Indian Control of Indian Education: Reflections and Envisioning the Next 40 Years

Michelle Pidgeon
Simon Fraser University

Marissa Muñoz
University of British Columbia

Verna J. Kirkness
Winnipeg, Manitoba

Jo-ann Archibald
University of British Columbia

The Indian Control of Indian Education *(ICIE) (1972) policy document was, and continues to be, evidence of the power of Aboriginal peoples in Canada working together to speak up against government assimilationist policies. The voices in this article represent four generations of Indigenous scholars who were either involved in creating or have been influenced by ICIE. The federal government's proposed Bill on First Nation Education is also critiqued in relation to the principles of ICIE. The article shares lessons learned about ICIE, reflections on power and knowledge, and visions for reciprocal relationships that truly embody the ICIE values articulated over 40 years ago. The principles about local control; parental engagement; Indigenous knowledge, culture, and language; Indigenous teachers; and better prepared non-Indigenous teachers are still as relevant and important as they were 40 years ago. The challenge remains to put these principles into everyday educational practice now and for the next 40 years.*

Introduction

The *Indian Control of Indian Education* (ICIE) (1972) policy document was, and continues to be, evidence of the power of Aboriginal[1] peoples in Canada working together to speak up against government assimilationist policies. Today, we once again find ourselves in the all too familiar territory of calling on our allies to speak out and against the proposed federal government's *Bill on First Nation Education*. As Verna J. Kirkness states, "In response to 1969[2] our people came together; we will now need to do the same again for this act" (personal communication, December 14, 2013). In addition to the urgent call for national unity, we need to ensure the protection of the next seven generations' rights to good quality education that truly honours Indigenous ways of knowing and being, languages, values, and cultures. As indicated in the ICIE policy:

> We want education to give our children the knowledge to understand and be proud of themselves and the knowledge to understand the world around them. (National Indian Brotherhood, 1972, p. 1)

The annual theme issue of the *Canadian Journal of Native Education* is sponsored by the Indigenous Education Institute of Canada, in the Faculty of Education at the University of British Columbia, which is located on the traditional and unceded land of the Musqueam First Nation. This land greets the waves of the Pacific Ocean daily. The waves remind us, the authors, of the intergenerational linkages and responsibilities that we have in strengthening Indigenous education. We start our article with first-wave Indigenous scholar, Verna J. Kirkness, Ni-Jin-Jada, of the Cree First Nation from Manitoba. A second-wave Indigenous scholar, Jo-ann Archibald, Q'um Q'um Xiiem, from Sto:lo and Xaxli'p First Nations in British Columbia, follows. Third-wave Indigenous scholar, Michelle Pidgeon, whose ancestry is from Newfoundland and Labrador, is next. Fourth-wave Indigenous scholar, Marissa Muñoz, Aki'NeNe, a Xicana Tejana from south Texas, concludes the intergenerational reflections. We return to a few key points about power and relationships in the concluding sections of the article.

Our Process

The development of this article came as a practice of intergenerational learning, in honour of the 40th anniversary of the *Indian Control of Indian Education* policy statement. Verna, first-wave scholar, was interviewed by Marissa, fourth-wave scholar, with a focus on Indigenous education in Canada in light of the ICIE policy. The interview was transcribed, verified, and shared among the group as the basis for personal and professional reflection. It happened that all four authors were in Vancouver in December 2013 and so we were also able to meet face to face to discuss our thoughts about the relationships between the original ICIE policy paper (1972), the interview transcript, the content of our article, and the recent *Developing a First Nation Education Act: A Blueprint for Legislation* document (Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development, 2013a). Individuals wrote subsections, but the work was entirely collaborative and reciprocal.

We were each asked to reflect on the following questions related to the ICIE (1972) document:

- Are there particular ICIE principles that have guided my work

and study? Is there a memorable moment or story?
- Are there particular ICIE principles that mean more to me now and in the future? Why?

The sections that follow do so in the order of these waves, to reflect the multiple generations of Indigenous scholarship shaped by ICIE.

ICIE Reflections of a First-Wave Indigenous Scholar:
Verna J. Kirkness, Ni-Jing-Jada

In 1972, Dr. Kirkness was the Education Director of the Manitoba Indian Brotherhood, responsible for writing the Education section of *Wahbung* (1971), the Manitoba response to the *White Paper* (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, 1969), and she was a member of the team working on the policy of ICIE. In 1974, she became the Education Director of the National Indian Brotherhood. This section presents some pertinent background information, memorable stories and turning points, and reflective thoughts that Dr. Kirkness shared in an interview with Marissa Muñoz. For more details about some of these points, see *Creating space: My life and work in Indigenous education* by Verna J. Kirkness (2013, pp. 77-84).

How did your teaching experience influence your participation in the landmark 1972 national policy of Indian Control of Indian Education?

> When I began my teaching career in 1954 the policy was nowhere in sight ... there were only a few of us Indigenous people in education at the time. I think there might have been about 20 of us Indian teachers across the country. In my own teaching experience, I think the connection I can make is that in the early years of my teaching I knew instinctively that parents should be involved in the school. I thought the parents should know what their children were doing so that they would be more interested in sending their children to school.
>
> Early in my teaching career, I taught in my own reserve in Manitoba. I taught Grade 3 and 5 classes. In the second year there, I became the principal of the school, but before that happened, I had started inviting the parents to the school in the evening and I did it once a month to talk about education. I told them a bit about schooling and what went on and I had a question box and asked them to put any questions in the box that they wanted discussed. I also planted a couple of questions in it myself because I wanted to discuss discipline and attendance. That way, I got their feelings and even their backing, in terms of what I was doing. On alternate Fridays, or every two weeks or so, I had the parents come and spend their afternoon in the school. They could come and watch the children in action and look at their work. I think that really was my connection to what lead up to years later, the policy of Indian Control of Indian Education: the primary thing being parental responsibility and local control.
>
> A principle that I believed in right from the start was the importance of having an advisory committee made up of people from the local community, whether on a reserve or at the university level. They provided me with direction and guidance. Having parents, grandparents, and Elders involved in what I was doing was very important to me. This was my bridge into the design and support of ICIE. (V. J. Kirkness, personal communication, 2013)

Is there a memorable or defining moment during the development of the ICIE policy that you can recall? What made this policy so important in the 1970s?

I felt strongly that education for our kids should be driven by our people. I often express this by saying, "The answers are within us." A major problem soon was identified. The federal government, namely the Department of Indian Affairs, had a different definition of control than we did.

We saw ourselves free to create a new system: a system where we learn how to read, write, do all the things we have to do, such as science, but based on our Indigenous knowledge as the foundation to our learning. Instead Indian Affairs' interpretation of the new policy was that Indians would be administering Indian Affairs' programs. The other thing that haunts me to this day is that we did not draft legislation for the policy.

Every province and territory wrote a position paper after the federal government issued the 1969 White Paper that basically was to remove the special status and rights of Indians in Canada. Each province and territory wrote its own position on education and other areas such as health, community, and economic development. Once these were all in, the National Indian Brotherhood looked at education first. What was being said by everyone is that we should have parental responsibility and local control and so that's the two basic principles of the policy.

George Manuel was the President of the National Indian Brotherhood. Trudeau was the Prime Minister at that time. They formed a Joint National Indian Brotherhood/Cabinet Committee. At the table to discuss education were the senior people of the National Indian Brotherhood, the presidents of various territorial and provincial organizations, and the senior ministers of Cabinet. We had meetings with them at which I was listening to them debate certain parts of Indian education. I remember being very impressed with our leadership and how knowledgeable they were. I was just there to hear what they were saying. I was just observing.

The most serious issue was that the Indian Act did not provide for the Minister of Indian Affairs to enter into agreements with Indian Bands to run their own schools. The Indian Act stated that the Minister could enter into agreements with provincial and territorial governments, churches, and charitable organizations for the education of Indian children. This same provision was needed for Indian Bands. Many meetings of the Joint Committee were held to revise the Indian Act to include Indian Bands. What I often think about is how different the implementation of ICIE would have been had this effort been completed. We faced many obstacles because Indian Affairs continued to interfere with our direction, understandably because legally the Minister was still responsible. During this process the president of NIB, George Manuel, decided to step down as his term ended and foolishly many of us who worked for him decided to leave as well. I regret this action. The people who replaced us did try to carry on for a while but the Joint Cabinet Committee was dissolved. The cause was lost. (V. J. Kirkness, personal communication, 2013)

What should the next generation of educators attend to now or in the future?

If we are really going to control education, then we have to have legislation that allows the Ministers to enter into agreements with our Bands.

I think we have to do more to be in touch with the community and not leave it to the Band Council and School Board. We need to educate and involve our total community. They have to know about our oppression and how we are dealing with this in our schools. We have to work with parents, grandparents, foster parents, everyone.

I am disappointed that we do not have our graduation rate as high as it should be. I still feel that our bottleneck is at the junior high level—children from Grade 8 and 9 are our greatest loss in school. I think our males are not accessing post-secondary education as widely as females. That's certainly the case in society, but it's happening more with our people. I think we should put a greater emphasis now on areas such as trades. When you look at the economy, like where the economy is now, I think we are moving along nicely, progressing nicely, we have more doctors and others of which I never dreamed that we would ever have. But there are other jobs that more of our people could be doing on the reserves. They could be building homes and other buildings. They could be painters and carpenters and draftsmen. I think we emphasized university education and we did not put much emphasis on the trades, which pay very well. (V. J. Kirkness, personal communication, 2013)

Knowing what you know now, how would you have shaped ICIE differently?

We should have made sure that we had a clear definition of "control." Instead, Indian Affairs used the term, "Band-operated schools" which I hate. With the term "operated," you do something to what is already there, but Band control suggests something different. So I think we should have done a better job on that definition

In addition, we could have had a stronger statement on public school integration. We should have, over the years, done more to help children in provincial and territorial schools. Often, our focus was on Band schools because ICIE was such a new thing that we were doing. I don't think we did justice at that time to children who were attending the provincial schools.

We also should have been stronger on fiscal responsibility of the federal government. One of the main reasons we are not on par with provincial systems, so to speak, is the under-funding of the Band schools. The funding of children who go there gets one-third less than what the federal government will pay for a child in a provincial school. I think we should have issued a very firm statement that there had to be parity. I don't know if we would have got it, but we should have tried. (V. J. Kirkness, personal communication, 2013)

ICIE Reflections of a Second-Wave Indigenous Scholar:
Jo-ann Archibald, Q'um Q'um Xiiem

I had just begun my teaching career in an urban elementary public school in 1972, the same year that the Native Indian Brotherhood (now the Assembly of First Nations) completed the *Indian Control of Indian Education* policy paper. I had many Aboriginal children in my grade two classroom for the first two years that I taught in this urban school district. The provincial educational curriculum did not have any Aboriginal material, although this school district convened a curriculum committee of teachers to work on some curriculum with the local First Nations. I was especially interested in this new curriculum committee and excited to be working with First Nations people. During my teacher education program, I was the only First Nations person in my elementary level courses. For my course assignments, I used Aboriginal culture as much as possible. Maybe this passion for Aboriginal learning and teaching materials stemmed from my public school experiences where I could not remember any positive examples of learning through culturally responsive curriculum; what I was exposed to in high school focused on history where Indian people were only portrayed as warfaring, violent, and savage. If there was any contemporary mention of Indian people in the high school curriculum, it was often as "The Indian Problem."

In 1974, I moved "back home" to the Sto:lo area in the Fraser Valley of British Columbia and continued to teach and then work in a school district role as an Indian Education Coordinator. I also began to work with Sto:lo Elders and an Indian cultural centre, Coqualeetza, to develop elementary social studies curriculum for both public and Band schools. I did not know about the *Indian Control of Indian Education* policy until almost 10 years after I began teaching.

In 1980, I met Verna J. Kirkness, who had become the first Indian director of the Native Indian Teacher Education Program (NITEP) in the Faculty of Education at the University of British Columbia (UBC). I had certainly heard of Verna, as she had a national reputation for writing about and giving numerous keynote speeches about Indian education and curriculum. She asked me to work on some NITEP projects and to consider teaching some of the program's Indian education courses. I accepted and my teaching career moved away from Kindergarten to Grade 12 (K-12) to teacher education. Verna had begun teaching some of the NITEP courses just before she accepted the director position. She believed they needed to be updated and more focused on Indian perspectives and culture. One of my first major NITEP projects was to revise two of the core Indian education courses.

One of the courses focused on the history of Indian education in Canada and it examined the various federal policies, one of which was the *Indian Control of Indian Education* policy. The ICIE policy was so refreshing and innovative after examining the educational policies that forbade or ignored Indian culture and language through various forms of education implemented by the early missionaries, the Industrial and Residential Schools, and integration to public schools. I thought, "Finally, here was a policy that was developed by Indian educators and leaders across Canada, which focused on two very important principles: local control and parental involvement." It also included the principle that Indian culture and language was foundational to successful education and that teachers who were culturally sensitive had an important role to fulfill. My reflection now focuses on the role of teachers, especially the role of Indigenous teacher education.

Indigenous Teacher Education: Creating Opportunities for Success

For the past 32 years, Indigenous teacher education has been a very important part of my educational responsibilities. My work in this area has been mainly with NITEP[3]. In 2014, NITEP will celebrate its 40th anniversary.

A few Indigenous teacher education programs were established at Canadian universities around the mid-to late 1970s, perhaps in response to the ICIE or as an exemplar to its call for more Indigenous teachers, as noted in the ICIE policy statement:

> If progress is going to be made in improving educational opportunity for [N]ative children, it is basic that teacher and counsellor training programs be redesigned to meet their needs. The need for [N]ative teachers and counselors is critical and urgent; the need for specially trained non-Indian teachers and counselors is also very great. (National Indian Brotherhood, 1972, p. 18)

A handful of Indigenous teachers who established the British Columbia Native Indian Teachers' Association (BC NITA) worked with UBC Education faculty members to establish NITEP. In the early 1970s, they estimated that there were approximately 26 Indian teachers in BC within a total teacher population of 23,000 (Archibald, 1986, p. 34). The NITEP founders followed through with the ICIE recommendation above to "redesign" the teacher education program to meet the needs of Indigenous children, instead of making minor adaptations to the existing BEd program, such as securing admission seats. Their vision, innovation, and commitment certainly created systemic change, and for 40 years, many Indigenous people and children have benefitted from their courageous leadership.

In 1974, NITEP became a new Bachelor of Education degree program for people of Indigenous[4] ancestry. It was offered as an option to the existing teacher education program. The key NITEP principles that relate to ICIE include Indigenous community involvement and decision making and Indigenous education courses that critically examine history, Indigenous knowledge/culture, languages, pedagogy, and community engagement. To ensure Indigenous community engagement, NITEP is structured so that at least one-half to two-thirds of the program is taken at a regional field centre. The field centres are established in partnership with local Indigenous communities or organizations. Local community educators, Elders, and cultural knowledge holders participate on the council that guides NITEP; some teach a course or participate as resource speakers and some mentor the students and faculty. NITEP students complete educational placements in each of their four years of the program, whereby the first three years are situated within various community and school-based settings. Over its 40 years, NITEP field centres have been located at 18 sites in British Columbia. Usually, four regional centres are offered annually.

NITEP's nine Indigenous courses form the foundation for an Indigenous education concentration. NITEP students examine the impact of colonization through educational policies and curricula; learn about ways that Indigenous community members and educators develop Indigenous knowledge (IK) learning resources, strategic plans, and local policies; and begin to develop their own IK educational philosophies and responses to Indigenous education. They also take the required teacher education courses and practica of the basic teacher education program. The cultural knowledge that NITEP students possess varies from those who know their Indigenous language and culture to those who have an awareness of their Indigeneity. NITEP's Indigenous courses provide a safe space for discussing issues related to cultural identity, while challenging students to engage in critical inquiry about the current state of Indigenous education and ways that they can participate in its advancement.

In my travels throughout British Columbia, I often find a NITEP alumnus teaching or in a leadership role in public or Band schools. They are also scooped up for positions at post-secondary institutions; in social service sectors; and in Indigenous, provincial, or federal government units. Many have said that they would not have completed their Bachelor of Education degree if it weren't for NITEP. Just as NITEP has created opportunities for their success, students have also contributed to the success of NITEP through their feedback during and after the program. Continuing to offer a relevant and good quality Indigenous teacher education for 40 years is an important achievement. The NITEP principles of community engagement and Indigenous knowledge, that align with those of the *Indian Control of Indian Education* policy, demonstrate that ICIE continues to have relevancy and is even more important today than ever.

Indigenous Teacher Education: The Next 40 Years

The first 40 years of both the *Indian Control of Indian Education* policy and Indigenous teacher education programs, such as NITEP, have created solid Indigenous education pathways based on principles such as community control/engagement and Indigenous knowledges. In order to ensure that these pathways lead to good quality education, I strongly believe that we need to keep offering Indigenous teacher education programs, especially ones that are for Indigenous people, for the following reasons: (1) the impact of colonization and educational policies that aimed to assimilate Indigenous people have continued to influence generations of Indigenous people; (2) Indigenous knowledge pedagogical approaches are in their early development stages within faculties of education in Canada; and (3) Indigenous teacher education programs, that have been in existence for many years, have much to offer general teacher education programs that are beginning to address Indigenous education in serious ways. Although other educational strategies can also address these three areas and Indigenous teacher education programs do more, the latter are often not considered for these purposes; therefore, I emphasize them next.

Indigenous teacher education programs have served as post-secondary educational pathways of equity, access, and relevancy for Indigenous people across Canada (Niessen, 2008). Often, Indigenous post-secondary students have identified various issues that they face during their programs of study, such as personal and institutional racism and emotional, social, and other responsibilities they take on for their families and communities (Archibald et al., 1995; Archibald, Pidgeon, & Hawkey, 2010). Programs such as NITEP, that have a cohort, extended family approach; a field centre coordinator who advises and teaches; Elders and cultural knowledge as mentors; and Indigenous courses provide Indigenous teacher education students with support and advocacy mechanisms to deal with personal, family, and community matters while they continue their studies. Students' initial reaction is often to quit the program, an action that they would have chosen if it were not for people working with and in the program (Archibald et al., 1995). Those who work with an Indigenous teacher education program fulfill important advocacy and mentoring roles for students to help them deal with intergenerational trauma, racism, and other matters.

In 2012, the UBC Faculty of Education introduced a required Aboriginal Education core course for all its teacher education candidates. Now, all teacher education programs in BC offer such a course to meet teacher certification criteria. In September 2012, the teacher qualification body (now the Teacher Regulation Branch and formerly the BC College of Teachers) introduced the requirement to complete a three-credit Aboriginal Education course in order to be certified to teach in BC.[5] This type of course is an important step to increasing mainly non-Indigenous students' educational awareness and knowledge about Aboriginal education. It should not be the final step. Programs such as NITEP have a wealth of experience in teaching about Aboriginal education and they continue to develop Indigenous knowledge pedagogical approaches, which can be shared with general teacher education programs or used as a catalyst for further development (Niessen, 2008). Examples of the latter are the recent mentoring program for teaching Indigenous material, the establishment of a professorship in Indigenous Education for Teacher Education, and an Associate Dean of Indigenous Education implemented in the UBC Faculty of Education. All of these recent initiatives have or will contribute to developing courses, professional development, and multimedia resources that address Indigenous knowledge pedagogy.

NITEP's leadership, over its 40-year history, has continued to review and revise its program to ensure its relevancy and quality. There is much that can be learned from this program, such as offering an effective community-based or regional model, working with other post-secondary institutions, providing a cohort approach, offering various types of educational placements, developing and teaching Indigenous courses, and working with Indigenous post-secondary students. We have several second-generation NITEP alumni family members, such as parent-child graduates, and more alumni are completing masters and doctoral programs. Perhaps they will undertake research in some of the aforementioned areas. We are entering an exciting era, swelling with the next waves of intergenerational Indigenous scholarship, as noted in the following sections.

ICIE Reflections of a Third-Wave Indigenous Scholar: Michelle Pidgeon

The aim of the ICIE policy paper at the time was to communicate, to the government and fellow Canadians, Indigenous visions for good quality education by stating

> ... we ... want our children to learn that happiness and satisfaction come from:
> - pride in one's self,
> - understanding one's fellowmen, and,
> - living in harmony with nature (National Indian Brotherhood, 1972, p. 1).

In 1991, Verna J. Kirkness and Ray Barnhardt articulated similar values through the 4Rs of respect, relevance, reciprocity, and responsibility to guide the understanding of those working in post-secondary education as to their roles and responsibilities to Indigenous education.

To situate myself, I was born and raised in Newfoundland and Labrador the same year that the ICIE document was written; however, my educational experiences in the then public Roman Catholic educational system, from the mid-1970s onward, did not reflect the ICIE vision. While there was some brief mention of the Innu, Inuit, Mi'kmaq, and Beothuk in my social studies courses, overall, there was an absence of recognition of the First Peoples and that, contemporarily, we were present in the classroom. My first experience with relevant curriculum was during my masters program when I took a newly designed fourth year English course on Aboriginal literature. It was during my time at the University of British Columbia, studying for my doctorate, that I came to truly understand what the 4Rs in one's educational experience could mean. I not only had Indigenous professors, but relevant coursework (e.g., Tsˋ’kel courses) and curriculum; respect for Indigenous ways of knowing and being was also evident throughout my program. I acknowledge that there were still tensions and a view that more could be done but, by far, it was the first time in my educational experience, as a person of Aboriginal ancestry, that I felt that I belonged. I also acknowledge that in the 40 years since the ICIE, much more has been done across the educational system of my home province related to curriculum development and pedagogy. For example, Memorial University's Bachelor of Education (Native and Northern) and the Diploma in Native and Northern Education programs work diligently to ensure that Labradorians have people from their communities as teachers and that the curriculum and pedagogy reflect Indigenous cultures and contexts.

As a higher education scholar, I see interconnections of the ICIE principles and the 4Rs throughout my own work and study. Therefore, I frame my reflection, using the 4Rs, to show how I see the ICIE principles living within Canada's higher education system; I reflect, towards the end, on changes needed within this system to truly honour the principles set forth in ICIE over 40 years ago.

ICIE Principles and Higher Education

It is critical to state very clearly that Indigenous peoples have always valued education. Prior to colonization, Indigenous nations had their own educational systems and pedagogies that were integral to their knowledge(s), culture(s), and language(s). These values are evident in the articulated Indigenous visions of education, which are centred and grounded in Indigenous traditions and cultures, as noted within the ICIE paper:

> We believe in education:
> - as a preparation for total living,
> - as a means of free choice of where to live and work,
> - as a means of enabling us to participate fully in our own social, economic, political, and educational advancement. (National Indian Brotherhood, 1972, p. 3)

The ICIE document outlined four areas of Canada's educational system requiring attention for Indigenous values to be integrated into education: (1) responsibility (e.g., local control; parental responsibility; school board representation; transfer of jurisdiction; and Indian control); (2) programs (e.g., curriculum and Indian values; language of instruction; and cultural education centres); (3) teachers (e.g., training programs for Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal teachers and counsellors; and Indian paraprofessionals); and (4) facilities (e.g., improved and new educational facilities; educational institutions; staff; and research).

Aboriginal participation in higher education has a complex and relatively recent history. While there were a few Aboriginal peoples attending post-secondary education prior to 1970, the majority of growth in participation occurred after this period due to the establishment of relevant programs, such as the Native Indian Teacher Education Program (NITEP) and First Nations Studies Program, coupled with designated federal funding programs for Aboriginal post-secondary participation.

The Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples (RCAP) (1996) and, more recently, the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (2013) process, provide insight to the barriers and challenges experienced by Indigenous peoples throughout Canada's educational systems. Simultaneously, Indigenous leaders and allies have been working towards making the educational system more relevant and meaningful to our communities, directly addressing the systemic and racist policies and practices that continue to perpetuate misunderstanding and misrepresentation of Indigenous peoples. It is through this tireless work that a slow but steady increase in high school graduation rates is evident along with increased success (albeit not on par with the rest of Canada) within post-secondary sectors. This growth has resulted in a diverse range of Aboriginal students enrolling at post-secondary levels, and increased services and academic programs being developed for Aboriginal peoples. We will return to program development later in this article; for now, let us focus on the topic of responsibility and post-secondary education.

Responsibility and Post-Secondary Education

While the federal government remains indifferent to its responsibility to the post-secondary education of Indigenous peoples, by stating that their responsibility is solely social and not legal within the *Indian Act*, the ICIE (1972) document clearly outlines Indian education, spanning one's life from early learning, K-12, to post-secondary studies. Indigenous understandings of responsibility clearly speak to the dual responsibility that all of us have in Indigenous education and to each other. In terms of responsibility and higher education, the ICIE (1972) document advocated that

> All Indian people, young and old alike, must be given a wide variety of educational opportunities. Specific problems in many Indian communities must be met by improved education. Much needed programs include: nursery and kindergarten education, junior and senior high school opportunity, vocational training, adult education, post-secondary education, and alcohol and drug abuse education. (National Indian Brotherhood, 1972, pp. 10-11).

This wholistic vision of responsibility of education, to be across one's lifespan, speaks to Indigenous values and the responsibility those writing the ICIE document had to the generations of Indigenous peoples they were thinking of.

Today, we can see that this responsibility continues to create tension as the federal government carries out policy revisions, both in terms of Indian education and in its wavering financial commitment to post-secondary education. The federal government's move to decrease responsibility is another example of the tensions between two worldviews and two sovereign nations, attempting to speak together but with the government only hearing, seeing, and interpreting issues from their perspective. The authors of the ICIE document saw the challenges of First Nations and non-First Nations peoples understanding each other. In recognition of the need for mutual understanding and appreciation of differences to be actualized within Canadian society, the ICIE document stated "it is essential that Canadian children of every racial origin have the opportunity during their school days to learn about the history, customs and culture of this country's original inhabitants and first citizens" (National Indian Brotherhood, 1972, p. 2). The irony is that the ICIE policy was specific to the relationship that First Nations had with the federal government, as dictated by the *Indian Act*. Today, however, we recognize that Canada's Aboriginal peoples also include Métis, Inuit, and others who self-identify as Aboriginal ancestry but who do not fall into federally-constructed categories of Indigenous peoples.

In my undergraduate teaching, I am often struck by the lack of awareness students possess when we begin speaking about Aboriginal peoples and education. Most of these students want to pursue teaching as a profession and, depending on where they went to school themselves and the courses they might have taken as part of their undergraduate degree, many remain unaware and frustrated that they don't know more. In challenging each other to think more critically about the knowledge we hold about First Nations peoples, the classroom becomes a powerful place for respect to be role modelled and reciprocal learning to occur. The responsibility of post-secondary education institutions to bridge this understanding is a key to all of us moving forward as a nation. In thinking about how we learn and engage with Aboriginal issues in this country (e.g., social media coverage of the Idle No More movement or misrepresentation of Indigenous issues by the media), the post-secondary campuses, encompassing the curricular and co-curricular experiences, provide many teachable moments to move forward the vision of ICIE principles of mutual understanding and appreciation of differences.

Verna J. Kirkness, in her reflection on the ICIE document, stated, "First Nations control is about doing what the mainstream hasn't been doing for our children" (personal communication, December 14, 2013). This notion is critical within the post-secondary realm, and the ICIE paper was very articulate in the responsibility that colleges and universities have to Indigenous education. It also emphasized the importance of increasing professional and university-educated Indigenous peoples to fulfill the broader goals of self-governance and determination. Upon hearing Verna's words, I reflected upon what I have witnessed through my work and interactions with colleges and universities across this country. I have seen those within front-line student service positions focus on building respectful relationships with Aboriginal students that empower the students' voices within the academy. There has been an increased focus on the recruitment of Aboriginal students, faculty, and staff and the development of Aboriginal strategic plans that guide institutional programs, policies, and practices with respect to Indigenous peoples (Pidgeon, 2008a). The next sections focus specifically on programs, teachers, and facilities.

Relevance: Programs

The ICIE document called for specific recruiting programs to attract Indigenous students to a broad variety of professions (e.g., nursing, law, teaching, medicine, engineering). It also spoke directly to the support services required for Indigenous student success: "Entrance requirements, pre-university programs, counselling and tutoring services, course requirements" (National Indian Brotherhood, 1972, p. 13). Recognizing the educational disparities in the K-12 system that prepares students for further education, the ICIE document requested that "rigid entrance requirements to universities, colleges, etc., must be adjusted to allow for entrance on the basis of ability, aptitude, intelligence, diligence and maturity" (National Indian Brotherhood, 1972, p. 13). It is hopeful to read words written in the 1970s and to gaze now across this country to see how much of this vision has been actualized.

In the past four decades we have seen growth and expansion of relevant Indigenous programs and services across our institutions. There are now programs established in law, teacher education, forestry, sciences, social work, and other designated major/minor areas of study that are relevant to Indigenous peoples. There are also more culturally relevant academic preparation programs aimed at supporting the transition to college or university. Many institutions also address admission requirements through prior learning assessments, designated seats for Aboriginal students, and/or the consideration of other factors besides grade point average (GPA) within their admissions processes. There are Aboriginal people working across student affairs and service areas (e.g., recruitment, housing, academic advising) but they are also firmly based within specific Aboriginal student services centres as well (Pidgeon, 2008a; Pidgeon & Hardy Cox, 2005).

We have also seen diversity in institutional types, with Aboriginal-based colleges, such as Blue Quills First Nation's College in Alberta, the Nicola Valley Institute of Technology in British Columbia, and the First Nations University of Canada in Saskatchewan, that were established to meet the local needs of surrounding Aboriginal communities and which create a space where Indigenous knowledge is central and Indigenous values are integrated through each aspect of the institutions' day-to-day operations. There are challenges, of course, even within these Indigenous institutions, as they are still bound by provincial and federal policies and procedures that are based on Euro-Western values (Battiste, Bell, & Findlay, 2002; Pidgeon, 2008a; Pidgeon, 2008b; Stonechild, 2006). Yet, Indigenous institutions provide a critical component envisioned within the ICIE document: choice! Today, Indigenous peoples have the choice to attend an Indigenous-based institution or a public institution that has the program and services where they can achieve their goals and aspirations.

However, there are still existing and continuing barriers to participation which, at times, replicate inequalities and perpetuate systemic barriers. Two specific examples are explored here, but it is recognized that there are more. The first is the challenge faced by Aboriginal peoples when they are not academically prepared in high school to have a choice as to which post-secondary institution they might attend. There is also a gender-based discussion that needs to be addressed when speaking of post-secondary choice and options. Verna J. Kirkness spoke directly to the gender inequities of Aboriginal peoples and post-secondary attainment, calling for more attention to be paid to our males (personal communication, 2013). Typically, there are more Aboriginal women attending university and more Aboriginal males attending trades schools (Statistics Canada, 2006, 2011, 2013). This representation indicates gendered professions which typically see a gender divide (e.g., social sciences and humanities for women and trades for men) and, in some cases, the economic realities of those who wish to work in their home communities where trades offer more employment opportunities in rural and remote areas. There are also more subtle and important barriers to point out that go beyond gender, such as positions of power. For example, there are more Aboriginal males in trades and, if kept in entry-level positions and not trained for leadership in the field, then who will make changes in the trades fields? (V.J. Kirkness, personal communication, 2013)

The second example speaks to the federal government's financial post-secondary support programs for First Nations. With limited access and funding, however, many First Nations students cannot access their desired program or the funding allotments do not cover the total costs of attending university or college (R. A. Malatest & Associates Ltd., 2008). Many post-secondary institutions have increased their responsibilities to include the financial needs of Aboriginal students. There are examples across Canada of third-party billing policies and specific scholarships and grants to those who self-identify as Aboriginal students. However, when one looks to the Aboriginal student experience literature, a continuing financial barrier remains (R. A. Malatest & Associates Ltd., 2008; RCAP, 1996). This specific challenge requires multiple stakeholders within institutions, governments, and Aboriginal communities to work together to address systemic polices and practices that continue to place barriers to accessing funding for higher education. As an example, many Indigenous-targeted scholarships require proof of Indian status, which many urban Aboriginal students do not have due to colonization or that on-reserve students have challenges receiving due to community politics. A policy shift that removes such stringent and narrow criteria, in addition to consideration of how awards are communicated to students, would hopefully reduce the financial barriers to pursuing a post-secondary education. The ICIE document called for the federal government to fully fund any First Nations student with the will and ability to undertake graduate studies, noting "it will be many years before the number of candidates for professional training exceeds the demand for trained professionals" (National Indian Brotherhood, 1972, p. 13). This still speaks to the current needs of many Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal organizations that require more Aboriginal presence and visibility.

Relationships and Respect: Teachers

The scholarship of TeHennepe (1993), Archibald et al. (1995), and even the video "What I Learned in Class Today: Aboriginal Issues in the Classroom" (First Nations Studies Program, 2008) reinforces the impact of the educator in the experiences of Aboriginal students—they help or, more frequently, hinder Aboriginal student success. That vote of confidence in ability, or proactive actions within the classroom to disrupt, interrupt, and prevent racial slurs or stereotypes, are all positive experiences that Indigenous students point to when they speak of their instructors that aided them. However, being singled out by a teacher or having teachers perpetuate stereotypes are direct examples, further supported by the work of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples (RCAP)(1996), that create unsafe learning environments for Aboriginal students. The relationship between the instructor and student is key to success and also key to creating systemic change across the Canadian education system. The recognition of this special relationship is evident in the *Accord on Indigenous Education*[6], signed in 2010 by each Dean of Education in Canada through the Association of Canadian Deans of Education (ACDE), sending a strong message. The *Accord* aims to actualize the goal of having the teachers who work with our children be more responsible, knowledgeable, and respectful of Indigenous peoples and education. While the Accord is specifically for teachers and principals within the K-12 system, a similar accord is needed across universities and colleges for all those working as leaders, professors, instructors, lecturers, sessional instructors, lab assistants, markers, tutors, and teaching assistants. This reciprocal vision of responsibility to Aboriginal children and their non-Aboriginal classmates, in which all learn together, valuing different knowledge systems and ways of being, provides a pathway forward for the next seven generations.

In thinking about relationships of educators and other stakeholders, the ICIE document noted the role of parental involvement within the K-12 system as a key component of *Indian Control of Indian Education*. Higher education has a different relationship with parents; however, there is still a place for Indigenous parents, Elders, leaders, and others to be involved in higher education, particularly within areas of governance and community relationships. We do see this happening more often, where respectful relationships between Aboriginal advisory committees and Elders' Councils are more integrated into the day-to-day affairs of running an institution. Senior executive positions at the institutional level, such as an Aboriginal Advisor to the President or an Associate Dean of Indigenous Education within faculties, have also been established. These positions of power within post-secondary institutions are also key to the vision of the ICIE document, to actualize influence and leadership over programs, services, and policies.

In thinking about the respect and relationships of our educators and our students, these relationships have been built because of the dedication and persistence of those first generation Indigenous scholars, Elders, and their allies who pushed against the system to create the necessary space and who also mentored and supported those younger generation of scholars to do the same. Through the creation of relevant programs and services and respectful teaching relationships, the vision of the 1972 ICIE document extends also to the physical dimensions of our college and university campuses.

Relevance: Facilities

Within increasing numbers of Aboriginal students, faculty, and staff within Canadian institutions, there has also been a call to make the spaces on campuses more relevant and respectful of the traditional unceded territories on which many institutions have been built. This honouring of protocol, while not a physical act, per se, speaks to their physical presence and, in important ways, acknowledges the colonial histories of the institutions, as to how they were built and their role within the colonization of Indigenous peoples. For example, in the 1970s, First Nations programs needed culturally relevant support services through Native Student Services, which are now commonly referred to as Aboriginal Student Centres or Indigenous Student Services. It is through the establishment of this physical, culturally relevant space that culturally relevant support programs were provided, and thus began the systemic change of Indigenizing the academy.

Aboriginal student services units evolved from one room within a student union building to today's examples of entire buildings that are architecturally built to respect local Indigenous peoples (Pidgeon & Hardy Cox, 2005; Pidgeon, 2008a). Within these buildings are cultural ceremony rooms, Elders' gathering spaces, kitchens, computer labs, and visual markers of the spaces that demonstrate living and breathing Indigenous knowledges. Students, faculty, and staff often refer to these spaces as their "home away from home." The existence of such spaces speaks to the relationships, respect, and relevance provided to Aboriginal students and to anyone else who chooses to enter. In contrast, institutions may simply put up Indigenous artwork and argue, de facto, that the institution is relevant and respectful to Indigenous peoples. Token acts of inclusion, such as the aforementioned example, perpetuate and reinforce stereotypes and systemic racism within our institutions. We need to keep envisioning ICIE principles in order to challenge systemic racism.

Future Visions ...

Since 1972, Canadian higher education has evolved to see more Aboriginal-specific programs and services, and even Aboriginal-specific institutions. However, with this relevance in programs and services, we have not yet seen the parallel growth in participation and degree attainment. The question of "Why?" surfaces. Why are there not more success stories emerging from our colleges and universities? The answer is complex and one that has multiple layers. For example, we know that Aboriginal students, staff, and faculty still encounter overt and covert forms of racism; financial barriers still remain a large impediment to the choices students have, as to where they go to college or university and whether they can afford to finish their programs; and the academic preparation within the K-12 sector influences whether or not our students have post-secondary choices.

The question of "Why?" highlights the complexity of Indigenous education and our history within Canada as a whole. The barriers facing Indigenous communities are not self-made or imposed. They are the legacy of the many systemic policies and practices (e.g., residential schools) that continue to be reproduced in our educational system. When I reflect on the 40 years since the ICIE document and where the next 40 years should take us as a nation, I would like evidence that we have learned from the past; and yet, I am not sure that post-secondary education institutions are taking up the issues that we find of greatest importance. With the guidance of our Elders and communities, and with the growth of Aboriginal faculty and researchers, we now have a body of work nationally and internationally that provides insight as to where we need to go. It would be my wish that those working in post-secondary and other educational leadership positions, both provincially and nationally, all have the heart and ears to hear and understand Indigenous policy recommendations and to work with Indigenous educators, communities, and leadership to implement them. This collective action would mean that the ICIE principles would be actualized so that when looking at institutional leadership, Indigenous peoples are present and graduation rates at high school and post-secondary education are on par (or even exceeding) our fellow Canadians. Our communities continue on the journey of healing and are empowered to be self-visioning economically, culturally, and politically. We want to see ourselves everywhere, in every profession, so that our next generations intuitively think "I can do that" because they see positive role models around them and an educational system that empowers them to dream, to have choice, and to become all that they wish to be.

ICIE Reflections of Fourth-Wave Indigenous Scholar: Marissa Muñoz

I identify as a Xicana Tejana, which simultaneously locates me politically, geographically, and relationally. Specifically, my maternal roots are of the Tlaxcalteca and Cohuahuiltecan-speaking peoples of the southern region of the Rio Grande, to the place now called south Texas. Today, the racist rhetoric generalizes all peoples of Mexican descent to be of illegal and/or immigrant origin (Santa Ana, 2002), but for many peoples across the southwest, we did not cross the border; the border is a recent invention imposed by the colonial government to disrupt the complex relationships and migration routes that Indigenous nations have relied on for many centuries (EagleWoman, 2008; Maestas, 2003; Osburn, 1999). As a Xicana, I recognize and honour my own Indigenous ancestry within the greater Mesoamerican context of colonization, and as a Tejana, I work to revitalize the specific cultural knowledges that emerged from place-based relationships between the peoples, the land, and the Rio Grande/Rio Bravo that is my ancestral home. Today, I live and work in Vancouver, BC.

Positionality Shapes My Lenses

While much of my writing focuses on the US-Mexico borderland, I am completing my doctoral studies in the US-Canada borderland, in the unceded traditional territories of the Coast Salish peoples, careful to acknowledge myself as a recently arrived international visitor, relative, and learner. This positionality demands that I develop a practice as a translator of contexts and a transliterator of ontologies, though my perspective is undeniably rooted in, and shaped by, the US side of each of these distinct international borders. It has been my privilege and honour to be immersed in a community of Canadian Indigenous educators, to centre my cultural self as the source of knowing and understanding, especially in my role as an educator. While I am not comfortable speaking to the specifics of the Canadian context, I can share my reflections as an emerging Indigenous scholar and professional educator, considering a hemispheric perspective of Indigenous education in its many various forms.

As I've come to understand the history of Canadian First Nations and Indigenous communities, and the clear visioning of both philosophical and logistical meanings of *Indian Control of Indian Education,* I am amazed. Through my international eyes, Canada generally provides processes for Indigenous peoples to self-identify. Thus recognized, individuals and communities can organize around the preservation of languages and revitalization of traditional knowledges, celebrating multiple generations working toward actualization, decolonization, and sovereignty. Whereas in the US, we seem to be arguing over federal recognition and imposed categories of colonial identity, Canada is celebrating 40 years of reclaiming education as a tool toward justice and decolonization. Until I moved here, I did not know this was possible.

At all education levels, the American mythology of manifest destiny has been normalized and accepted as the dominant perspective, paired with the ongoing melting pot approach to complete assimilation (Galicia, 2010; Villanueva, 2013). It is the American way, the American hegemony, upon which much of the mainstream curricula has been built, which marginalizes through exclusion: to have a different way of knowing and way of being is to be un-American and must be immediately eradicated or assimilated. In this way, colonization is ongoing in classrooms across the United States, a daily conflict of ideologies between whom the learners are and who the educational system wants them to become.

My Own Teaching Practice

I loved teaching sixth grade. Yet, after several years of teaching middle school in California, I found myself overwhelmed and unable to make the impact that I knew was possible. Every spare moment of time was devoted to anti-bias and anti-racism study groups, culturally-sensitive curriculum, and community organizing, yet I was still part of a public school system that supported only a very narrow range of the learners in my classroom. In preparing my grades for the report cards, patterns were easy to see. Despite my best efforts using recommended and inclusive practices, the students who failed most often were the English language learners, the economically disadvantaged, and usually my racialized and Indigenous learners. Even with a long list of accommodations, these students were learning, but did not progress at the same rate as the other students. Privilege was invisible to those who benefitted from it and crushingly unfair to those who did not. Moreover, it was usually assumed that the problem was the learner rather than an unfair educational system.

Aware of these challenges, I modified and accommodated, but still the results were the same: the students I helped the most could not easily succeed within the given school structure. I felt conflicted. My role as an educator was that of a gatekeeper, perpetuating the very stratification and inequity I wished to dismantle. Ultimately, I left the classroom because I was unable to resolve who I was as a cultural being with what I was required to perform professionally as a classroom teacher. Like so many other racialized and Indigenous teachers, I left the teaching profession before the five-year mark, feeling like a failure. Although I didn't have the tools to recognize it at the time, today, I better understand how the mainstream public school system only supports a very narrow range of educators that parallels the success of a very narrow range of learners. Much like the learners who may bring a different cultural framework from home, who struggle with the dominant ideology of the mainstream public school system, teachers face the same difficulties. In both cases, having a different cultural framework and a different way of knowing lead to similarly dismal options: assimilation at the cost of one's cultural self or the inevitable curtailing of long-term career possibilities.

Shifting Perspectives

These realizations may never have been apparent had I stayed in California. The shift in perspective was afforded by the dramatic shift in my personal geography and immersion in the Vancouver community of Indigenous educators. There are so many differences and dynamics to understand between these two contexts that it can sometimes become overwhelming. The first time I encountered the ICIE policy paper, I read through my teacher lenses and immediately recognized the impact such a statement could have on my own teaching career. Later, I re-read through my community member lenses and could imagine the impact such a vision could have in revitalizing the traditional culture of my own home community. It was a revelation to me that I could fully integrate my cultural self with my professional educator self, creating a teaching practice that could nurture and support students, teachers, parents, and the community. My American mind had no previous basis for considering such a possibility. In this way, my own process of learning, and of shifting perspectives, has been similar to that of an insect molting—painful, vulnerable, necessary, and ultimately transformative.

Before working on this project, I was familiar with the ICIE policy paper but the opportunity to interview Dr. Kirkness breathed new life into the text. Listening to her allowed me to understand the original intentions of ICIE, not through the federal policies and programs, but as a testimony from an educator who helped shape community-centered Indigenous education through her own teaching practice. Her stories clearly illustrate that the 1972 ICIE policy paper was meant to be read as a clear declaration of autonomy: we are not satisfied with your colonial education system and we demand something radically different, based in Indigenous intellectual traditions for the nurturance of our learners and communities.

Yet, even such a clear and straightforward statement of vision was trimmed and molded to fit the colonial Canadian legal, political, and educational frameworks. Through Dr. Kirkness' rich account, and by focusing on the progress and challenges of the original ICIE document, we are invited to consider the role we each have in honouring the past, and shaping the present and future of Indigenous education.

The Power of Self-Determination

My own role as a fourth generation emerging Indigenous scholar is to apply the teachings of my Elders, my teachers, and my communities in the continued struggle for education that nurtures the intergenerational transmission of traditional knowledge. Part of this responsibility is refusing to be complacent and satisfied with existing frameworks that do not work for our collective communities. Thus, this 40th anniversary serves as a reminder to be vigilant and critical, questioning how and why current educational outcomes do not yet align with community intentions. Analysis must include a range of perspectives, examining power dynamics at the multiple levels, from the micro to the global.

Struggles over the education of Indigenous peoples can be seen across the globe, as local communities fight to preserve the traditional language and culture of the region (Battiste, 2005; Galicia, 2010; Villanueva, 2013), rather than the globalized Euro-Western ideologies. Fundamentally, the question is philosophical, creating different futures for our youth: one in which traditional values and knowledge will have shaped them into capable and contributing community members or one in which traditional culture is minimized in favour of marketable skills and consumer habits that contribute to the global economy. In this way, education shapes our youth which, in turn, shapes the future of our communities. As Indigenous peoples, the options feel somewhat limited in this age of globalization: we can persevere, be assimilated, or face eradication.

Here in Canada the mainstream media continues to portray First Nations education through deficit lenses, often blaming communities rather than examining the historical and political circumstances that have led to present conditions. Similarly, federal educational policy continues to assume First Nations educational initiatives require management and oversight, as they are not yet at parity across many criteria with provincial public schools. Time has done little to reconcile the ways in which different worldviews have led to different interpretations of what *Indian Control of Indian Education* means, both in theory and in practice. Definitions have yet to be agreed upon and terms have yet to be clarified.

The original ICIE document was written by the National Indian Brotherhood/Assembly of First Nations assuming that Indigenous knowledge would be the basis for the content, the methods, and framework for understanding education, with provincial educational benchmarks added to support Indigenous ways of knowing and being in the classroom. However, when the federal government adapted the concepts and language of the ICIE document, it was done so assuming a Euro-Western Canadian worldview, in which some Indigenous content was sprinkled into provincial educational systems, but the power structure remained unchanged. Rather than distribute decision-making power and hold school officials accountable to their communities, a few community members have been employed to monitor and report to the government, functioning the way schools always have in the provincial system. To create the model that gives Indian communities control of the education of their learners would require a radical restructuring of existing systems of education, ideology, and political and legal power (Battiste, 2005). Simply making space for a few Indigenous concepts and individuals within white-dominant society is not enough to facilitate the changes demanded by the ICIE document. It becomes necessary to reflect and ask: "Are we on the path to cultural revitalization through education? Are current educational practices and outcomes successful in centring the cultural ways of knowing and being that will affirm our learners and communities as vibrant and powerful? What else can be done to get us there?"

In light of the many lessons I've learned during my time in Vancouver, and inspired by the self-determination of ICIE principles in creating a viable alter-Native model of education, I turn now toward home, to reframe the current educational struggles of the US southwest. Lacking a clear, unifying vision, such as in the ICIE document, and a unified critical mass of coordinated, concerned Indigenous educators, the following examples may offer a warning of how easily systems of power can attempt to erase Indigenous identity.

Reframing Home: The Struggle for Recognition

Colonization is ongoing, as the continued denial of the existence of many Indigenous people across the US southwest and Mexico parallels the erasure of the many Indigenous cultures, languages, knowledges, and histories across the globe. In spite of such landmark efforts as the *United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples* (2008) to protect the rights of Indigenous peoples' education, that honours and protects their traditional knowledges, education continues to be used as a tool of assimilation and cultural genocide. Evidence of this can be seen in both the US federal educational benchmarks and state standards, in which Indigenous peoples and knowledges are rendered extinct, past tense, with little to no regard for current efforts toward survival and preservation. As an educator, this rewriting of history—specifically, the erasure of Indigenous peoples and knowledges—and the subsequent indoctrination of learners toward the colonial *terra nullius* mythology, is of primary concern. To understand the current struggle over curricula, we need to first understand the historical context of the US southwest.

When the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo ended the Mexican-American war in 1848, the US took nearly one million square miles, nearly half of the Mexican territory, pushing the US border to its current location, and jumping over thousands of Indigenous communities. In its original form, the treaty was written with provisions for the "Mexican citizens" residing in the territory, consisting primarily of *"pueblos de indios, genizaros, ...* and *mestizos"* (Urrieta, 2003, p. 160) (translated as Indian villages, detribalized Indians, and mixed race Indians) to be granted American citizenship, and to retain the title to their lands. However, President James Polk omitted these articles upon ratification (Hernandez, 2001) to reclassify the territory as "unclaimed", rendering Mexican Indigenous descended peoples across the southwest landless exiles in their own ancestral territories.

Explicit national policies encouraging anti-Mexican and anti-Indigenous violence in the late 1800s and early 1900s prompted many communities and families to refuse to be registered by the American government. Survival required silence around the question of racial identification. Indigenous populations across the southwest continue to speak their Native languages and practice their traditional knowledge, even though they are officially detribalized and not recognized as Indigenous peoples (Tamez, 2008). Even today, many people refuse to claim Indigenous ancestry out of shame and fear of repercussion. Terms such as Hispanic and Latina/o have since been coined and applied by various presidential administrations to confuse the issue of identity by conflating race, ethnic ancestry, and language groups (Gross, 2003; Pewewardy, 2000). Census records over the past century have been noticeably unreliable, as the results are often blank, skewed, and confusing, the answers of identity shifting depending largely on who is asking the questions (Campbell & Heyman, 2007; Maestas, 2003).

Thus, the history of racial violence across the southwest is crucial to understanding the current political climate shaping education (Gross, 2003; Maestas, 2003; Tamez, 2010). One recent example is the court decision to uphold Arizona state law HB 2281, which outlaws what is called Mexican-American studies or ethnic studies as divisive and "un-American." Specifically, curricular materials focusing on the pre-contact Indigenous knowledge systems and Mesoamerican histories, rather than a sanitized colonial mythology, are considered dangerous and offensive (Sandoval, 2012; Villanueva, 2013). Similar laws are currently being debated in Texas, such as SB 1128, which would disqualify ethnic studies courses from consideration as legitimate history courses that count toward graduation requirements (Planas, 2013). In other words, students can choose to take Mexican-American studies or Indigenous studies courses, but these only count as ethnic studies electives and cannot be taken to replace the "real" history courses.

In both Arizona and Texas, a majority of the population is of Mexican Indigenous-descent, yet power is held by the wealthy Euro-American elite, and legal and systemic de-legitimation maintains the Eurocentric American hegemony. Unsurprisingly, colonization in the forms of willful historical amnesia, land dispossession, and cultural genocide is ongoing as Indigenous peoples continue to be dehumanized, silenced, and stripped of their identities and rights through mis-education.

If I were to consider the next steps in the southwest in light of the lessons learned from the ICIE, I would start from existing successful models, such as American Indian schools and tribal colleges that are successful in honouring specific community cultures, in spite of marginalization and constant threat of cancellation. Perhaps the US has yet to witness a critical mass of communities that work to take back the educational system because we are too easily distracted by the battle over identity between the federally recognized Native Americans and the non-federally-recognized Indigenous others. We cannot allow colonial categories of identity to derail hemispheric inter-tribal social movements toward the inclusive preservation of the many traditional knowledges, languages, and collective memories that nurture our many Indigenous communities. There is much to learn from Indigenous education efforts across the globe.

Discussion: Indigenous Meaning of Control and Power

Across many Indigenous worldviews, ecologies are understood holistically as an interrelated network of beings-in-relation connected by intellectual, physical, emotional, and spiritual aspects. Similarly, humans are understood within concentric rings of context that extend to all of creation, guided by the responsibilities to past and future generations of community members. Clearly, each perspective would define the learner with different terms and would describe the purpose of education differently than that of a Eurocentric framework.

In our interview, Verna J. Kirkness spoke of the ICIE challenges rooted in a colonial worldview. She also spoke about an Indigenous worldview as the basis of Indigenous education that centres Indigenous knowledge as the source for content, curricula, and pedagogy. She suggests that building an Indigenous education system based in an Indigenous worldview would be radically different in **form and function** than what currently exists. These philosophical differences are dramatic, leading to very different understandings of the **purpose** of education. Kirkness elaborated:

> The curriculum is another thing that I thought we were very insightful about.... We were adamant our own curriculum would emphasize our Indian values, our customs, our languages, and so on. The words that are written right in the policy state that unless the child learns about the forces and the history of his people, the values, the customs, the language, he will never really know himself or his potential as a human being. (personal communication, October, 17, 2013, p. 9 transcript)

Clearly, the original ICIE policy was explicitly and intentionally designed to reaffirm the learner as an Indigenous person, to prioritize Indigenous ways of knowing and being as central to learner empowerment. These are, therefore, very different understandings of the **implementation** and **expectations** of educational practice compared to a Eurocentric classroom. However, the ways in which Aboriginal students experience Indigeneity within their mainstream education, particularly with regard to curriculum and pedagogy, continue to lead to differences in educational **outcomes**. There are many examples of the ongoing work to push colonial education systems toward change to be truly inclusive, and, further yet, to grow Indigenous-based institutions, whether K-12 or post-secondary, that operate from Indigenous forms of governance, leadership, policy, curriculum, and pedagogy. There is no formula for how to do this successfully, as each community has different needs and goals. Common across many contexts are the underlying values based in Indigenous traditions and understandings of self in relation to our communities.

Whereas the original ICIE policy paper recognized and honoured the

Indigenous learner as the next generation of Indigenous community member, the colonial system of education is geared to assimilate the next generation of obedient, multicultural Canadian citizens. Kirkness explained:

> Indian Affairs had a different interpretation that we were not aware of until the policy was accepted.... So the Minister of Indian Affairs hung on and didn't really allow the Indian Control to develop as it should. The Minister kept things as the status quo, and was still trying to do things the old way to be successful. (personal communication, October, 17, 2013, p. 6 transcript)

This last quote speaks to the ongoing power differences of relations between the federal, provincial, and Indigenous governments. The tensions of the ongoing colonial practices, while more subtle today than 100 years ago, are ongoing and there are fundamental differences of understanding (e.g., Euro-Western and Indigenous) that need to be continuously translated and navigated when we are working within the Canadian educational system.

Even today, we are faced with the challenge of reminding the federal government of some fundamental problems when they are articulating policy for Indigenous peoples. Aboriginal people want to be involved as partners in the construction of legislation and decision-making processes. However, in the current process of drafting legislation, Indigenous communities are often asked for a consultation responding to a document that has already been written by the federal government. By design, this process inherently has us responding to the Euro-Western construction of Indigenous policy. Clearly this approach does not work.

In the release of the document *Working Together for First Nation Students: A Proposal for a Bill on First Nation Education, October 2013,* we are left asking: "Would the new legislation align with the original ICIE policy document or would the newly proposed law maintain the power dynamics of colonial education as usual?" In the first pages of text, the answers became obvious.

> Students must receive instruction, materials, transportation and required equipment for their education and schools must have the professional services and learning supports typical of education systems, regardless of which governance option a First Nation decides. (Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development, 2013b, p. 7)

For example, lacking any clarification of terms within the rest of the paragraph, what does "typical" refer to? Is "typical" referring to the average provincial public school classroom, or does it include culturally-centric community supported classrooms? Furthermore, the very concept of *Indian Control of Indian Education* would seem to contradict the notion that both students and schools be treated uniformly regardless of decisions of a particular First Nations community. The prescriptive language above and throughout the proposed bill puts the onus on First Nations to fulfill the federal government's numerous detailed requirements, which reinforces Kirkness' earlier point that First Nations schools continue to be "operated" by the community and not "controlled" by them. The federal government is also silent about their responsibility to ensure that First Nations schools are adequately funded with the resources necessary to achieve these goals. Thus, different interpretations of the concept of "control" will continue with the proposed bill, much the way it has for the ICIE document.

In the section of the original ICIE document, *The Role of Parents in Setting Goals,* the policy states:

> We are the best judges of the kind of school programs which contribute to these goals without causing damage to the child. We must, therefore, reclaim our right to direct the education of our children. (National Indian Brotherhood , 1972, p. 3)

Upon first glance, the proposed legislation seems to borrow some of the language of the 1972 ICIE policy paper, but strategically applies it toward the colonial conception of education. Whereas the proposed legislation assigns each First Nations community a choice of governance from a set of predefined options, the original ICIE document was intending for First Nations to reclaim the right to define the content, the curricula, the pedagogy, and the logistical support in their local schools. The difference between these interpretations of "shared power" is directly related to the differences in the purposes of education between an Indigenous and colonial framework of understanding.

Some instances of philosophical disagreement are not as subtle. Explicitly under the "Interpretation" section of the 2013 proposed bill:

> 'Education program' includes the subjects that are taught at a school as part of a course of study, the learning objectives and the manner of assessing the students' achievement of those learning objectives. (This definition is meant to encompass the curriculum and/or course of study students follow leading to a high school diploma.) (Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development, 2013b, p. 10)

Whereas, in a colonial education system, learners are constantly assessed as a measure of academic achievement, prioritizing intellectual learning objectives and banking-model styles of pedagogy as indicators of success, Indigenous approaches to education are quite different. As defined in the ICIE document, the "educational program" includes the following:

> We want education to provide the setting in which our children can develop the fundamental attitudes and values which have an honored place in Indian tradition and culture.... We want the behavior of our children to be shaped by those values which are most esteemed in our culture.... School programs which are influenced by these values respect cultural priority and are an extension of the education which parents give children from their first years. These

> early lessons emphasize attitudes of:
> - self-reliance,
> - respect for personal freedom,
> - generosity,
> - respect for nature,
> - wisdom.
>
> All of these have a special place in the Indian way of life. (National Indian Brotherhood, 1972, p. 2)

From a holistic Indigenous approach, the "education program" may include intellectual, emotional, physical, and spiritual aspects of development, for which growth can be demonstrated in a number of personalized, non-competitive, and inclusive ways. These values in no way compromise a student's attainment of graduation requirements. In both instances, the goal is high school graduation, yet we can clearly see that the difference lies in acknowledging who the learners are as complete, proud, capable Indigenous individuals and community members.

Articulated in the ICIE paper and in ongoing work since 1972, the Indigenous philosophical approach continues to push and create radical changes, while the colonial philosophical approach has remained locked as it always has. Social change is not a measure of intention; it can only be measured by a difference in the outcome of events. In other words, we will know that the intentions written into the ICIE document will be successful when graduation rates for Indigenous students are on par with those of their peers, when learners are supported and affirmed by their home cultures, and when balanced, capable learners contribute to healthy, prosperous communities.

Moving Forward: Respectful and Reciprocal Relationships

On this 40th anniversary of the *Indian Control of Indian Education* policy, we are served well by the reflections of all that has been achieved and also by the important reminder that there is still much work to do. In each of our reflections we speak of areas of growth, of meaningful change and challenges within the educational contexts that we have worked and/or researched or even attended as students ourselves. Despite years of colonization, we persevere; our resilience as Indigenous peoples will enable us to live the values of the ICIE policy and to make them stronger for the next seven generations.

We encourage Indigenous and non-Indigenous allies to work both separately and cooperatively, in respectful and reciprocal relationships, to move Indigenous education in directions originally envisioned by the ICIE document. The meaning of reciprocity here implies that both Indigenous and Canadian societies benefit from good quality Indigenous education.

We encourage Indigenous nations across Canada and elsewhere to develop respectful and reciprocal relationships with each other, in order to learn from each other, to support our respective self-determination and sovereignty approaches for good quality Indigenous education, and to resist continuing attempts of new forms of colonization and assimilation. The relationships between Indigenous nations are critical as we move forward; together, we are a united power that can make significant changes.

Our relationships with the federal government can only be improved by having our own visions of education for our people clearly in our minds and hearts. The scholarship of Indigenous researchers, policy makers, educators, leaders, and allies has articulated the shared visions of meaningful Indigenous education, self-determination, and self-governance. In moving forward, we must continue to disrupt and transform educational systems that do not work for Indigenous learners, break the hegemonic assumptions of colonization, and build educational policies, programs, and practices that honour Indigenous ways of knowing and being. We raise our hands in thanks and in respect for all those who have gone before us, the waves of scholars, activists, leaders, and citizens who have stood for Indigenous ways of knowing and being. We raise our hands in appreciation to all those who now stand together to continue the good work of those before us.

Notes

[1] The terms *Indigenous* and *Aboriginal* will be used interchangeably throughout this article. The term *Indian* will be used when discussing points about the *Indian Control of Indian Education* policy paper or to indicate the time period when the term was commonly used.

[2] The date of 1969 refers specifically to the federal government's 1969 policy document, commonly referred to as the *White Paper*, titled *Statement of the Government of Canada on Indian Policy (The White Paper):*
http://www.aadnc-aandc.gc.ca/eng/1100100010189/1100100010191

[3] The official name for NITEP has not changed, even though the terms *Native* and *Indian* are not commonly used, except in either historical or legal contexts (i.e., the Indian Act). NITEP is more like a name than an acronym and many alumni feel strongly about keeping the name because it represents important values, such as family, caring, and culture.

[4] First Nations (status and non-status), Métis, and Inuit people are eligible to apply.

[5] See the BC College of Teachers (BCCT) Policy P5.C.03.1(b):
www.bcteacherregulation.ca/documents/AboutUs/BylawsPolicies/bylaws.pdf)

[6] The *Accord on Indigenous Education* can be found at:
http://www.usask.ca/education/aboriginal/downloads/ACDEIndigenousAccord.pdf

References

Archibald, J.-A. (1986). Completing a vision: The Native Indian Teacher Education Program at the University of British Columbia. *Canadian Journal of Native Education, 13*(1), 33-46.

Archibald, J.-A., Bowman, S., Pepper, F., Urion, C., Mirehouse, G., & Shortt, R. (1995).

Honoring what they say: Postsecondary experiences of First Nations graduates. *Canadian Journal of Native Education, (21)*1, 1-247.

Archibald, J.-A., Pidgeon, M., & Hawkey, C. (2010). *Aboriginal transitions: Undergraduate to graduate, Phase II final report.* Vancouver, BC: Indigenous Education Institute of Canada, The University of British Columbia. Retrieved from http://www.aboriginaltransitions.ca/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2011/02/phase2.pdf

Association of Canadian Deans of Education. (2010). *Accord on Indigenous education.* Delta, BC: Author. Retrieved from http://www.csse-scee.ca/docs/acde/acde_accord_indigenousresearch_en.pdf

Battiste, M. (2013). *Decolonizing education: Nourishing the learning spirit.* Saskatoon, SK: Purich Publishing:.

Battiste, M., Bell, L., & Findlay, L. M. (2002). Decolonizing education in Canadian universities: An interdisciplinary, international, Indigenous research project. *Canadian Journal of Native Education, 26*(2), 82-95.

Battiste, M. (2005). Indigenous knowledge: Foundations for First Nations. *World Indigenous Nations Higher Education Consortium (WINHEC) Journal.* Retrieved from http://www.truworld.ca/__shared/assets/Batiste-Indigenous-Knowledge29332.pdf

Brayboy, B. M. J. (2005). Toward a tribal critical race theory in education. *The Urban Review, 37*(5), 425-446. doi:10.1007/s11256-005-0018-y

British Columbia Ministry of Education (n.d.). *BCCT bylaws & policies (ones remaining in force).* Vancouver, BC: Ministry of Education, Teacher Regulation Branch. Retrieved from http://www.bcteacherregulation.ca/documents/AboutUs/BylawsPolicies/bylaws.pdf

Campbell, H., & Heyman, J. (2007). Slantwise: Beyond domination and resistance on the border. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography, 36*(1), 3-30. doi:10.1177/0891241606287000

EagleWoman, A. (2008). The eagle and the condor of the western hemisphere: Application of international Indigenous principles to halt the United States border wall. *Idaho Law Review, 45,* 555-574.

First Nations Studies Program, University of British Columbia. (Producer). (2008). *What I learned in class today: Aboriginal issues in the classroom* [Online video]. Retrieved from http://www.intheclass.arts.ubc.ca/video.html

Galicia, L. R. (2010). *Chicana power and pedagogy* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, IL.

Gillborn, D. (2005). Education policy as an act of white supremacy: Whiteness, critical race theory and education reform. *Journal of Education Policy, 20*(4), 485-505. doi: 10.1080/02680930500132346

Gross, A. J. (2003). Texas Mexicans and the politics of whiteness. *Law and History Review, 21*(1), 195-205.

Hernández, S. (2001). The legacy of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo on Tejanos' land. *The Journal of Popular Culture, 35*(2), 101-109. doi: 10.1111/j.0022-3840.2001.00101.x

Kirkness, V. J., & Barnhardt, R. (1991). First Nations and higher education: The four Rs - respect, relevance, reciprocity, responsibility. *Journal of American Indian Education, 30*(3), 1-15. Retrieved from http://jaie.asu.edu/v30/V30S3fir.htm

Kirkness, V. J. (2013)_*Creating space: My life and work in Indigenous education.* Winnipeg, MB: University of Manitoba Press.

Maestas, E. G.-B. (2003). *Culture and history of Native American peoples of south Texas.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation).The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX.

Manitoba Indian Brotherhood. (1971). *Wahbung: Our tomorrows.* Winnipeg, MB: Author.

Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development. (2013a). *Developing a First Nation education act: A blueprint for legislation, July 2013.* Ottawa, ON: Author. Retrieved from https://www.aadnc-aandc.gc.ca/DAM/DAM-INTER-HQ-EDU/STAGING/texte-text/fN-Education_blueprint-ebauche_1373053903701_eng.pdf

Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development. (2013b). *Working together for*

First Nation students: A proposal for a bill on First Nation Education, October 2013. Ottawa, ON: Author. Retrieved from https://www.aadnc-aandc.gc.ca/DAM/DAM-INTER-HQ-EDU/STAGING/texte-text/proposal_1382467600170_eng.pdf

Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. (1969). *Statement of the Government of Canada on Indian policy (The White Paper, 1969).* Ottawa, ON: Author. Retrieved from http://www.aadnc-aandc.gc.ca/eng/1100100010189/1100100010191

Monture-Angus, P. (1999). Considering colonialism and oppression: Aboriginal women, justice and the "theory" of decolonization. *Native Studies Review, 12*(1), 63-94.

National Indian Brotherhood. (1972). *Indian control of Indian education: Policy paper.* Ottawa, ON: Author. Retrieved from http://64.26.129.156/calltoaction/Documents/ICOIE.pdf

Niessen, S. (Ed.). (2008). *Aboriginal knowledge exchange project self-study compilation and report: Aboriginal ways of knowing in teacher education.* Regina, SK: Saskatchewan Instructional Development and Research Unit (SIDRU), Faculty of Education, University of Regina.

Osburn, R. (1999). Problems and solutions regarding Indigenous peoples split by international borders. *American Indian Law Review,* 24(2), 471-485.

Pewewardy, C. (2000). Renaming ourselves on our own terms: Race, tribal nations, and representation in education. *Indigenous Nations Studies Journal, 1*(1), 11-28.

Pidgeon, M. (2008a). *It takes more than good intentions: Institutional accountability and responsibility to Indigenous higher education.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation).Vancouver: University of British Columbia.

Pidgeon, M. (2008b). Pushing against the margins: Indigenous theorizing of "success" and retention in higher education. *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory & Practice, 10*(3), 339-360.

Pidgeon, M. & Hardy Cox, D. (2005). Aboriginal student services in Canada. *Journal of the Australian and New Zealand Student Services Association, 25,* 3-30.

Planas, R. (2013, March 18). Texas ethnic studies bill protested by Latino activists. *The Huffington Post.* Retrieved from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/03/18/texas-ethnic-studies-bill-protested-latino-activists_n_2902948.html

R. A. Malatest & Associates Ltd. (2008). Factors affecting the use of student financial assistance programs by Aboriginal youth: Literature review. Retrieved from http://www.cmec.ca/Publications/Lists/Publications/Attachments/197/factors-affecting-aboriginal-youth.pdf

Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples (RCAP). (1996). *The report of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples. Gathering strength* (Vol. 3). Ottawa, ON: Minister of Supply and Services. Retrieved from http://www.aadnc-aandc.gc.ca/eng/1307458586498/1307458751962

Sandoval, C. D. M. (2012). *Mesoamerica heals our school: A critical narrative inquiry of ancestral computing para el Vivir Comunitario en El Sereno* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of California, Los Angeles.

Santa Ana, O. (2002). *Brown tide rising: Metaphors of Latinos in contemporary American public discourse.* Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Statistics Canada. (2013). *The education and employment experiences of First Nations people living off reserve, Inuit, and Metis: Selected findings from the 2012 Aboriginal Peoples Survey. Aboriginal Peoples Survey, 2012.* Retrieved online http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/89-653-x/89-653-x2013001-eng.pdf

Statistics Canada. (2011). *The educational attainment of Aboriginal peoples. The National Household Survey (NHS) 2011.* Retrieved online http://www12.statcan.gc.ca/nhs-enm/as-sa/99-012-x/99-012-x20110003_3-eng.pdf

Statistics Canada. (2006). *Aboriginal peoples in Canada in 2006: Inuit, Metis, and First Nations, 2006 Census: Findings.* Retrieved online http://www12.statcan.ca/english/census06/analysis/aboriginal/index.cfm

Stonechild, B. (2006). *The new buffalo: The struggle for Aboriginal post-secondary education in Canada.* Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press.

Tamez, M. (2008). Space, position, and imperialism in south Texas: Dr. Eloisa García Tamez

v. U.S. Secretary Michael Chertoff, U.S. Department of Homeland Security, U.S. Border Patrol, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. *Chicana/Latina Studies, 7*(2), 112-121.

Tamez, M. (2010). *Returning Lipan Apache women's laws, lands, & power in El Calaboz Ranchería, Texas-Mexico border*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Washington State University, Pullman, WA..

TeHennepe, S. (1993). Issues of respect: Reflections of First Nations students' experiences in postsecondary anthropology classrooms. *Canadian Journal of Native Education,* 2(20), 193-260.

United Nations. (2008). *United Nations declaration on the rights of Indigenous peoples* (UNDRIP Publication No. 07-58681). Retrieved from http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/documents/DRIPS_en.pdf

Urrieta, L., Jr. (2003). Las identidades también lloran, identities also cry: Exploring the human side of Indigenous Latina/o identities. *Educational Studies, 34*(2), 147-168.

Villanueva, S. T. (2013). Teaching as a healing craft: Decolonizing the classroom and creating spaces of hopeful resistance through Chicano-Indigenous pedagogical praxis. *The Urban Review, 45*(1), 23-40. doi: 10.1007/s11256-012-0222-5