"Learning to Teach" in and for Indian Country: The Promise and Paradox of Preparing Culturally Responsive Teachers for Schools Serving Indigenous Students

Angelina E. Castagno, Bryan McKinley Jones Brayboy,
Deborah Chadwick, Lindsey Cook

This chapter explores the unique, complex, and urgent phenomenon of learning to teach in and for Indian Country. Based on our work with seven different federally funded Indigenous educator preparation programs at three different universities, we discuss three central paradoxes that frame the work of preparing high-quality, culturally responsive educators to serve Indigenous students. We close with suggestions that may be needed to guide future efforts around learning to teach in and for Indian Country.

For at least the past 30 years, educational researchers have been exploring how it is that teachers "learn to teach." In the mid-80s, David Berliner (1986) advanced this line of thinking by exploring what expert teachers know and how they come to acquire that knowledge. By the early-90s, Carter (1990) and Kagan (1992) summarized the learning to teach scholarship by explaining that although most teacher preparation programs focus on content/subject-matter knowledge, as well as procedural knowledge about how to manage one's classroom and curricula, a crucial element of learning to teach occurs during the early years of one's professional career when a teacher struggles through day-to-day classroom happenings. Novice teachers who reflect on their classroom practice and attempt to continuously improve on that practice, eventually become more expert teachers. Novice teachers generally enter the classroom with a strong passion for teaching, but they usually spend the first few years learning how to manage their classroom, the next few years focusing on the content of their instruction and related assessments, and only after working through these elements of teaching are they able to truly turn their attention to their students. In other words, ongoing and sustained reflective practice is critical to a teacher's process of learning to teach.

While these generic comments about learning to teach certainly have some applicability for any teacher in any community, we want to suggest that learning to teach in and for Indian Country is a unique, complex, and urgent phenomenon that we ought to be paying more attention to. Indeed, we cannot be satisfied with the current preparation of educators for Indian Country.

We begin with the words of two young teachers, one Navajo and one Hopi. Both speak to the need for preparing culturally responsive teachers for schools serving Native youth and how that is connected to their own understandings of what it means to be an educator, an Indigenous person, and a member of a tribal nation. One shares:

Cite as from J. Reyhner, J, Martin, L. Lockard & W.S. Gilbert. (Eds.). (2015). *Honoring Our Elders: Culturally Appropriate Approaches for Teaching Indigenous Students* (pp. 61-73). Flagstaff, AZ: Northern Arizona University.

> As educators, we should feel that we are able to teach students culturally and be truly sovereign enough to build our own curriculum that includes Common Core. As educators we should also be able to teach our people the way that we feel is appropriate for the betterment of our community.[1]

And the other says,

> A top priority is being able to keep culture but also being able to implement new ideas and practices to make sure our students are given the same opportunities that those in more urban areas are given, such as access to technology and various programs. Being able to implement Common Core Standards is a huge priority right now and being in such a rural area can make it challenging to get exposure to all that is available for both teachers and students. Finding a balance between old ways and new changes is always challenging but I think it can be done when given the chance by not only teachers and administrators, but by the community as well.

As both of these young teachers suggest, the preparation of culturally responsive Indigenous teachers for schools serving Indigenous youth is clearly needed, but this is difficult work given the larger context of assimilation and standardization that still structures our educational institutions.

Federal legislation and intervention has long played a central role in the schooling of Native youth across the United States. Indeed, the federal government has a trust responsibility towards tribal nations and Indigenous peoples and has consistently reaffirmed this responsibility and its commitment to tribal sovereignty and self-determination through Executive Orders like President Obama's 2004 American Indian and Alaska Native Education order 13336, the Tribally Controlled Schools Act of 1988 and many others. One example of the federal government's involvement in Indigenous education can be seen in the development of American Indian and Alaska Native educator training programs funded through the United States Office of Indian Education (OIE) and housed at universities, tribal colleges, and school districts serving reservation communities across the nation. These programs seek to increase the number of highly qualified, culturally responsive Indigenous teachers and administrators working in schools that serve Indigenous youth. Teachers clearly have some of the greatest impact on the experience and success of young people in schools, so the preparation of teachers is of critical importance.

Over the past ten years, we have been fortunate to work with seven different federally funded Native educator preparation programs at three different universities. Although led by different people, formed in collaboration with different tribal nations and local communities, and located in different states, all of these programs have shared a deep commitment to increasing the number of Native teachers and administrators in schools serving Native youth. We've learned an

incredible amount from our interactions with these programs and especially the experiences of the graduates in these programs, and the goal of this chapter is to pull some of that knowledge and experience together to address the opportunities and challenges associated with learning to teach in and for Indian Country.

Keeping the words of the two young teachers in mind, this chapter is organized around first, the promises, and related paradoxes involved with preparing teachers for schools serving Native youth. Indeed, it seems that for every opportunity, there is a corresponding challenge to this work. We then move on to some suggestions about what may be needed to guide future efforts around the preparation of culturally responsive teachers for schools in Indian Country.

Promise/Paradox #1: We have an extensive knowledge bank about what is needed from teachers in Indian Country, BUT, there are incredible pressures to conform, standardize, and fit into a one-size-fits all model of schooling in the U.S.

Many Indigenous teacher preparation programs are initially conceived because there is a recognition of the need for more Indigenous teachers for Indigenous schools who are both willing and able to engage in culturally responsive schooling with their students. Those who write the program applications know that standard teacher preparation programs have not been providing the best possible experience for Indigenous people who plan to teach in reservation schools. Targeted and specialized programs are meant to fill this gap. There is a wealth of knowledge, both in the published literature and in communities and schools, about how to do this.

The research on multicultural education and culturally responsive teaching asserts that all students learn better and achieve at higher rates when teachers engage them with curricula that is connected to their everyday lives, employ pedagogical techniques that correspond to their own cultural norms and integrate an ethic of care and social justice into their classrooms (Banks & Banks, 2001; Gay, 2000; Ladson-Billings, 1995; Nieto, 2004; Sleeter & Grant, 2003). Furthermore, there is a plethora of research that affirms that teachers who know and care about Indigenous youth, speak their language, know their culture, and participate in the local community provide a more effective education (Brayboy & Maughan, 2009; Castagno & Brayboy, 2008; Deloria & Wildcat, 2001; Deyhle & Swisher, 1997; Lomawaima & McCarty, 2006; McCarty & Lee, 2014; McCarty, Yamamoto, Watahomigie, & Zepeda, 1997; Reyhner, 1992; Yazzie, 1999). This scholarship on Indigenous education, when combined with the work of Indigenous scholars from disciplines outside of education, provides an important perspective and focus on issues of tribal sovereignty, self-determination, colonization, assimilation, and the unique government-to-government relationship between tribal nations and the United States (Brayboy, 2005; Deloria & Wildcat, 2001; Grande, 2000; Lomawaima & McCarty, 2002; Robbins, 1992).

In addition to this published work, tribal educational leaders, teachers in reservation schools, and local community members know what it takes to ensure their youth are experiencing success in schools. To give just four examples of the

community-based knowledge that exists around this, we can turn to the Navajo Nation's culture standards (Office, 2000), the Alaska Native Knowledge Network (http://www.ankn.uaf.edu/), the ʻAha Punana Leo (http://www.ahapunanaleo.org/) Hawaiian immersion schools, and Montana State's initiatives around Indian Education for All (http://opi.mt.gov/programs/indianed/IEFA.html).

Given the wealth of knowledge that exists, the question then becomes, how do we ensure that teachers learn to teach in these ways? In other words, how can we facilitate the preparation of culturally responsive teachers for the schools and students in Indian Country? These questions are especially important because teacher preparation is largely controlled and facilitated by mainstream, predominantly White universities that are set up to convey what is believed to be a sort of universally-applicable education. As a staff member in one of the Native teacher preparation programs noted, "one of the biggest challenges is that everything we want to do is always already predesigned within a Eurocentric framework."

A key challenge is the prevalence of the dominant multicultural paradigm within mainstream teacher preparation programs. One student explained this by noting, "as far as, you know, the classes just to teach, I think those were good. But as far as the cultural aspect of it, I think that would be just us being able to integrate what we already have into what we've already learned." In fact, almost every graduate from the different preparation programs expressed that their coursework did not adequately prepare them to be culturally responsive teachers in schools serving Native youth. Equally significant, almost every graduate has also told us that they wished they had had classes that centered this information and that were adapted to be more relevant to the kinds of schools they would be teaching in across Indian Country. Although most preparation programs have a single diversity or multiculturalism class, this is not what Indigenous teachers, planning to teach in schools serving Native youth, need. As one student described, "I think the only class that I took that had anything to do with, you know, being a culturally responsive teacher was the one [diversity] class that I took that was required and that was it…. But a lot of that was just information that I pretty much had already, that I already knew…. The one class is not going to prepare someone to be culturally responsive." Some graduates also expressed regret that they weren't able to take courses outside the college of education or even outside their university (at a nearby tribal college, for example) while they were in the teacher preparation program. These students' desires highlight the interconnected and interdisciplinary nature of culturally responsive education grounded in Indigenous knowledge, sovereignty, and self-determination (Battiste, 2002; Brayboy & Maughan, 2009; Deloria Jr. & Wildcat, 2001).

The rationale for a generic set of courses that purport to prepare all teachers for all schools is generally framed around providing an "equal" education to all students in colleges of education. Adapting coursework to meet the specific needs of a relatively small group of Indigenous teachers in a particular program is a potentially difficult issue since students are enrolling in a large teacher preparation program that serves hundreds of students and includes a particular program of study with standard coursework and syllabi. However, given that

many universities have a specific goal of meeting the needs of Indigenous communities and given that these universities benefit from the prestige and financial resources of federally funded programs, the institution has a special obligation to support these kinds of curricular modifications.

In sum, then, this first promise and paradox of preparing culturally responsive Indigenous teachers is that despite a bank of knowledge, patterns of assimilatory education often continue. There is incredible pressure to conform, to standardize, and to fit into the same box that schools in every other community across the nation are supposed to fit into. But we know this is not what our Indigenous youth need in order to experience success and thrive in their communities and schools.

Promise/Paradox #2: Preparing culturally responsive Indigenous teachers for schools serving Native youth is consistent with and supports sovereignty, self-determination, and tribal nation-building goals, BUT, most of the targeted efforts to prepare Native teachers and administrators are largely controlled by the federal government and mainstream, predominantly White colleges and universities.

Tribal nations' goals of self-determination through self-education (Brayboy & Castagno, 2009) can only be realized if tribal leaders and local communities shape, determine, and facilitate the schooling of young people. These communities need teachers who know the local language and culture; are committed long-term to the health of the community; and have the knowledge and skills needed to provide rigorous, effective, and relevant education to students (Castagno & Brayboy, 2008). As just one example, the Navajo Sovereignty in Education Act of 2005 (http://www.navajocourts.org/Resolutions/CJY-37-05.pdf) clearly outlines the importance of culturally responsive schooling to the survival and sovereignty of the Diné people:

> The Navajo language is an essential element of the life, culture, and identity of the Navajo People…. The survival of the Navajo Nation as a unique group of people growing and developing socially, educationally, and economically, and politically within the larger American Nation requires that the Navajo People and those who reside with the Navajo people retain and/or develop an understanding, knowledge and respect for Navajo culture, history, civics, and social studies.

Many of the programs designed specifically to prepare Indigenous educators are built with similar goals in mind. Although it is often the case that the small number of individual faculty and staff members who develop these programs are motivated by and committed to tribal nation building and sovereignty, the larger institutions in which these programs are usually housed may not have a similar commitment.

Indeed, throughout most universities and colleges of education, there exists a culture that values colorblindness, equality, and sameness for all, and an extraordinarily slow pace of change. But the goals of tribal sovereignty and self-determination through self-education can only be fulfilled by explicitly recognizing and strategizing around the unique political and legal status of Indigenous students and tribal nations, by privileging fair and just—rather than equal or same—approaches to education and treatment of students, and by requiring immediate and significant change. None of these are consistent with the dominant culture of most predominantly White universities, but this current culture and approach is insufficient for honoring and facilitating sovereignty and self-determination.

Furthermore, the degree to which these programs and efforts are truly supported by the university vary tremendously. While some programs enjoy genuine institutional commitment in the form of devoted personnel and financial resources, flexibility, and responsiveness regarding program and student needs and sustained commitment to the coursework and faculty and staff lines that are required for the preparation of culturally responsive teachers, other programs are quite isolated and only sustained through the passion and commitment of one or two individuals at the university. These programs sometimes find themselves at odds with university personnel who say things like, "we just can't devote too many resources to such a small program," and "why would they be treated any differently than our other students." One could argue that this concern over numbers and costs is part of the culture of higher education, but it is directly in conflict with serving Indigenous students, whose numbers are relatively small in predominantly White universities.

And finally, many aspects of these programs are also dictated by the Office of Indian Education, which provides most, if not all, of the funding for Indigenous teacher preparation programs. This funding is provided as one means of fulfilling the federal government's trust responsibilities outlined in thousands of treaties, court decisions, and executive orders—but significant power resides with those who hold the purse strings. In addition, predominantly White colleges and universities are in the business of preparing teachers, and they benefit greatly from having more diverse student and staff populations. They also benefit from the recognition that accompanies externally-funded programs.

The paradox, then, becomes how to reconcile potentially divergent, or even competing, motivating forces and authority over the direction of teacher preparation efforts. Although significant opportunity lies in honoring and facilitating tribal nation building goals, there are related obstacles if non-Native leaders, institutions, and bureaucracies feel threatened by tribal sovereignty.

Promise/Paradox #3: There is a clear and obvious need for culturally responsive Indigenous educators in schools serving Native youth, BUT, most rural and reservation schools also present added complexities and challenges for teachers and leaders.

Based on almost any indicator of academic, social, economic, and health disparity, we know that Native youth and communities are not currently well-served. The BIE's Indian Education Study Group recently facilitated multiple listening sessions across Indian Country and released their final report and 2014 Blueprint for Reform (see http://www.bie.edu/BFRI/index.htm) outlining a re-structuring plan for the federal bureaucracies that oversee Indigenous education across the United States. Although there is clearly a range of opinions and sentiments about how that process unfolded and the suggestions in the final report, it is important to realize that we may be in an opportune time to influence the direction of federal action and policy around Indigenous education. The promise, then, lies in the fact that there is much work to be done and a clear need. But the work that is required is fraught with obstacles.

We all know that Race to the Top, School Improvement Grants, and other current reform efforts create additional bureaucracies and mandates for schools, and these appear to be disproportionately impacting schools serving Indigenous youth across the nation. All new teachers experience typical "first year teacher" challenges, but new teachers who go into consistently underperforming schools that may be subject to sanctions and/or are in processes of school improvement or turnaround experience far more challenges. Given the leadership, staffing, and achievement patterns in many rural and reservation schools, most of the graduates of Indigenous Teacher Preparation programs end up negotiating added challenges owing to changes in school leadership, school reform efforts, new teaching assignments mid-year, and unfilled support roles within either their school or district. As one new teacher told one of the authors, "being a new teacher, it's a lot to take on…during my hiring interviews, I wish I asked more about the school situation…and I wish I had more guidance as to, not just finding a job, but making sure it wasn't going to be more than I could handle." Even for Indigenous teacher preparation program graduates not placed in "failing" schools where reform efforts are all-encompassing, many express added stress owing to the late date at which they are hired and the subsequent lack of time to adequately prepare for their students. This paradox of needing Native teachers in reservation schools, and yet the added complexities found in these schools, should not be underestimated in preparing teachers. In many ways, the needs of the schools and necessary academic reform make culturally responsive teaching seem like a luxury; ironically, we know that students tend to do better academically when they see their schooling as relevant and rooted in the things they know (Castagno & Brayboy, 2008).

Lessons learned for programs preparing teachers in and for Indian Country

So given these promises and paradoxes of learning to teach in and for Indian Country, what can we do to move these efforts forward? In other words, what might be needed?

First, we need new paradigms for preparation programs that deeply engage culturally responsive schooling (Castagno & Brayboy, 2008; McCarty & Lee, 2014), Indigenous Knowledge Systems (Brayboy & Maughan, 2009), and nation

building (Brayboy, Castagno, & Solyom, 2014; Brayboy, Fann, Castagno, & Solyom, 2012). A new paradigm would engage students in practical experiences as modeled by highly qualified teachers of Indigenous youth. Many of the new teachers graduating from Indigenous teacher preparation programs have a keen sense of what is required in their future profession. Added to the two young teachers we referenced at the beginning of this paper, here are two others' ideas about what it means to be a good teacher in schools serving Indigenous youth.

> In order to be a good Native teacher, one should know the culture. There's more to our culture than tradition. It's about showing students how to be respectful of oneself, and others, including adults and elders. Also being respectful of our surroundings. There are aspects or factors tied within our culture that build a child's character. I think there is more to being a Native teacher than just teaching Common Core. I feel that it is an obligation to teach students about their culture….

Another teacher noted:

> Being a good Native teacher goes hand in hand with culture. From my experience being Native and a teacher, I use a lot of my traditional values to help me manage my classroom. For example, respecting our elders in my culture is a huge custom that I like to express to my students in order to gain respect and understanding of teacher-student relationships.

Graduates of most Indigenous teacher preparation programs generally agree that these programs are successful in conveying the importance of being culturally responsive teachers, but there is less success in helping graduates see how to make this a reality. In fact, the most frequently noted weakness in these programs is the lack of information about how to be culturally responsive teachers who are able to integrate Native languages and cultures into their classrooms. As one student explained, "we talked about why cultural responsiveness is important, but we didn't do lesson plans or talk about how it relates to standards and assessments." And still another explained, "I think it was more just mainly on paper like after you get out, after you graduate, you're supposed to try and do it in your classroom."

So one thing that is needed is a genuine, deep, and sustained engagement with culturally responsive schooling theories and approaches in teacher preparation efforts. As mentioned earlier, we have plenty of knowledge of the theory about culturally responsive schooling, but what is lacking is widespread understanding of transferring this knowledge to classroom practice. At the same time, there must be a commitment from the institution to build programs with individuals who have the experience and "know how" to model what culturally responsive teaching looks like for pre-service teachers. Beyond theorizing why it's important, the students must be able to see what it looks like in practice—not just from a single course or lesson plan, but rather as an interlocking web for the

way in which their program is designed. This is something that is both painfully missing in teacher preparation programs, but also in the schools they are student teaching in. Unfortunately, we have seen too many examples of student teaching placements with practicing teachers and in schools where culturally responsive education is not engaged. While we understand the multiple demands placed on teachers to standardize, we are in a vicious cycle of producing teachers that are told to teach in culturally responsive ways, but that graduate still not knowing what that looks like in practice because schools and veteran teachers rarely engage in it themselves.

In addition to a deep and sustained engagement with culturally responsive schooling, efforts to prepare Indigenous teachers for schools serving Native youth must also be grounded in and guided by tribal nation building principles and goals. Whereas graduates have spoken to us at some length about being a culturally responsive teacher, they articulate very little about sovereignty and self-determination. Most of them either tell us that they don't know what we mean by sovereignty and self-determination, or that they do not think there is any connection between sovereignty, self-determination and teaching Indigenous youth.

This brings us to the next recommendation, which is that there must be genuine collaboration between universities, tribal colleges, and tribal nations regarding what tribal communities need. Colleges and universities must take seriously tribal nations' needs, goals, and policies; teacher preparation efforts must, therefore, reflect and facilitate the knowledge and leadership within local communities. Only then can Indigenous teacher preparation programs "move away from colonization and assimilation and towards a more real self-determination and tribal sovereignty" (Brayboy, 2005, p. 440). These collaborations would be centrally aimed at serving Indigenous communities and honoring relationships between people, places, actions, and beliefs is vital to this goal. As just one example, university-based programs might turn to the Navajo Nation as a sovereign governmental entity for guidance about how to conceptualize and implement a teacher preparation program that is culturally responsive and relevant to Diné communities. Indeed, the Navajo Nation has developed a set of cultural content standards (Office, 2000) for educators working with Diné students, and these standards could guide the curriculum, pedagogy, and programming for nearby Indigenous teacher preparation programs. This would result in a teacher preparation program that looks very different from the standard program offered at institutions across the country.

Similarly, Diné College (based in Tsaile, Arizona) offers Associates degrees in early childhood and elementary education, as well as a Bachelors degree in elementary education. All students in any degree program at Diné College must take Navajo history, culture, and language courses as part of their graduation requirements. Collaborative efforts between tribal colleges and mainstream, predominantly White colleges might begin to honor the sovereignty and educational goals established by tribal and community leaders. Although there are examples of where this is happening, it is almost always funded through short-term grants that result in minimal institutional changes for the majority of teachers who attend large universities.

The sort of collaboration that we are writing about would likely result in preparation programs that have some of the following characteristics that we've seen successfully implemented in particular programs:

First, programs would include opportunities for tribal community members to remain in their communities while gaining the necessary university degrees and certifications and then to get local jobs upon their successful completion. Responding to questions about her ability to engage culturally responsive teaching, one new teacher explained, "I'm definitely doing it but I'm Navajo and I grew up here." This notion of where one grew up and/or where one lives and calls homes is a common theme in many teachers' comments related to cultural responsiveness. Another added, "being up here [in the Four Corners region and on tribal lands] feeds into providing that cultural connection." This highlights the central place relationships, responsibility, and reciprocity play in the educational process, as well as the fact that knowledge is connected to places and spaces. Learning to teach in and for Indian Country must involve being in one's community and listening to how the local places and spaces can inform the learning process. The importance of educators' connections to their communities and tribal lands should not be underestimated, and we clearly need more preparation programs that allow students to remain in their home communities while taking courses and completing student teaching requirements.

Second, programs would have real and sustained institutional commitment. Developing Indigenous teacher preparation programs with tribal leaders presents an important opportunity for colleges and universities to honor their obligations and responsibilities to tribal nations. Northern Arizona University, for example, has clear statements in its institutionalized goals and strategic plan regarding its commitment to Arizona's tribal communities and Indigenous peoples.

Third, programs developed and operated collaboratively would include relevant and meaningful student teaching experience. The student teaching aspect of teacher preparation programs is a critical time in the development of a teacher. Unfortunately, for many teachers-in-training in urban and suburban areas, they do not benefit from experience working with Native students during their student-teaching experiences. As one recent graduate articulated, "that's one of the problems…they don't place us in schools with Native students so we can't actually have practice on how to incorporate culture into schooling…my [practicum] teacher was learning at the same time that I'm teaching the kids so I have nothing to look up to and I didn't have a model of how to do that." Schools like Puente de Hózhǫ́ and the Native American Community Academy highlighted in McCarty and Lee's (2014) recent work would be ideal settings to place student teachers.

In one program we're familiar with, student teachers worked in the classrooms at a Navajo community school throughout their entire teacher preparation program, and many of the students talked about the importance of learning "how they do things in a rural community school" and seeing how involved community members were in the schooling of their children (Castagno, 2012). The experiences these students had at the Navajo community school were significant for

their learning precisely because they were vastly different from anything they could have experienced in a program solely housed within a predominantly White university and a White community.

And finally, successful, collaborative programs would include induction support that is tailored and on-going beyond a teacher's first year in the classroom. Learning to teach is neither a linear nor a time-confined endeavor. There are clearly ebbs and flows, and for many teachers learning to teach occurs throughout their entire career. At the same time, the first year a teacher is in his or her own classroom is critically important, and preparation programs that pay special attention to that first year can have a lasting impact on new teachers learning to teach.

One program that we're familiar with had dedicated staff who maintained exceptional records and contact with program graduates, knew where each person was teaching, what support they did or did not have, which exams they had or had not passed, the extent to which graduates kept current on the OIE systems to log credit for pay back, etc. Many graduates of this program commented on how helpful program staff had been in terms of keeping them up-to-date and informed about payback requirements and necessary paperwork. Furthermore, the program sent students to conferences, advocated for and helped facilitate getting extra time on the National Evaluation Series (NES) teacher certification exams, provided classroom resources to teachers in their induction year, and provided classroom assistance to new teachers. Almost every participant expressed something consistent with the following: "There was plenty of support and encouragement from [program staff] as we started our first year of teaching. The constant support was helpful in knowing that [staff and the program] really did care how we were doing in our first year and that made me feel more comfortable and confident that should I need any help, there was someone there to give that support."

In addition to new paradigms for teacher preparation and collaborative programs, the final suggestion we want to highlight is that learning to teach in and for Indian Country requires increased and sustained resources so that teachers are engaging students in facilities that are well-maintained, outfitted with up-to-date technology and internet capabilities, and conducive to learning. Teaching and learning are obviously holistic and systemic. They do not occur in a bubble between the teacher and the learner, which is why if our goal is the very best processes and outcomes for teachers learning to teach, we must also consider the systems and institutions within which learning to teach takes place. In other words, are the school facilities up to date, well-maintained, and consistent with what we would find in high-income suburban districts? Are the textbooks, curricular materials, classroom supplies, and other things teachers use available, current, and relevant? Are there district, state, and/or federal mandates impacting the school that make it more difficult for teachers to do good work?

In many ways, we're suggesting that preparing culturally responsive Indigenous teachers for schools in Indian Country requires systemic reform that results in the institutionalization of programs that 1) prepare Indigenous teachers

with culturally responsive curricula driven by the goal of self-determination and centered around Indigenous knowledge systems; 2) are led and directed by Indigenous faculty and community members; and 3) are supported with hard-money funding sources. As some of us have argued elsewhere (Castagno & Brayboy, 2008), successful examples of this sort of culturally responsive schooling share the following characteristics: 1) they contextualize and localize curriculum and pedagogy so that they resemble the knowledge and learning of local communities; 2) the knowledge, norms, values, resources, and epistemologies of communities are viewed as legitimate and are intimately integrated into schools; and 3) students are engaged and learning "school knowledge" at the same time and through experiences that also facilitate the learning of local community knowledge. Learning to teach with these epistemological and foundational principles can be done, but it requires the will, commitment and collaboration of multiple parties and institutions—a tall order, but one that is long overdue.

Note

[1]All quoted material from program participants and staff in this chapter were obtained by at least one of the authors either through program evaluation data collection or through on-going program feedback. IRB approval was obtained for all data collection included in this chapter.

References

Banks, J., & Banks, C. (Eds.). (2001). *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives* (4th ed.). New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Battiste, M. (2002). *Indigenous knowledge and pedagogy in First Nations education: A literature review with recommendations.* Ottawa: Indian and Northern Affairs.

Berliner, D. (1986). In pursuit of the expert pedagogue. *Educational Researcher, 15*(7), 5-13.

Brayboy, B. (2005). Toward a Tribal Critical Race Theory in education. *The Urban Review, 37*(5), 425-446.

Brayboy, B., & Castagno, A. (2009). Self-determination through self-education: Culturally responsive schooling for Indigenous students in the USA. *Teaching Education, 20*(1), 31-53.

Brayboy, B., Castagno, A., & Solyom, J. (2014). Looking into the hearts of Native peoples: Nation building as an institutional orientation for graduate education. *American Journal of Education, 120*(4), 575-596.

Brayboy, B., Fann, A., Castagno, A., & Solyom, J. (2012). *Postsecondary education for American Indian and Alaska Natives: Higher education for nation building and self-determination*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Brayboy, B., & Maughan, E. (2009). Indigenous knowledges and the story of the bean. *Harvard Educational Review, 79*(1), 1-21.

Carter, K. (1990). Teachers' knowledge and learning to teach. In W. Houston (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 291-310). New York: Macmillan.

Castagno, A. E. (2012). "They prepared me to be a teacher, but not a culturally responsive Navajo teacher for Navajo Kids": A tribal critical race theory

analysis of an Indigenous Teacher Preparation Program. *Journal of American Indian Education, 5*1(1), 3-21.

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

Deloria Jr., V., & Wildcat, D. (2001). *Power and place: Indian education in America*. Golden, CO: Fulcrum.

Deyhle, D., & Swisher, K. (1997). Research in American Indian and Alaska Native education: From assimilation to self-determination. *Review of Research in Education, 22*, 113-194.

Gay, G. (2000). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Grande, S. (2000). American Indian identity and intellectualism: The quest for a new red pedagogy. *Qualitative Studies in Education, 13*(4), 343-359.

Kagan, D. (1992). Professional growth among preservice and beginning teachers. *Review of Educational Research, 62*(2), 129-169.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). But that's just good teaching! The case for culturally relevant pedagogy. *Theory into Practice, 34*(3), 159-165.

Lomawaima, T., & McCarty, T. (2002). When tribal sovereignty challenges democracy: American Indian education and the democratic ideal. *American Educational Research Journal, 39*(2), 279-305.

Lomawaima, T., & McCarty, T. (2006). *To remain an Indian: Lessons in democracy from a century of Native American education.* New York: Teachers College Press.

McCarty, T., & Lee, T. (2014). Critical culturally sustaining/revitalizing pedagogy and Indigenous education sovereignty. *Harvard Educational Review, 84*(1), 101-124.

McCarty, T., Yamamoto, A., Watahomigie, L., & Zepeda, O. (1997). School-community-university collaborations: The American Indian language development institute. In J. Reyhner (Ed.), *Teaching Indigenous languages* (pp. 85-104). Flagstaff, AZ: Northern Arizona University.

Nieto, S. (2004). *Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Publishing.

Office of Diné Culture, Language and Community Service, Division of Diné Education. (2000). *T'áá Shá Bik'ehgo Diné Bí Ná nitin dóó Íhoo'aah* (Diné Cultural Content Standards). Window Rock, AZ.: Author. Retrieved March 17, 2015 from http://www.odclc.navajo-nsn.gov/Portals/0/Books/Taa%20Shaa%20(yellow)/entire%20book/entirebook.pdf

Reyhner, J. (1992). Bilingual education. In J. Reyhner (Ed.), *Teaching American Indian students* (pp. 59-77). Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.

Robbins, R. (1992). Self-Determination and subordination: The past, present, and future of American Indian governance. In M. A. Jaimes (Ed.), *The state of Native America: Genocide, colonization, and resistance* (pp. 87-121). Boston: South End Press.

Sleeter, C., & Grant, C. (2003). *Making choices for multicultural education: Five approaches to race, class, and gende*r (4th ed.). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Yazzie, T. (1999). Culturally appropriate curriculum: A research-based rationale. In K. Swisher & J. Tippeconnic (Eds.), *Next steps: Research and practice to advance Indian education.* Charleston, NC: Appalachia Educational Laboratory.