonstration or models of requested performance.
- **Encourage student decision making**—Involve students in the choice or design of instructional activities.

Additionally, Demmert et al (2014) provide a set of Native CBE rubrics, which are discussed more fully in the Native Culture and Language brief as part of this project.

Place-based Literacy

On place-based literacy, Mendoza (2017) explains the importance of teacher education programs that emphasize place rather than a distributed community (p. 413). She explains that teacher education students learn about literacy from primarily two dominant perspectives, one being that “literacy across the curriculum necessarily involves socializing students into talking and writing to some extent like scientists, historians, and literary critics” (p. 413). The other is focused on “the importance of training students to be effective communicators in an increasingly globalized, digital world” (p. 413). Mendoza (2017) asserts that these perspectives “tend to deemphasize the notion of place while emphasizing the notion of a distributed community” (p. 413).

To counter these perspectives, Mendoza draws on the Canadian “method of qualitative inquiry called *métissage* to disrupt the traditional dichotomy between First Nations and white colonials” (p. 414). Mendoza (2017) explains that the term *métissage* has been defined as “the mixing of cultural identities in Canada because of colonialism and transcultural influences” (p. 414). She compares *métissage* with the concept of “the third space” (p. 414). She uses this method in her teacher education classes to encourage students to engage in dialogue that leads them “to question official narratives that present white, middle class experiences as universal or present different demographic groups as belonging to discrete categories” (p. 414).

Native Knowledge 360° and Statewide Efforts

As an example of how to integrate Native knowledge systems across the curriculum, Jacob et al (2018) suggest the National Museum of the American Indian's (NMAI) Native Knowledge 360°: Framework for Essential Understandings about American Indians project (<https://americanindian.si.edu/nk360/understandings.cshtml>). "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'" (p. 163).

The authors also provide summaries of statewide Indian education efforts to include Native knowledges in schools of the following states: Hawaii, Alaska, Montana, North Dakota, Oregon, South Dakota, Washington, and Wyoming.

Development of Culturally Responsive Skills

Lansing (2014) suggests that tribal colleges and universities "have the potential to develop programs that look at the unique skill sets needed for teachers who are culturally responsive to the needs of Native children. This includes a mindset that values the perpetuation of Native language and culture and cultivates teachers who will serve as nation builders" (p. 26). The Safety Zone Theory (SZT) put forth by K. Tsianina Lomawaima and Teresa McCarty, asserts that there are domains where this mindset will flourish, and Native and non-Native teachers alike will value the perpetuation of Native language and culture.

One such study focused on a paradigm shift from mainstream praxis in teacher education to SZT and its impact on teachers of Native students (Lansing, 2014). Southwestern Indian Polytechnic Institute's (SIPI) reimagined its early childhood education (ECE) program and "strengthened its practices across the disciplines, activating the central role of Native language, culture, and partnerships to enhance teacher training and practice" (p. 29) (<https://www.sipi.edu/apps/pages/ECE>). Based on a pilot implementation of the SZT, SIPI has built in opportunities for students to think critically about possible domains where cultural differences are valued and embraced.

State Legislation

Henderson, et al. note that due to the low numbers of Native teachers in Montana, Native students are unlikely to have an Native teacher, no matter which school they attend (p. 77). Henderson et al. (2015) say what is important, "is the willingness of educators to engage in the demanding, but often profound, endeavor of becoming culturally responsive" (p. 79). The authors cite the impact of state legislation on teacher preparation in Montana.

The Montana Indian Education for All (IEFA) Act mandates that educators integrate Native content into the curriculum and instruction across all content areas and grade levels. Henderson et al. (2015) explain that "Montana educators have legal, instructional, and ethical obligations to teach all Montanans, Indians and non-Indians alike, about the unique histories and cultures of the state's first inhabitants" (p. 78). The authors suggest that the "growing success of this unique legislation has depended on

adequate funding, collaboration with tribal partners, active state leadership, and a long-term commitment to professional development” (p. 79).

Accompanying the IEFA Act is Montana Code Annotated 20-9-33 for Native academic achievement. This law provides funding toward efforts to close the achievement gap between Native and non-Native students (p. 76).

Native Community Partners

Lees (2016) presents the need for research that adequately examines “the roles and perceptions of community partners as stakeholders in teacher education” (p. 365), noting that the research clearly shows the need to improve teacher education to meet the needs of Native students. Approximately 20% of Native students live in urban areas (Lees, 2016, p. 364). The author points out that “these students live in communities and attend schools that have higher poverty rates than their Anglo counterparts and are primarily served by non-Indigenous teachers with little to no preparation around Indigenous education” (p. 364). Further, Lees (2016) asserts that “few teachers enter classrooms prepared to meet the unique needs of tribally diverse Indigenous students, resulting in a continuation of poor educational experiences and low academic success” (p. 365).

Lees (2016) explored a community–university partnership between the Kateri Center of Chicago (an Native community organization) and the Teaching, Learning, and Leading With Schools and Communities teacher preparation program at Loyola University Chicago. “The study examined the roles of indigenous community partners as co-teacher educators working to better prepare teachers for the needs of urban Indigenous children and communities” (p. 363). The case study identified three themes in the partnership that support the needs of urban Native students and their teachers: “experiences with Native peoples, professional development, and community” (Lees, 2016, p. 374). The author suggests, “Each of these themes advanced the conversations around the perceptions and roles of Indigenous communities as sovereign stakeholders committed to decolonization in primarily non-Indigenous teacher preparation” (p. 374).

Korteweg and Fiddler (2019) offer a perspective from Canada related to challenges of settler teacher education, “such as exposing the legacies of colonialism in education, cultural harms and systemic racism in curriculum, and ongoing ignorance as entitlement by teachers” (p. 254). The authors also share their perspectives on “the complexities of methods for improving respectful relationality with Indigenous students and community” (p. 254). Korteweg and Fiddler (2019) point out that the Canadian Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) “stipulated that transformed education systems are needed to address the academic success of Indigenous students first, while also moving mainstream or ‘settlerstream’... Canada towards reconciliation by addressing the mass ‘cultivated ignorance’ ... of generations of school children” (p. 255).

Elements of Korteweg and Fiddler's (2019) teacher education course:

- “Cultural experiences in indigenous community settings or indigenous dominant spaces for learning (settler) cultural humility;
- “Outdoor classes that were purposefully sequenced to demonstrate Land as first teacher ... or land-as-pedagogy;
- “Service learning in indigenous education contexts or indigenous focused classrooms (36–40 hours);
- “Regular sharing circles in our classes that allowed the TCs to process affective or emotionally charged responses while witnessing instructors’ and peers’ articulations of epistemological shifts, critical moments of personal awareness, and reflexive applications to their daily lives.” (pp. 258-259)

The authors also made a conscious effort to have the students “engage with first-person voices or representations by Indigenous writers, leaders, role models, artists, scholars, knowledge holders or keepers, families, and Elders” (p. 259).

Certification of Tribal Speakers and Culture Experts to Teach

In a pre-colonial context, Native knowledge systems were immersed in the languages and cultures of the Native peoples of North America. As explained in a separate brief on Native Culture and Language, many of these Native languages are now endangered largely due to the assimilationist policies of the United States. Regardless of the status of each tribe’s Native language, all tribes share a concern for their language’s survival.

Warhol (2012) explains that since the passage of the Native American Languages Act (NALA) in 1990, “Native communities throughout the U.S. have created myriad programs to maintain and revitalize their languages. Current language and education policy for American Indians, Alaska Natives and Native Hawaiians, though, remains highly complex and contradictory” (p. 70). The author goes on to say that “while federal policies such as NALA support the revitalization and the rights of Native peoples to use and maintain their languages, other federal and state policies maintain an emphasis on English and assimilation” (pp. 70-71).

Warhol (2012) also explains that “amidst pervasive English-only policies at the federal and state levels, the Esther Martinez Native American Languages Preservation Act, passed late in 2006, continues to build on the foundation laid down by NALA. This legislation creates an additional grant program administered by the Administration for Native Americans (ANA) specifically for Native-language nests and immersion survival schools” (p. 71) (<https://www.acf.hhs.gov/ana/resource/native-languages-immersion-esther-martinez-initiative>). Further, the U.S. Department of Education’s Native American Language Program supports schools that use Native languages as the primary language of instruction; maintain, protect, and promote the rights and freedom of Native people to use, practice, maintain, and revitalize their

languages; and support efforts to maintain and revitalize the languages and cultures (<https://oese.ed.gov/offices/office-of-indian-education/native-american-language-program/>).

Funding for Cultural Programming

Many schools across the United States have received federal funding for Native language and culture under the Indian Education Act of 1972 to support the cultural programming. Some schools on or near tribal reservations also receive Johnson O'Malley funds and Impact Aid funds from the federal government that can be used to further enhance these programs. This programming allows Native language and culture experts that have not completed a teacher education program to work in public schools as paraprofessionals; however, conditions are not always ideal. These experts are:

- not always actual experts in the Native languages and cultures;
- severely underpaid for their work;
- not seen as legitimate teachers by other teachers;
- not required to meet any particular standards;
- not always accountable to any particular tribe (unless a tribe is involved in the grant);
- not always required to have any background or educational experience in Native education; and
- often temporary, part-time employees with little promise of continued employment.

State Support

Teaching and learning Native knowledge and language has the potential to be a positive influence on student engagement, interest, and academic achievement; however, the effort of integrating Native languages and cultures in the education system has been primarily led by a small number of educators. Recently, states have begun passing education laws that provide the level of recognition deserved by Native language and culture teachers. Notable examples include Montana, Michigan, and South Dakota. These examples demonstrate the ability of the language and culture certification process to take hold and expand in areas, as well as the willingness of educational institutions to adopt new programs.

Montana

Montana has a Class 7 certification process for Native language and culture teachers, which requires “verification by the authorized representative of a tribal government, that has a memorandum of understanding with the Superintendent of Public Instruction, that the applicant has met tribal standards for competency and fluency as a requisite for teaching that language and culture” (Montana Office of Public Instruction, 2020). Littlebear (1997) explains that all of the tribes in Montana “testified that only each tribe has the knowledge and resources to address its own language and cultural situation and that diverse language teaching approaches were desirable.” Littlebear (1997) says that the Class 7 process “has enabled the tribes to develop curriculum and strategies to promote their languages and to assure their viability” (p. 1), though implementation was slow. The author explains that:

Most are taking language instruction into the classroom for the first time. Not all tribes have dictionaries or books in their language; some have not decided whether they want to teach it as an oral language or as a literacy language. They must decide which dialects will be used, whether they will standardize their orthography (writing system), who will

teach it, and how the teaching methods will be evaluated in the classroom.” (Littlebear, 1997)

Michigan

In 2011, Michigan adopted Standards for the Preparation of Teachers of Anishinaabemowin Language & Culture. The standards “are the result of efforts by language and curriculum experts at the University of Michigan and members of the Michigan Anishinaabemowin Inc., a group comprised of tribal leaders and educators” (Michigan Department of Education, 2011, p. 2). According to the state:

“The standards are designed to align with the K-12 content standards in the Michigan Curriculum Framework, as well as national standards from the American Council for the Teachers of Foreign Languages, National Association for Bilingual Education, and Teachers of Second Language Learners. Additionally, the standards are such that they support efficient instruction that leads to the high level of proficiency required to develop the fluency necessary for this language to be taught for world language credit.” (Michigan Department of Education, 2011, p. 2)

In spite of the efforts to develop the Anishinaabemowin Language & Culture standards, only two teachers have received certification to teach Anishinaabemowin at a public school in Michigan. Both of the teachers were recognized by their tribal governments as being qualified to teach Anishinaabemowin language and culture and were qualified to teach another subject prior to their Anishinaabemowin certification.

Additionally, Northern Michigan University (NMU) and Bay Mills Community College (BMCC) (a tribal college in Michigan) are currently working with the state to implement an Anishinaabemowin Teacher Preparation and Certification partnership. In this partnership, teacher education students will complete their Anishinaabemowin immersion experience at BMCC and their teacher education program at NMU. Students will also complete a Native American Education certification program that is endorsed by the Tribal Education Departments National Assembly as part of their coursework while at NMU through the Center for Native American Studies.

South Dakota

In South Dakota, teachers of Lakota, Dakota, and Nakota language and culture can apply for a permit from the South Dakota Department of Education to teach without a teaching degree. Teachers are limited to seven approved Lakota language and culture courses.

South Dakota's Lakota language and culture teacher permit requirements (South Dakota Department of Education, 2019):

- demonstrate knowledge of Lakota, Dakota, Nakota culture;
- demonstrate proficiency in the oral and written language;
- complete an approved suicide awareness and prevention training;
- complete a 3-hour methodology course directly related to teaching the language and culture;
- be recommended for licensure by a regionally accredited institution of higher education offering a teacher education program in Lakota studies; and
- be recommended for licensure to teach the oral and written language and culture by an Native language board or similar organization recognized by a tribal government.

Lowrey (2019) cites the following successes of this effort:

“More school districts across the state have begun to implement pieces of the Oceti Sakowin Essential Understandings, a set of educational standards that seek to encourage schools to incorporate Lakota language, culture and history into everyday lessons. Lakota-language classes have been popping up in schools around the state as well. In majority-Native districts such as Oglala Lakota County, teachers have started Lakota immersion classrooms, which teach all their lessons in the Lakota language” (p. 1).

References

- Castagno, A. (2012). They prepared me to be a teacher, but not a culturally responsive Navajo teacher for Navajo kids: A tribal critical race theory analysis of an indigenous teacher preparation program. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 51(1), pp. 3-21. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/43608618>
- Christman, D., Guillory, R., Fairbanks, A., & González, M. (2008). A model of American Indian school administrators: Completing the circle of knowledge in Native schools. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 47(3). pp. 53-72. Retrieved from www.jstor.org/stable/24398768
- Demmert, W. (2011). What is culture-based education? Understanding pedagogy and curriculum. In J. Reyhner, W. Sakiestewa, G. Louise Lockard (Eds.), *Honoring Our Heritage: Culturally Appropriate Approaches for Teaching Indigenous Students* (pp. 1-9). Retrieved from <http://jan.ucc.nau.edu/~jar/HOH/Honoring.pdf#page=13>
- Fox, S. (2000). Standards-based reform and American Indian/Alaska Native education. Paper presented at the American Indian and Alaska Native Education Research Agenda Conference, Albuquerque, NM. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED455039.pdf>

Henderson, D., Ruff, W., & Carjuzaa, J. (2015). Social Justice Leadership for American Indian Sovereignty: A model for principal preparation. *Journal of Education and Social Justice*, 4(1), pp. 75-91. Retrieved from <https://scholarworks.montana.edu/xmlui/handle/1/14892>

Jacob, M., Sabzalian, L., Jansen, J., Tobin, T., Vincent, C., & LaChance, M. (2018). The gift of education: How indigenous knowledge can transform the future of public education. *International Journal of Multicultural Education*, 20(1), pp. 157-185. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1173732.pdf>

Korteweg, L., & Fiddler, T. (2019). Unlearning colonial identities while engaging in relationality: Settler teachers' education-as-reconciliation. *McGill Journal of Education*, 53(2), pp. 254-275. Retrieved from <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1058397ar>

Lansing, D. (2014). Preparing teachers to contribute to educational change in Native communities: Navigating safety zones in praxis. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 53(3), pp. 25-41. Retrieved from www.jstor.org/stable/43608729

Lees, A. (2016). Roles of Urban indigenous community members in collaborative field-based teacher preparation. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 67(5), pp. 363-378. Retrieved from <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/0022487116668018>

Littlebear, R. (1997). Montana adopts landmark language certification process. *Tribal College Journal of American Indian Higher Education*, 9(2). Retrieved from <https://tribalcollegejournal.org/montana-adopts-landmark-language-certification-process/>

Lowrey, N. (2019). Native American students left behind by S.D. education system. *Argus Leader*. Retrieved from <https://www.argusleader.com/story/news/education/2019/11/22/native-american-students-left-behind-south-dakota-education-system/4269896002/>

Mendoza, A. (2017). Preparing preservice educators to teach critical, place-based literacies. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 61(4), pp. 413-420. Retrieved from <https://ila.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/jaal.708>

Michigan Department of Education. (2011). *Standards for the Preparation of Teachers of Anishinaabemowin Language & Culture (FN)*. Retrieved from https://www.michigan.gov/documents/mde/Anishinaabemowin_Standards_553938_7.pdf

Montana Office of Public Instruction. (n.d.). *Requirements for Montana Class 7 Native American Language and Culture Educator Licensure*. Retrieved from <https://opi.mt.gov/Class7NALC>

Penn State College of Education. (n.d.). *American Indian Education Research Center Established at Penn State*. Retrieved from <https://ed.psu.edu/news/news-items-folder/american-indian-center>

South Dakota Department of Education. (2019). *Native American Lakota, Dakota, Nakota Language and Culture Permit*. Retrieved from <https://doe.sd.gov/certification/documents/NA-Language.pdf>

Warhol, L. (2012). Legacies of NALA: The Esther Martinez Native American Languages Preservation Act and implications for language revitalization policy and practice. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 51(3), pp. 70-91. Retrieved from www.jstor.org/stable/43608638

White, C., Bedonie, C., De Groat, J., Lockard, L., & Honani, S. (2007). A bridge for our children: Tribal/university partnerships to prepare indigenous teachers. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 34(4), pp. 71-86. Retrieved from www.jstor.org/stable/23479112

Writer, J. (2008). Unmasking, exposing, and confronting: Critical race theory, tribal critical race theory and multicultural education. *International Journal of Multicultural Education*. 10(4), pp. 1-15. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.18251/ijme.v10i2.137>