

# Reinvigorating the Teaching of the Civil Rights Movement

## The Praxis Project

CASKEY RUSSELL, FRANCISCO RIOS,  
MARGARET ZAMUDIO, & JACQUELYN BRIDGEMAN  
*University of Wyoming*

### Abstract

This article explores the work and findings of the Praxis Project: a group of university educators who worked with elementary and secondary school teachers in a professional development setting to reinvigorate their civil rights pedagogy. The Praxis group created a *Six Category Model for Teaching Civil Rights* and used that model as a foundation for discussions, presentations, and debate during the professional development sessions. The Praxis Project also implemented the pedagogy of that model in a classroom setting for a group of high school students under the observation of their teachers. The professional development sessions created a three-way dialogue between the Praxis group, the educators, and students that highlighted the obstacles and the opportunities of teaching the civil rights movement in the current educational climate.

There is no such thing as a *neutral* educational process. Education either functions as an instrument which is used to facilitate the integration of the younger generation into the logic of the present system and bring conformity to it, or it becomes the practice of freedom—the means by which men and women deal critically and creatively with reality and discover how to participate in the transformation of their world.

—Richard Shuall's Forward to Paula Freire's  
*Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, 1998, p. 16

The writings and teaching of Paulo Freire, the Brazilian educator and activist, have been a critical reminder that education is never neutral. Decisions, about what we learn (curriculum), how we learn (pedagogy), how we assess those learnings (evaluation), and even who can be in classrooms and what languages can be spoken there, are always political. Whether drenched in a politics of control and domination or in a politics of liberation and transformative pedagogies that promote critical thinking, these politics play themselves out in classrooms, schools, and universities across the United States. As we write this, the politics of control and domination drape across the landscape of the American education system.

In the fall of 2005, the authors of this paper were presented with an opportunity to be part of the Western History Coalition's Professional Development Project.<sup>1</sup> While several topics were available to the professional development specialists who were invited to take part in this project, we saw productive opportunities in working with social studies educators in our state (Wyoming) to bring the civil rights movement (CRM) into their classrooms. We named ourselves the Praxis Project and began to formulate a professional development session aimed at reinvigorating civil rights pedagogy in Wyoming at the elementary and secondary levels.<sup>2</sup> We assumed the educators<sup>3</sup> with whom we would be working already had some knowledge and curricular materials related to the CRM, and thus our task would be one of pedagogy *reinvigoration*. We found that, in thinking about how to reinvigorate civil rights pedagogy, we were also forced to critically think about the construction of a communal transformative pedagogy that could promote critical thinking and, perhaps, Freireian-style liberation through education. This article will detail the Praxis Project's work, from its inception up through its presentations and findings. We are hopeful that our work might add to the conversations related to the construction of transformative pedagogies. We also hope that this article can provide, at the very least, a starting point for developing similar applied approaches to teaching the CRM.

## The Project

### *The Team*

The members of the Praxis Project, all professors (i.e., two assistants, one associate and one full) at the same Mountain West university, come from different ethnic backgrounds and represent four different academic departments. The group's diversity and differing areas of academic expertise brought a variety of perspectives to the project. This diversity was especially beneficial in that the members could rely on one another to fill in gaps in knowledge and theory.

JB, professor at the College of Law and adjunct in African American Studies, specializes in employment law, family law, and torts, as well as African Americans and the American legal system. CR is a professor of English and

American Indian Studies whose expertise is in postcolonial theory and the deconstruction of stereotypes. MZ is a professor of Sociology and Chicano Studies, whose expertise is in race, class, gender theory, as well as immigration and labor issues. FR, a professor in education, specializes in multicultural education, bilingual, and second language learning, as well as Latinos/Chicanos in education.

### ***The Conceptual Framework: Informing the Curriculum***

During our first meeting, we decided it was necessary to approach reinvigorating the teaching of the CRM at a very fundamental level by keeping in mind one salient question: What should high school students know about the CRM (recognizing, as we did, that the ultimate beneficiary of any professional development work should be students)? In answering that question, several key concepts kept recurring throughout our initial discussions, which were informed by the professional literature. Those main concepts in turn became the basis for what we called our *Six Category Model for Teaching Civil Rights*. Taking each of these categories in turn, one may discern the nature of the Praxis Project's research and learning regarding civil rights pedagogy.

***The co-opted language of the CRM.*** This category arose after each member of the Praxis Project expressed dismay at how certain words and phrases important to the civil rights movement had been co-opted by political groups whose agendas appeared to us retrogressive in terms of advancing civil rights and social justice. The equating of Affirmative Action with "quotas" and "reverse racism" is an example of such co-option.<sup>4</sup> The attempt to control language, especially emotionally-charged slogans and terms, is always political; and educators interested in civil rights and social justice need to be ever vigilant about such co-option, and students must be made aware of how co-option functions (Crawford, 1999; Lindholm-Leary, 2001).

***What is race?*** This question arose early in our discussions and persisted throughout. Every member of the group wanted high school students to understand the social constructedness of race. Though the biological difference between people is infinitesimal, especially in regard to skin color, the social constructions behind race have created an American society that perceives these contrived racial categories to be natural, biological facts (Haney-Lopez, 1994; Omi & Winant, 1986). The artifice of these social constructions is so well-hidden (which is why they are taken to be fact) behind decades of stereotypes, rationale, and institutional support, the group determined it imperative that high school students learn to deconstruct the artifice (Eagleton, 1983).

***Issues of land and labor.*** This is arguably the most important category for the various ethnic groups represented by the Praxis Project (i.e., African American,

Chicano/Latino, American Indian) as much of the civil rights struggles of these groups derive from issues of land and labor (Blackburn, 1997; Cornell, 1988; Hurtado, 1990). This topic works as an organizational concept that educators, at every level, can use in their classrooms to address civil rights and social justice issues. Furthermore, the topic extends beyond the different races represented by the Praxis team. Classroom discussion about the social justice struggles of many groups (Irish, Asian, Italian, etc.) can be organized around issues of land and labor.

***Civil rights legacy: The past tied to the present.*** All members of the Praxis Project recognized the need to take the CRM out of the limiting time frame of the 1950s and 1960s and limiting context of the American South. Students must connect civil rights *movements* throughout history up into the 21<sup>st</sup> century, and push beyond the geographical confines of the American South (CCTHITA, 1991; Josephy, Nagel, & Johnson, 1999; Loewen, 1993; Sullivan & Martin, 2000; Zinn, 1999).

***How do we think critically and act politically?*** Throughout the process of preparing for the professional development session, we felt the need to impart not only strategies that aid in developing critical thinking, but the imperative for acting politically in the cause of civil rights and social justice (hooks, 1994). How could the group help overcome the apathy and feeling of futility that are often a reaction to exhortations to become politically active? To put it bluntly, students must be shown, by example, that there comes a time to put down the pens and pick up the protest signs (Freire, 2000).

***Violent versus non-violent forms of activism.*** We realized that these two forms of activism and the questions they raised were present in each ethnic groups' own civil rights struggle. The most obvious example of the violent/nonviolent dichotomy of course is Dr. King's view of nonviolent resistance versus Malcolm X's more confrontational approach to civil rights, and there are examples of this dichotomy within every activist group struggling for civil rights and social justice.<sup>5</sup> However, students must understand that viewing activism as a binary precludes the understanding of how the two factions can work together toward the same ends and that they are indeed not mutually exclusive (Weaver, 2007, pp. 248–249).

### ***The Pedagogy***

Regarding the pedagogy of the professional development session, we wanted to extend the depth of knowledge the educator participants had about the CRM. Clearly, the depth of content knowledge educators bring to the classroom is an overriding concern in teacher education; indeed, much of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) federal reform focuses on increasing content knowledge in the

academic disciplines.<sup>6</sup> We also wanted our project balanced with some student-centered, active-oriented teaching, and we wanted the participants to learn as much from the content as they would from the pedagogy. Thus we were determined to make our presentations both academic and practical.

In an attempt to pursue a pedagogy of liberation, it was also essential that we recognize the dialectical process of learning: that is, while playing the role of teachers, we are also learners. It is in this posture of teachers in dialogue with students that learning, the central focus of education, can be an outcome for both teacher and student. As Doyle (1993) describes:

Teaching is not a position where you ever arrive. The first contested ground for transformation must always be the teachers' own knowledge. There is transformation, or at least freedom, in accepting the dialectical nature of teaching and learning. (p. 61)

Thus, a critical part of this project was to document our own learning as well as that of the educators with whom we worked.

Lastly, we wanted to make the experience as authentic as possible so we worked with the Western History Project Coordinator to extend our professional development session to include a second day so we could also work with local high school students and, for the educators, model CRM pedagogy in a classroom setting. This would allow the educators to observe how students responded to our presentations and to learn from our mistakes.

In advance of the actual professional development, we created a functional yet flexible professional development agenda<sup>7</sup> and asked two local high school teachers to meet with us and observe our presentation(s) of the material and go over our expectations and goals. These teachers offered invaluable feedback and suggestions that the group incorporated.

With our pedagogy and presentations complete, a date and location was selected for our professional development session.

### ***The Professional Development Sessions***

***Session one (The educators).*** In determining the structure for the first day in which the group would work solely with educators, we decided that the most prominent aspect would be presentation of the Six Category Model, and we wanted ample time as well for the educators to share what they already knew about teaching civil rights, address concerns, and consider new ideas regarding civil rights pedagogy.

We created a K.W.C.L. chart to be handed out at the beginning of the session. The acronym stood for: What do you **K**now about the civil rights movement? What do you **W**ant to learn about civil rights? What **C**oncerns do you have in teaching civil rights? In the end, what did you **L**earn? We wouldn't review these charts immediately; rather, we set aside a large amount of time at the end of the

session to review the K.W.C.L. charts knowing that they would provide a forum for open discussion with the educators. Any concerns not addressed during the session could be brought out and discussed during this time using the K.W.C.L. as a starting point.

We also created a series of provocative statements, placed into “anticipatory guides,” which were addressed in written form by the educators. The goal of these provocative statements was to force the educators to use what they had learned during the session and address any misperceptions raised by the statements. Each Praxis Project member came up with three provocative statements to be handed out at the beginning and then again at the end of the session to assess how well the educators understood the information we presented. An example statement would be: The gains made in the civil rights movement came from the benevolence of the U.S. government. We hoped the educators, by the end of the session, would be able to realize the error in such statements.

The main focus of our time with the educators would revolve around a panel discussion of the Six Category Model. We coordinated it so each Praxis member would lead the discussion on the same category he or she would be presenting to the students during session two. Lastly, we wanted to bridge the two sessions and bring the educators into dialogue with the students. So, at the very end of the first session, we decided to ask each educator to write on a note card his or her response to the following prompt: “Dear Students: You have the responsibility to help create a more democratic and socially just society. We need you to . . .”. We would also inform the educators that their answers would be shared with the students in session two.

*Session two (The students).* Though we as a group were relatively comfortable with the prospect of working with high school teachers, we were confronted with what, for university professors, was a frightening realization: How to make this knowledge accessible for high school students. Utilizing our Six Category Model, the group assigned individual members the task of creating teaching presentations for the high school students using one or more of those six categories as the main theme(s).

The presentations were designed around each individual’s area of expertise. The general pedagogical model was to be broken down into four sections: An introduction, a lecturette, an activity, and a review. “Lecturette” is a term the Project used to describe a truncated lecture (i.e., shortened to focus on the “essence” of the ideas to be shared) aimed at keeping the interest and attention of high school students. The activities would take off from and enhance the information presented in the lecturette and were derived, either directly or indirectly, from Menkart, Murray, and View’s (2004) text *Putting the Movement Back Into Civil Rights Teaching*.<sup>8</sup>

Lastly, we would end session two by giving the students the note cards with the educators’ responses to the written prompt. We would then ask the students

to respond to a similar prompt: “Dear Teacher: We young people need your help in creating a more democratic and socially just society. You can help us by . . .”.

### ***Data Sources and Findings***

Multiple data sources exist to uncover how the participants experienced the professional development as described. We have our own discussion notes and online journal entries (J). We have the charts the educators (CE) and students (CS) produced during various activities. We have the anticipatory guides (AG) the educators completed. We have session evaluations (E) done by the educators. Finally, we have the educator/student note cards (NC), which correspond to the aforementioned written prompts.

To narrow the search through the completed data set, we looked to answer two specific questions relating to what was learned: What were the central learnings participants gained from the professional development project (primary data source—E) and what was the impact of the professional development project on the teaching team (primary data source—J)? To analyze this data, we initially employed an emergent, grounded theory approach (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). As our initial examination was anchored in the specific data sets, we asked ourselves, “What is in this material” (Strauss & Corbin, 1998, p. 59)? We identified each of the themes that emerged from the analysis and examined their range. In our analysis we noted repeated patterns, identified categories, and conditions within the data. We mapped the data back to these themes for final definition and clarification. We now share and explain the emergent themes identified and anchor them to examples from the data sets.

### ***Educator Learning***

We were heartened to hear what the educators learned as a result of their participation in the professional development sessions. They shared these in a debriefing session at the end of the second day (CE). They also detailed their central learnings in the project director’s session evaluation (E) that was given to and required of all participants.

The educators stated that their knowledge was expanded (CE). Their list of learnings included facts about “people,” “race,” diversity,” and “change.” It also included ideas about the movement related to “democracy, a path not a place,” and that, while there are “multiple perspectives,” the CRM was a “change to benefit all.” It included the social-emotional elements of their learning evident in their language with words such as “struggle,” “awareness,” “empathy,” and “passion.” Finally, they were able to make connections to contemporary society. These were made tangible in their list of words such as “on-going,” “legacy/history,” and “present/relevance.”

At one point during the debrief, one of the educators got up, went to the chart table, and discussed the challenge associated with moving students from a “bystander” role to that of an activist. She suggested that she had learned, while

studying about the holocaust, that 8–10% of Germany’s population were advocating the elimination of Jews while another 3–5% (who the educator labeled “the righteous”) were working to counter this ideology. That meant that the other 85% of German citizens were “bystanders.” She went on to discuss the ways in which educators can play a critical, influential role by moving students out of their “bystander” role toward more of an activist-oriented posture.

In the evaluation of the project (perhaps a more authentic data source since these were written for the project director and given to her at the end of the workshop), the educators, 20 in all, detailed their central learnings by way of prompts that asked: “List three ideas you want students to fully understand about the civil rights movement? Why those three ideas? Why are they important?”

The educators identified 15 key ideas that they learned. The most frequently stated learning is that the CRM still continues today in that there is continuing oppression and acts of resistance (as noted by 17 of the 20 educators who completed the evaluation), an understanding that promotes contemporary opportunities for civil rights activism. One educator (SH) stated, “The CRM is an ongoing process” that is important to understand since “civil rights issues won’t go away until we all take ownership and ‘racism’ is gone.” Another educator (AC) suggested that learning about the CRM promotes a sense of “civic responsibility and possibility for empowerment. A second learning, identified by 11 of the 20 educators, centered on an understanding that the CRM involved many issues and many different cultural groups. Educator PP was clear that “my kids need to understand that ordinary people of all ethnic backgrounds participated in Civil Rights Movement changing local focus on a day to day basis.” VE stated it this way: “Many others were involved in the movement including women and children” and this is important because she “would want them [students] to understand these ideas to dispel myths about the movement and to understand the truth behind the movement.” For JF, this means “that multiple perspectives must be presented.”

The third key learning (for 7 of 20 teachers) dealt with the idea that the CR movement involved many ordinary people and was fundamentally a grassroots movement. DL stated, “This was a grassroots movement” and that this was important to understand because “I hope students develop a critical consciousness.” MO stated it this way: “All people of different genders, age, and socioeconomic background played an important role in the Civil Rights movement. These are important so they have the historically accurate information and also that they could make a difference in their life regarding racism, equality.”

As we know, educators not only learn from what we teach but also how we teach. Thus, the educators also learned from our pedagogy, particularly about activities that were visual or that activated prior knowledge. For example, the use of pictures, used in presentations by CR and MZ, was the one strategy most highly identified by the educators ( $n = 7$ ) on their evaluation forms when asked to explain one pedagogical strategy that they think would be “robust, powerful with respect to teaching the civil rights movement.” JC identifies “using photographs



to have students make predictions about what might be happening at a moment in history. This would be powerful for my students to see a group of ethnically diverse people and have them try to predict what they are doing, etc.” She especially thought photos of CRM activity in Wyoming would be powerful since this “could connect the civil rights with Wyoming history.”

We did a variety of activities that made the participants share their initial understandings (such as sharing stereotypes of a specific social group, think-pair-share, and a cultural pursuit/bingo activity). For example, a cultural pursuit/bingo activity (25 squares with one CRM question listed in each square; participants answered all that they knew, then moved around the room seeking answers from other participants for those items that they did not know/experience) engendered this reaction from one of four educators who identified it as a good pedagogical strategy. AC wrote:

In the Civil Rights Bingo activity, people were all actively engaged—creating relationships so an open and respectful atmosphere was developed. In addition, collective knowledge and experience was shared, opportunities to learn from each other. Many questions allowed for new information to be presented and generating broader interest.

Besides activities that activated prior knowledge, even more positive responses came from activities where we “revisited” prior understandings. Activities such as double circles to have participants share their initial and final understandings about CRM principles and the **Know-Want to Know-Concerns-Learned** charts were examples of such activities. One educator, MC, commented on this latter (KWCL chart) activity:

The idea of having kids express what they already know—then look back and identify what is really fact/fiction. It’s a great teaching approach because it puts kids right where they’re at. They write what they know and it’s easier for them to relate. Capturing the essence (of what they learned) allows them to come away with something concrete instead of being overwhelmed with too much information.

### ***Teaching Team Learnings***

The teaching team (Praxis Project members) as learners also benefited from this workshop. One of the last prompts we asked of each other for our collective journal (J) related to: what we see as the biggest challenges to teaching the CRM, what surprised us about the workshop experience, what we learned, what we would do differently, and where we hoped to go next with this project. Because these journal narratives were long, for space considerations we will only include one member’s reflections on each of these critical learnings from the teaching team.

***Students do want to know about the CRM.*** The high school students expressed a strong desire to learn more about the CRM. Throughout that second day, the students exhorted their teachers to be bolder in the classroom, to teach about civil rights and social justice, even radical political perspectives, and not to worry about offending parents and school boards. The Praxis group realized it is possible that recent political events are setting a stage for even greater student interest in learning about the CRM. This student interest provides a forum for both elementary and secondary teachers to interject civil rights and social justice pedagogies into their classrooms, if they seize that opportunity. FR discussed this in his response to the prompts:

We are, I believe and hope, however at a particularly important moment where there are winds of disaffection which might help in this regard (I think war has that kind of effect on young people who are the ones who get shot at). I think, and we saw it in Casper, that young people do want to learn how people in the 50s and 60s and 70s stood up against the power structures and said “Basta” (enough). I also had it reconfirmed that we need to keep making our lessons active, to open up the “third space” for people to just dialogue about their perceptions, their experiences, and their hopes/dreams as part of an academically robust curriculum.

***Making the topic relevant and teaching it in an active way.*** This relates directly to the previous finding. In examining the data, the group determined the need for more interactive exercises to foster critical thinking, multiple perspective taking, and to allow students to grasp the relevance of the CRM to their own lives. The standard lecture format is no longer effective in dealing with high school students (if indeed it ever was). Students need to see examples of civil rights activism from their own regions, states, and towns. Students must be shown that: (1) men and women from all races have played a part in the CRM; (2) the CRM’s struggles are still ongoing; and (3) every student has a stake in the CRM, be it activism or apathy. JB believes:

... that if the students are given the greater context of American history in which the civil rights movement fits they may see its importance to America (and in several ways the world) generally, and hopefully make the links to things that have meaning to them in the present day. For example, perhaps some of the issues that various groups were trying to address during the movement could be linked to current events such as hurricane Katrina or the rash of protests regarding American immigration policy (or lack thereof) in recent months.

***The disconnect between educators/students.*** Based on several activities within the workshop and discussions, it became apparent that there was broad disconnect between the educators and students. The educators described the

students as disinterested in education and learning, unresponsive to radical ideas and uncritical in thinking. The students described their teachers as boring, timid in the classroom, and uninterested in general toward the contexts in which students today exist. This was by far the Praxis Project's most shocking finding. How we accounted for this disconnect relates in large part to our next learning. CR writes about this disconnect thusly:

The teachers complained that the students were not interested or intellectually curious, and the students complained that the teachers weren't teaching them relevant subjects or issues, and were afraid to express their own personal opinions in the classroom. I blame neither the students nor the teachers for this disconnect. Rather, it seems high schools have become assembly line factories whose goal is to churn out automatons who are similar in their critical capacities for thinking and learning. Any student who doesn't conform will be discarded, of course.

***The negative weight of the NCLB and related frustrations.*** All team members identified No Child Left Behind (NCLB) as an impediment to the productive possibilities of teaching the CRM. As was mentioned earlier, education is always political, and the NCLB legislation exemplifies a politics of control and domination of the worst sort. Reinvigorating the teaching of the CRM, and indeed teaching civil rights or social justice at all, is difficult to achieve within the climate and shadow of NCLB. The disconnect between teachers and students stems in large part from NCLB, which fosters uncritical students who equate learning with rote memorization, and teachers who fear for their jobs (rightfully so) were they to include any real transformative pedagogy or unorthodox understandings of the CRM within their classrooms. Instead, banal pedagogies aimed at conformity, the passive acceptance of the status quo, and a belief in the infallibility of high-stakes testing are the norm under NCLB. As MZ details:

I got to see the impact of No Child Left Behind up close and personal. I see the effects of it in my classroom, but have never discussed the actual constraints it puts on educating students with those who must deliver it. The policy is intentionally disempowering. This has always been clear to me. But Casper gave me a first hand look at how destructive it is to education. We are creating a generation of lemmings and alienated educators that will soon be incapable of understanding the very meaning of Civil Rights and the need to preserve the gains of the Movement.

## **Concluding Comments**

This professional development experience was extraordinary in many ways. That it was conducted around teaching the civil rights movement in a conservative state,

that it included an opportunity to work with educators AND students, and that we were able to develop a critical focus of the impact of this work on the participants as well as the teaching team, all made this an important and unique experience.

As we think about what all of this means, we reach four important conclusions. First, the educators did learn some very important (unorthodox and nuanced) understandings about the CRM. They came to understand the CRM is a spirit that moves beyond time (1950s–1960s) and place (the American South), to understand that it went beyond “Black–White” race relations and included a variety of groups, and to recognize the grassroots base for the CRM (one where “ordinary” women and men engaged in everyday protests); these are, in our opinion, important learnings.

Second, we were reminded that our teaching does matter. Students, and the educators in this professional development session, learned as much from how we taught as what we taught. We recognize that it behooves professional development trainers to consider what they teach and what they model. Beyond modeling, it’s helpful when the professional development trainers can be transparent with their pedagogy including open discussions about “why” certain pedagogies are being used. We especially benefited by modeling these pedagogies for a group of high school students.

Third, we were reminded in the most explicit way about the importance of “connections” in the teaching–learning enterprise. These connections need to occur between the students and the curriculum (making it relevant) but also between the teachers and the students. It is also important that the teachers feel a deep cognitive and affective connection to the curriculum.

Finally, we observed how the larger socio-political context impacts schooling and even the professional development trainings within those settings. A truly transformative pedagogy that realizes Freire’s vision of liberation through education cannot be achieved under NCLB. While support for NCLB is often couched in terms of equality and concern for the poor and minorities (another example of the co-opting of language), such legislation represents the political desire for control and domination against which proponents of Freirian-style pedagogy must continually battle.

We appreciated our time with the educators and the students not only for the opportunity for professional and personal interaction but also for what the experience taught us. We were again reminded about the importance of seeing all education, including professional development, as a dialectical process in which all teachers are learners and all learners are teachers. This is the only way in which authentic transformation, personal and institutional, can begin—and begin we must.

## Notes

1. The Western History Coalition’s Professional Development Project was part of a national program aimed at strengthening the teaching of social studies throughout the K–12 curriculum.

2. The name “Praxis Project” came about organically during our initial email discussions of civil rights pedagogy. The name stuck as it aptly described our intentions: the practical application(s) of a branch, or branches, of learning.
3. We use “educators” here to refer to the participants (all of whom are teachers) of the professional development project. Teachers refers to the leaders of the professional development project.
4. Consider California’s “Civil Rights Initiative” which abolished affirmative action and their “English for the Children” proposition which makes it illegal for teachers, in the main, to use any language other than English in the classroom.
5. American Indian scholar Jace Weaver terms the two sides of this dichotomy the *Warrior* and the *Diplomat*. He states that both are necessary to further the social justice and civil rights goals of American Indians.
6. See the Department of Education’s publication, *Improving Teacher Quality State Grants: ESEA Title II, Part A Non-Regulatory Guidance* (Revised, Oct. 5, 2006), available at <http://www.ed.gov/programs/teacherqual/guidance.doc> (accessed June 30, 2007).
7. Available upon request from the authors.
8. *Putting the Movement Back Into Civil Rights: A Resource Guide for K–12 Classrooms*, edited by Menkart, Murray, and View, was published in 2004 by Teaching For Change and the Poverty & Race Research Action Council (PRRAC). The text not only provided the Praxis Project with a comprehensive history of American Civil Rights Movements, it also included classroom exercises aimed at all levels of primary and secondary education. The text became the Praxis Project’s bible and was instrumental in teaching the members about the history of civil rights from different ethnic perspectives. The members used the text to develop their presentations, in-class exercises, and to present as a resource for high school teachers.

## References

- Blackburn, R. (1997). *The making of new world slavery: From the Baroque to the Modern, 1492–1800*. New York: Verso.
- CCTHITA: Central Council of Tlingit and Haida Indian Tribes of America. (1991). *A recollection of civil rights leader Elizabeth Peratrovich, 1911–1958*. Juneau: Sealaska Corporation.
- Cornell, S. (1988). *Return of the native: Native American political resurgence*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Crawford, J. (1999). *At war with diversity: US language policy in an age of anxiety*. New York: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Doyle, C. (1993). *Raising curtains on education*. South Hadley, MA: Bergin & Garvey.
- Eagleton, T. (1983). *Literary theory: An introduction*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota.
- Freire, P. (2000). *Pedagogy of freedom: Ethics, democracy, and civic courage*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Haney-Lopez, I. F. (1994). The social construction of race: Some observations on illusions, fabrication, & choice. *Harvard Civil Rights and Civil Liberties Law Review*, 29, 1–62.

- hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom*. New York: Routledge.
- Hurtado, A. (1990). *Indian survival on the California Frontier*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Josephy, A., Nagel, J., & Johnson, T. (Eds.). (1999). *Red power: The American Indians' fight for freedom*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska.
- Lindholm-Leary, K. (2001). *Dual-language education*. New York: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Loewen, J. (1993). *Lies my teacher told me: Everything your American history textbook got wrong*. New York: Touchstone.
- Menkart, D., Murray, A., & View, J. (Eds.). (2004). *Putting the movement back into civil rights teaching: A resource guide for K–12 classrooms*. Washington, DC: Teaching For Change & The Poverty & Race Research Action Council (PRRAC).
- Omi, M., & Winant, H. (1986). *Racial formation in the United States from the 1960s to the 1990s*. New York: Routledge.
- Shaull, R. (1998). Forward. In P. Freire (Author), *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (New rev. 20<sup>th</sup> Ed.) (pp. 11–16). New York: Continuum.
- Strauss, A. L., & Corbin, J. M. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory*. London: Sage.
- Sullivan, P., & Martin, W. (2000). *Civil rights in the United States* (Vols. I & II). New York: Macmillan Reference.
- Weaver, J. (2007). More light than heat: The current state of Native American Studies. *The American Indian Quarterly*, 31(2), 233–255.
- Zinn, H. (1999). *A people's history of the United States*. New York: Harper Collins.

## About the Authors

**Caskey Russell** is an associate professor in English and American Indian studies at the University of Wyoming. Originally from Washington State, he earned his PhD from the University of Oregon in 2001. He is an enrolled member of the Tlingit Indian tribe of Alaska. He is a co-author of the book *Critical Race Theory Matters: Education and Ideology* (Routledge, 2011). He may be reached via e-mail at: ccaskey@uwyo.edu

**Francisco Rios** is professor in the Education Studies department at the College of Education at the University of Wyoming. He has taught courses in second language acquisition, foundations of education, and multicultural education. His research interests include teachers of color, Latinos in education, and pre-service teacher education with a multicultural focus. His most recent book is *Critical Race Theory Matters*, co-authored with Zamudio, Russell, and Bridgeman. Francisco is the Senior Associate Editor of *Multicultural Perspectives*. He may be reached via e-mail at: frios@uwyo.edu

**Margaret “Margie” Zamudio** was an associate professor of sociology at the University of Wyoming. Born and raised in Los Angeles, Margie received her PhD from UCLA in 1996. She was a sociology faculty member at the University

of Colorado at Boulder from 1996–2002. She came to the University of Wyoming in 2002 joining the faculties of the Sociology Department, the Chicano Studies Program, and the Women’s Studies Program. Margie was promoted to associate professor with tenure in the Spring of 2009.

**Jacquelyn Bridgeman** has been a member of the University of Wyoming’s College of Law faculty and adjunct faculty in African American and Diaspora studies since 2002. She teaches in the areas of employment law, legal writing, torts, and family law. She also teaches two undergraduate courses in the African American and Diaspora Studies department: African Americans and the American Legal System and Black Politics. Bridgeman was named the University of Wyoming College of Law outstanding faculty member in 2005 and received the University of Wyoming John P. Ellbogen Meritorious Classroom Teaching Award for teaching excellence in 2008. Before joining the College of Law faculty, Bridgeman was an associate attorney at the Los Angeles, California law firms of Curiale, Dellaverson, Hirschfeld, Kraemer & Sloan and Loeb & Loeb where she specialized in a wide range of labor and employment matters. She graduated from Stanford University (1996) with honors and received her J.D. from the University of Chicago (1999). Bridgeman’s scholarship interests lie primarily in the areas of African Americans, equality, and race issues. She also writes on the topics of politics, sports, and education. She is a co-author of the book *Critical Race Theory Matters: Education and Ideology* (Routledge, 2011). She may be reached via e-mail at: [jbridge@uwyo.edu](mailto:jbridge@uwyo.edu)