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This qualitative case study explored a community-university partnership for teacher preparation with an urban Indigenous community organization in Chicago, Illinois. In the examined partnership, Indigenous participants collaborated with university faculty to prepare graduate-level students in an initial preparation program. I examined the impact of the partnership on the participating Indigenous community members, emphasizing how their interactions with university faculty and teacher candidates impacted the Indigenous organization and participants. Indigenous participants considered what teachers must understand to serve urban Indigenous children and the community’s role in teacher preparation.

I collected data through focus groups with Indigenous participants before and after engagement with the partnership; direct observations of partnership activities where Indigenous participants interacted with teacher candidates and university faculty, and offered individual interviews for all participants. The collected data was audio recorded and transcribed, then analyzed using conventional content analysis. With Indigenous Postcolonial Theory (IPT) guiding the study, I examined the perspectives of urban Indigenous community members interacting with a non-Indigenous university teacher preparation program preparing teacher candidates to serve the needs of diverse children and their families. This study held implications for continued development of Indigenous community-university partnerships, policy and practice in urban Indigenous education,
and potential for partnerships to advance self-determination and postcolonialism through self-education.
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

Indigenous Children’s School Experiences in United States Public Schools

The United States (U.S.) is home to about 4.4 million Indigenous peoples who are citizens of both the U.S. and their respective tribal nations. Indigenous citizens represent 1.5% of the total U.S. population and include approximately 644,000 students enrolled in kindergarten through twelfth grade (K-12) (Faircloth & Tippeconic, 2010). Approximately 92% of these children attend U.S. public schools and about 8% attend Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) schools (Alliance for Excellent Education, 2008; Faircloth & Tippeconic, 2010). U.S. schools have historically underserved Indigenous students and continue to provide low quality school experiences (Castagno & Brayboy, 2008; Faircloth & Tippeconic, 2010; Pewewardy, 1998), reflected in the disparities between Indigenous and non-Indigenous school achievement (Castagno & Brayboy, 2008; McCarty, 2009) and high school graduation rates (Faircloth & Tippeconic, 2010).

The remainder of this dissertation will depict Indigenous children’s school experiences, past and present, and put forth an approach for healing the historical wrongdoings (Adams, 1995; Faircloth & Tippeconic, 2010; Pewewardy, 1998) through collaborative, field-based teacher preparation.

1In this study, I use the term Indigenous in reference to the original people of what is now named North America. I recognize Indigenous as synonymous to Native, Native American, American Indian, Indian, First Peoples, and First Americans—all with a connection to global Indigenous communities.
Prior to western European colonization of what that came to be known as the U.S., Indigenous children experienced education through tribal teachings grounded in culture and tradition (Cajete, 2005; Pewewardy, 2002). Colonial education drastically changed those approaches as it aimed to assimilate Indigenous children to Anglo\(^2\) culture (Battiste, 2000; Lomawaima & McCarty, 2006; Pewewardy, 2000). Through public education, colonialism and neocolonialism, argued to be more harmful than the overt historical colonialism (Browne, Smye, & Varcoe, 2005), schools continued to strip Indigenous peoples of their cultures, customs, languages, and methods of teaching and learning by recognizing Anglo knowledge as superior to Indigenous knowledge (Battiste, 2000; Lomawaima & McCarty, 2006; Pewewardy, 2000; Quijano, 2000)—in some cases the U.S. government legally prohibited traditional healing practices and ceremonies leaving Indigenous peoples detached from their spirituality and sense of self (Lomawaima & McCarty, 2006; Yazzie, 2000).

Today, Indigenous children “continue to be miseducated about their histories, cultures, and contributions to the American landscape” (Beck, 2000, p. 237), leading to incongruence between home and school and poor school performance (Beck, 2000; Dehyle & Swisher, 1997; Pewewardy, 2005; Watras, 2004). In this introductory chapter, I depict Indigenous education from the early 1900s to present day public schooling, focusing on Indigenous efforts to provide children with quality education, current disparities between Indigenous students and their Anglo peers, and limitations in teacher preparation—all contributing to the significance of this study, an examination of a

\(^{2}\)I use the term Anglo in reference to the original colonial settlers of what is now named North America, mainly of western European origin; and the present day dominant western, mainly white, North American society.
partnership between an urban Indigenous community organization and a university teacher preparation program. I conclude the chapter with implications for Indigenous education, my personal connections to this study, research delimitations, and an overview of this dissertation’s organization.

School Experiences from 1900s to Present Day

Colonial education aimed to assimilate Indigenous children to Anglo culture, commonly phrased by Captain Richard C. Pratt, the founder of the first Indian boarding school—Carlisle Indian Industrial School, as an effort to “kill the Indian and save the man” (Pratt, 1892, p. 261). Anglo-designed and operated schools separated Indigenous children from their families and tribes to eliminate exposure to Indigenous methods of teaching and learning, and instead integrate children into Anglo lifestyles (Adams, 1995; Lomawaima & McCarty, 2006; Pewewardy, 1998). To do this, the U.S. government supported varying educational approaches including boarding schools, progressive day schools, and integrated public schools, all “deliberately designed to colonize Indian minds as a means for gaining access to Indigenous resources” (Grande, 2008, p. 235). However, Indigenous communities have voiced their opposition to Anglo assimilation by efforts of self-determination through self-education (McCarty & Bia, 2002; Pewewardy, 1998). In the following subsections, I summarize these assimilation efforts and Indigenous resistance as well as identify a gap between teacher preparation and Indigenous communities, ensued by a description of how this study aimed to connect the efforts of an urban Indigenous community organization and a university teacher preparation program to improve the quality of teachers serving Indigenous children.
**Boarding schools.** The Indian boarding school movement during the 19th and early 20th century represents a significant period in Indigenous education, which resulted in transgenerational trauma endured by today’s Indigenous peoples (Adams, 1995). Enrolling students between the ages of five and eighteen, the U.S. government preferred boarding schools for educating Indigenous children as they provided complete cultural immersion (Adams, 1995; Hendrick, 1974; Lomawaima & McCarty, 2006), but the time spent in boarding schools was detrimental to the physical, emotional, and academic wellness of Indigenous children (Adams, 1995; Lomawaima & McCarty, 2006). Boarding school superintendents prohibited children from visiting their families and tribes, and in 1902, the schools suppressed all forms of Indigenous culture, banning the use of Indigenous languages and thus preventing children from communicating with each other and continuing tribal rituals (Hendrick, 1974; Lomawaima & McCarty, 2006).

BIA officials, including Captain Richard C. Pratt, designed boarding school curricula to further assimilation efforts by replacing Indigenous cultural norms with lessons on Anglo history, values, economics, language, religion, and dress, with boarding school teachers assigning English names, haircuts, and clothing as a means to remove the children’s cultural identity (Adams, 1995; Lomawaima & McCarty, 2006). The schools promoted vocational education to prepare Indigenous children for the work force, but in fact modeled their instruction from the industrial education used for manual training of Blacks post Civil War (Anderson, 1988). By excluding content needed for success in Indigenous life and instead preparing students for a life of servitude in Anglo society (Adams, 1995; Hendrick, 1974; McCarty & Watahomigie, 1998), school leaders consequently increased the economic growth of the Anglo organization through the work
of Indigenous children (Grande, 2008). The hegemony apparent in the boarding school movement significantly shaped future developments of assimilation in Indigenous education (Corson, 1998; Pewewardy, 1998); which was recently made clear in Arizona’s banning of Mexican American Studies and teaching of Indigenous knowledges (Rodriguez, 2013).

**Progressive day schools.** Responding to the Meriam Report’s (Meriam, 1928) plea to improve boarding schools’ quality of life and educational instruction for Indigenous children, John Collier’s 1932 *Indian New Deal* promoted tribal sovereignty and cultural pluralism intending to integrate progressive methods of teaching and learning in Indigenous education (Senese, 1981). Drawn from studies of anthropologists using Indigenous languages to promote Christianity, Collier’s policy integrated Indigenous cultures and languages in school activities to improve English language and literacy instruction (Belgrade, Mitchell, & Arquero, 2002). Collier’s colleague Willard Walcott Beatty supervised the implementation of culturally inclusive programming, but used the efforts of bilingual-bicultural education to persuade Indigenous children to abandon their tribal traditions in favor of Christianity and Anglo culture (Senese, 1981). Collier’s advocacy of cultural preservation through progressive day schools outweighed Beatty’s attempt at a more humane method of boarding school assimilation resulting in progressive day schools successfully employing bilingual-bicultural education (Senese, 1981).

In 1935, Collier promoted Indigenous day schools to implement a progressive curriculum that balanced Indigenous dance, language, song, stories, and arts and crafts with Anglo-valued subjects, as well as vocational topics including farming, canning
foods, milking cows, woodworking, mechanics, and gardening (Senese, 1981). Although Collier’s colleagues denounced his work and accused him of breaking the law and displaying pro-communist beliefs, Collier continued his efforts. He promoted day schools as an inexpensive alternative to boarding schools during the economic depression (Laukaitis, 2006), but his programs were difficult to staff and sustain (Glass, 1988). With the onset of World War II, the majority of day schools lost funding and by the 1950s the BIA eliminated progressive methods of teaching in Indigenous education. Indigenous children began enrolling in public schools that served primarily Anglo-American children (Senese, 1981; Watras, 2004), and which utilized curriculum and instruction without consideration of Indigenous cultures (Laukaitis, 2006).

**Education after relocation.** In 1952, Dillon Meyer, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, advanced termination policies believing that North American tribes should not be sovereign nations, leading to *Operation Relocation* (Burt, 1986). *Operation Relocation* worked to move Indigenous peoples off of government supported reservation lands through recruitment offices that encouraged resettlement in urban areas including Chicago, Los Angeles, Salt Lake City, and Denver. This effort successfully recruited 30,000 Indigenous people to urban areas during the 1950s and tripled those numbers in the 1960s and 70s (Burt, 1986). Chicago became a prevalent destination for relocation and a concentrated Indigenous community settled in the then deteriorating neighborhood of Uptown on the northeast side of the city. While the government’s promise of jobs and security was not fully realized, many of the relocated Indigenous peoples remained in the city and raised their children (Beck, 2000). Enrolling them in Chicago Public Schools
(CPS) only to result in an estimated 90% dropout rate (Laukaitis, 2005)—the relocation experience was far from successful.

To ease the relocation transition Indigenous community members developed pan-Indian agencies to support the needs of their children that remained unaddressed in schools. St. Augustine’s Center for American Indians created after-school tutoring programs, the AmerIndian Child Development Center worked to improve attendance and decrease dropout rates, and the American Indian Center began a summer day camp to help Indigenous children better understand the urban environment (Laukaitis, 2005). In the early 1970s, the American Indian Center and Native American Committee streamlined their efforts and opened Little Big Horn High School and Preschool.

With Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) funding, Little Big Horn addressed violence, transience, and childcare problems that interfered with children’s academic success. Developed and led by Indigenous community members, Little Big Horn improved attendance, decreased dropout rates, developed school-community collaboration, increased students’ self esteem, fostered Indigenous children’s understandings of life in urban Chicago, and provided a safe setting for children’s holistic achievements (Laukaitis, 2005). Unfortunately, government funding ceased in the mid-1970s and prevented further development and expansion of these successful community driven educational endeavors, leaving Chicago’s Indigenous community to support services through donations and volunteers (U.S. Department of Education, 2012). Determined to offer equal opportunities to Indigenous children, the American Indian Center, joined by the St. Kateri Center of Chicago (Kateri) and other nonprofit organizations, worked to maintain programming to address the needs of Indigenous

**Efforts of self-determination.** Responding to historical traumas and ineffective public schooling, Indigenous leaders continuously strived for self-determination (Corson, 1998), but educational efforts exemplifying Native-led schools and educational programs such as Chicago’s Little Big Horn remained sparse throughout history (Adams, 1974). An exemplary effort toward self-determination occurred in 1966 with the opening of the Rough Rock Demonstration School, a school operated by Indigenous peoples for Indigenous peoples. Rough Rock embraced community ways of teaching and learning and a bilingual-bicultural curriculum (Adams, 1974; Corson, 1998; McCarty & Bia, 2002). Often criticized for being ineffective in improving the academic success of Indigenous children and fulfilling the requests of community members, Rough Rock endured and exists today as a tribally operated school serving the particular needs of Indigenous children and communities.

An additional endeavor toward self-determination focused on early childhood and family centered education is the Bureau of Indian Education (BIE) Family and Child Education (FACE) program, established in 1990 (BIE, 2009). In 46 BIE funded schools, FACE aimed to offer adult educational programming to parents of enrolled preschoolers and promoted culturally appropriate parenting respective of tribal affiliations (BIE, 2009). FACE connected schools, families, and communities by promoting the cultural and linguistic diversity of individual tribes and recognizing parents and communities as influential educators of Indigenous children. Likewise, the Montana’s Indian Education for All policy (Carjuzaa, Jetty, Munson, & Veltkamp, 2010) demonstrated Indigenous
leaders collaboration with public schools to integrate Indigenous histories, cultures, and knowledges into mainstream curricula. These examples of self-determination through self-education account for a portion of the small number of existing programs; the desire of Indigenous communities to supervise the education of their children is ever present on and off reservation lands (U.S. Department of Education, 2012).

**Indigenous Students and Anglo Achievement Measures**

In 2008, approximately 90% of Indigenous children in the U.S. attended public schools and about 20% of Indigenous students resided in urban areas and attended schools with higher poverty rates than their Anglo counterparts (Alliance for Excellent Education, 2008). Urban Indigenous children have had minimal exposure to teachers of Indigenous descent or understanding of Indigenous cultures and values (Alliance for Excellent Education, 2008; Writer, 2001). Instead of increasing teachers’ awareness of Indigenous children’s needs, public schools serving Indigenous students have advanced colonial education with a climate of assimilation by utilizing Anglo history, values, economics, language, religion, and dress to implement a curriculum ineffective for Indigenous students (Castagno & Brayboy, 2008; Pewewardy & Hammer, 2003; Writer, 2001).

National and local achievement reports depicted the present day educational struggles of urban Indigenous children, but scholars questioned the validity of Anglo assessment measures for Indigenous children (Ahlquist, 2011; Castagno & Brayboy, 2008; Dehyle & Swisher, 1997, Ladson-Billings, 2006). A 2013 National Association for Educational Progress (NAEP) report showed that the 4th grade reading scores depicted an achievement disparity between Indigenous children and their white peers that increased
from a 10 point gap in the year 2000 to a 27 point gap in 2013 (NAEP, 2013). Similarly, the 4th grade math scores displayed a stark disparity between Indigenous students and their white peers with a 23 point gap in 2013 compared to a 20 point gap in 2003 (NAEP, 2013). At no point, from 1992 to 2013, did the NAEP report equal achievement in reading or math between Indigenous students and their white peers (NAEP, 2013). In 2007, the NAEP reported that all ethnic groups had increased reading scores except for those identified as Indigenous (NAEP 2013).

Additionally, the National Indian Education Study (National Center for Educational Statistics; NCES, 2012a) conducted by NAEP to explicitly examine Indigenous achievement showed no significant change in reading scores of American Indian or Alaska Native students from 2005 to 2009 with only 7% of Indigenous 4th graders testing at or above the Basic level in reading as measured by NAEP. NCES reported similarly low math scores for Indigenous students, with a greater achievement gap in 2009 than was present in 2005. The academic disparities for Indigenous students, informed by Anglo measures on national achievement tests, extended to alarming dropout rates for high school students, who were reported by Faircloth and Tippeconic (2010) and NCES (2012b) as having the highest dropout rate of any ethnic group in the nation.

In 2012, Chicago Public Schools (CPS) enrolled 1,409 Indigenous students, 0.3% of the total school population (CPS, 2013a). The third largest public school district in the U.S., CPS served a majority minority student population with 40.5% of students identified as African American and 44.7% identified as Hispanic (CPS, 2013a). CPS also identified approximately 16% of students as bilingual, 12% were eligible for special education services, and 85% of students qualified for free or reduced lunch (CPS, 2013a).
CPS has struggled to meet the needs of their diverse student body and has faced particular difficulty with the academic achievement of Indigenous students.

In line with the national assessment data, Indigenous students struggled to succeed on CPS achievement measures. In 2013, 51.8% of Indigenous elementary students grades three through eight met or exceeded reading standards on the Illinois Standards Achievement Test (ISAT), while 76.7% of their white peers met or exceeded reading standards on the same assessment (CPS, 2013b). Likewise, 55.7% of Indigenous third through eighth grade CPS students in 2013 met or exceeded math standards while 77.8% of white children in the same group met or exceeded the same standards (CPS, 2013b). Equally alarming were CPS’ five year cohort dropout reports, with a 40% Indigenous dropout rate in 2013, decreased from a nearly 60% (59.6%) dropout rate in 1999 (CPS, 2013c).

Whereas these statistics reflected inequalities in U.S. schools, scholars advancing methods of culturally responsive schooling (CRS) critiqued assessments utilized to measure the proclaimed achievement gap between Indigenous and non-Indigenous students (Ahlquist, 2011; Dehyle & Swisher, 1997; Ladson-Billings, 2006). Dehyle and Swisher (1997) examined testing measures with Indigenous children and found detachment between the culture of mainstream tests and those of minority students, concluding that Anglo driven assessments were not aimed to measure diverse students’ learning and achievement. Dehyle and Swisher revealed that Indigenous children performed well on visually cued assessments, but that the Anglo-normed standardized tests, emphasizing verbal and auditory skills, resulted in lower achievement. The results of these widely accepted testing measures, used to explicate the politicized academic
achievement gap (CPS, 2013b; NAEP, 2013; NCES, 2012a; NCES, 2012b), reiterated the disconnect between Anglo centric curricula and the needs of Indigenous students.

Anglo-centric curriculum content, pedagogy, and assessments have failed to address minority cultures’ teaching and learning styles (Forbes, 2000; McCarty, 2009; Pewewardy, 1998) resulting in what Ladson-Billings (2006) coined an *education debt* due to a lack of historical, economic, and sociopolitical opportunities, as opposed to an achievement gap due to academic ability. Schools have applied assimilation methods by inflicting the majority population’s cultural norms on minority populations rather than addressing the specific cultural needs of diverse children with little success, resulting in minority students’ failure to succeed when tested on Anglo standards (Ahlquist, 2011; Castagno & Brayboy, 2008; Dehyle & Swisher, 1997; Forbes, 2000; Ladson-Billings, 2006; Writer, 2010). In response to the academic struggles of minority children based on Anglo-centric methods of teaching and learning, I utilize the next section to identify a gap between Indigenous students’ educational needs and teacher preparation.

**Teacher Preparation**

With Indigenous children’s school experiences shadowed by an *education debt* (Ladson-Billings, 2006) and teachers being the number one in-school factor impacting student achievement (Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2005), teachers need quality preparation to meet diverse student needs (Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2005; Writer, 2001; Writer, 2010). As described in the previous section, urban Indigenous children are particularly vulnerable to low academic achievement and increased dropout rates (Castagno & Brayboy, 2008; CPS, 2013b; CPS, 2013c; Faircloth & Tippeconic, 2010); however, few teachers enter classrooms prepared to meet the unique needs of this small, but struggling
cultural group resulting in a continuation of poor school experiences and low academic success (Belgrade et al., 2002; Forbes, 2000; Pewewardy, 1992; Reyhner, 1993; Writer, 2001; Writer, 2010).

Universities can acknowledge the gap between teacher preparation and classroom practices by offering integrated field experiences in diverse schools and communities (Oakes, Loef-Frank, Hunter-Quartz, & Rogers, 2002), creating what Zeichner (2010) referred to as a third space where candidates access both university resources and experiences in diverse teaching and learning contexts. Various teacher education scholars proposed that candidates should engage with culturally and linguistically diverse schools and community organizations throughout their teacher preparation, arguing that the field experiences should align with methodology courses held on university campuses (Ball & Cohen, 1999; Grossman, Compton, Igra, & Williamson, 2009; Zeichner, 2010). These experiences were beneficial to candidates learning teaching practices and provided opportunities to engage with children from backgrounds different than their own (McDonald et al., 2011; Murrell, 2000; Oakes et al., 2002); however, these opportunities have been limited and did not examine the long term impact on candidates’ success in meeting the needs of diverse children. Additionally, the little research that existed around the impact of field experiences on schools and communities identified minimal benefit to partner institutions and regular inconveniences around scheduling (Budhai, 2013).

For community-school-university partnerships to succeed, mutually beneficial relationship must be fostered—valuing all participant voices to create sustainable relationships of collaborative teacher preparation (Kruger & Teaching Australia – Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership, 2009). Building from Kruger
and colleague’s understandings of sustainable, mutually beneficial university-school partnerships, detailed in chapter two, universities may enhance their collaboration with community organizations to prepare candidates in authentic teaching and learning settings to serve diverse children and their families. However, the partnerships must be examined to ensure that mutual benefit occurs in practice. In the next section, I outline the purpose of this study based on the identified problems in Indigenous education and the questions guiding this investigation.

**Healing Indigenous Education through Community-University Collaboration**

In this study, I explored one community-university partnership in the urban area of Chicago, Illinois. Kateri, an urban Indigenous community organization, which aims to serve the diverse spiritual and cultural needs of urban Indigenous community members distanced from their tribal supports; and Loyola University Chicago’s (Loyola) *Teaching, Learning, and Leading with Schools and Communities* (TLLSC), a university-based, teacher preparation program that aims to prepare teachers to meet the needs of all students. Through the Kateri-TLLSC partnership, stakeholders collaborated to prepare teachers for the specific needs of urban, Indigenous students.

The purpose of this study was to examine the impact of the partnership on the community organization, its members, and its services as they collaborated with the university to prepare candidates to understand and meet the needs of urban Indigenous children. The questions guiding this study were:

- What aspects of Indigenous cultures do Kateri community partners believe teachers should understand to serve urban Indigenous children?
● How do Kateri community partners view their roles in preparing teachers to meet the needs of urban Indigenous children?

● How does the involvement of teacher candidates in an urban Indigenous community based organization impact the community partners and their experiences?

Through this research I aimed to understand (a) what aspects of Indigenous cultures the involved community members wished to make known to non-Indigenous candidates, (b) how the community members defined their roles in collaborative teacher preparation, and (c) how involvement in teacher preparation impacted an urban Indigenous community.

**Implications for Indigenous Education**

Findings from this study held implications for further development of collaborative, field-based teacher preparation programs between Indigenous communities and mainstream universities, aiming to positively impact Indigenous education and ultimately address the education debt (Ladson-Billings, 2006) between Indigenous children and their Anglo peers (NCES, 2012a). An investigation of the community’s experience in collaborative, field-based teacher preparation may impact future implementations of partnership activities to ensure mutual benefit and sustainability. By engaging in a collaborative partnership for teacher preparation, the participating Indigenous community organization and its members may take an active role in preparing teachers to meet the needs of urban Indigenous children, advancing efforts of self-determination and postcolonialism (Battiste, 2000) through self-education.
Personal Relevance

My role as a researcher in this study was unique due to my personal and professional backgrounds. I took great interest in advancing the educational experiences of Indigenous children because of my commitment to educational equality, but also because of my Odawa descendency. My mother is a registered tribal member of the Little Traverse Bay Band of Odawa Indians. Growing up, my mother, aunts, uncles, and cousins all shared tribal ways of being; some more than others, and I often received their messages unknowingly. At the beginning of my doctoral studies, an examination of the history of Indigenous education focused my research interest to teacher preparation inclusive of urban Indigenous children, families, and communities. I became involved with Kateri to volunteer and engage in the Chicago Indigenous community and quickly dedicated myself to supporting their work.

Concurrently, I was enrolled in Loyola’s curriculum and instruction doctoral program and worked as a graduate assistant on the redesign steering committee to develop TLLSC, a new teacher preparation program embedded in schools and communities. My work on the committee provided me with in depth knowledge of TLLSC’s goals for teacher preparation and I shared Kateri’s programming with TLLSC faculty and likewise shared TLLSC’s development with Kateri leaders; working to cross borders between the Indigenous community and university structures. Both organizations showed an interest in the other’s goals, and committed to partner to prepare teachers to serve all children, understanding the particular needs of Chicago’s Indigenous communities.
I viewed this dissertation as a single step in the direction to improve Indigenous education and enter a period of postcolonialism. I believed that community organizations and universities must substantially expand their collaboration to prepare future teachers for an increasingly diverse student population. This goal was of particular importance to Chicago’s urban Indigenous community, where children are separated from their tribes and enrolled in one of the nation’s largest public school systems. I aimed to continue this work beyond the completion of this study and advocate for improved teacher preparation through collaboration with culturally diverse community organizations, with particular attention to improving the educational experiences of Indigenous children in urban schools.

Research Delimitations

This study occurred during the TLLSC summer session of 2014 in the first semester of graduate level candidates’ enrollment in TLLSC. Situated in the second of two modules of Sequence 1: Introduction, I examined the Community Immersion module sessions held at Kateri. The study included Indigenous participants who were active members of the Kateri community and interested in collaborating with university faculty to prepare teachers to meet the needs of all children. The Kateri-TLLSC partnership met the case selection of an urban Indigenous community organization adept to serving the needs of intertribal community members and interested in collaborative teacher preparation.

The main source of data and focus of this study occurred through two focus groups with community partners, one prior to sequence activities and one after the sequence concluded. In addition to focus groups, I collected data through observations of
all interactions between community partners, candidates, and university faculty, as well as one individual interview with Joe, a community partner. Only activities held at Kateri or with Kateri community partners were included in the data collection for this study.

**Organization of the Dissertation**

This dissertation is organized in five chapters, with the remaining four chapters as follows. Chapter II begins with a description of the theoretical framework used to guide this study grounded in Indigenous Postcolonial theory (IPT) (Battiste, 2000). The next section of Chapter II reviews the literature around culturally responsive schooling specific to the needs of Indigenous children and collaborative teacher preparation through community-university partnerships. This literature review (a) provides definitions of culturally responsive teaching (CRT) and CRS, and (b) reviews the literature specific to CRS strategies for Indigenous children, specifically examining approaches that would best suit diverse Indigenous communities in an urban context. Chapter III provides an account of my qualitative research methodology with case study methods, a description of the case, utilization of focus groups, observations and interviews, participants, and data analysis. Chapter IV depicts my findings through distinct themes as they answer each research question and a discussion of the findings in relation to the extant literature. Chapter V concludes this dissertation with a discussion of conclusions and implications of this study with specific connections to IPT (Battiste, 2000), areas in need of future research, and my personal reflections.
CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Teacher Preparation in Indigenous Communities:

Theoretical Framework and Literature Review

The educational experiences of Indigenous children in U.S. schools depicted throughout history call for a detailed examination of school practices serving Indigenous populations. Extensive literature around best methods of instruction for Indigenous students must be accounted for when researching Indigenous education. Additional research has examined teacher preparation in diverse urban contexts and is valuable in exploring teacher preparation for urban Indigenous communities, but the field of study has yet to investigate community-university collaboration for teacher preparation with urban Indigenous populations.

To account for the complexities present in Indigenous education, I situated this dissertation study in Indigenous Postcolonial Theory (IPT) (Battiste, 2000). IPT supported my investigation to identify the impact of an Indigenous community-university partnership on the involved community organization. Recognizing the complexity of interrelated issues present in an urban Indigenous community working to promote self-determination, IPT provided a continuous focus on the needs and experiences of the Indigenous participants.
In this chapter, I address collaborative teacher preparation in an urban Indigenous community organization. I begin with a description of my theoretical framework as it related to this dissertation study. I then review the literature around culturally responsive schooling for Indigenous children and community-university partnerships for teacher preparation.

**Theoretical Framework**

I framed this study with IPT (Battiste, 2000) to understand how the context of an urban Indigenous community-university partnership impacted the participating Indigenous community organization. IPT addressed the value of teaching and learning methods occurring outside of school settings within an urban Indigenous organization, which may be different than Anglo approaches to education (Battiste, 2004; Rogoff, 1994). This theoretical framework considered the historical traumas and contemporary racism experienced by Indigenous peoples and how efforts to overcome marginalization towards a postcolonial state impacted their engagement with primarily non-Indigenous candidates. I used this IPT lens to constantly consider the complex histories and lived experiences of the Indigenous participants and how the cultural complexities impacted their involvement in the Kateri-TLLSC partnership. I now define IPT as it related to this study and how I utilized it in my theoretical framework.

**Indigenous Postcolonial Theory**

The term postcolonial in this study was not used to define a period of time after colonialism, but rather “an aspiration, a hope, not yet achieved” (Battiste, 2004, p. 1). I used IPT “to describe a symbolic strategy for shaping a desirable future, not an existing reality” (Battiste, 2000, p. xix). Diverging from postcolonial theory (see Gandhi, 1998),
IPT was inclusive of decolonization efforts to restore the cultural values and understandings suppressed from colonization (Kumar, 2009). IPT rejected Anglo centric theories and rigid categorization schemes, which have been used to oppress Indigenous peoples, and instead expanded and adapted existing knowledges relevant to Indigenous settings. IPT acknowledged the historical pain and oppression experienced by Indigenous peoples as their own and worked to prevent others from seizing and defining Indigenous history through etic perspectives.

Additionally, IPT provided an important lens for mutually beneficial research involving Indigenous peoples working to advance decolonization (Battiste, 2000; Swadener & Mutua, 2008) and also surpassing colonial oppression to authentic sovereignty (Battiste, 2000). IPT contributed to tribal sovereignty in this study through collaborative teacher preparation between an Indigenous community organization and non-Indigenous university, where Indigenous participants contributed to defining the needs of their children in a community of learners that valued each participant’s voice (Rogoff, 1994). Rogoff’s advancement of a community of learners stated “learning is a process of transformation of participation arguing that how people develop is a function of their changing roles and understanding of the activities they participate in” (p. 209).

Using community of learners as a construct, I built on Rogoff’s (1994) research around Indigenous community ways of teaching and learning, which she emphasized as different than mainstream, Anglo methods of education. In building from Rogoff’s (1994) work, I recognized that while both Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples must collaborate to advance social equality (La Rocque, 1993), such endeavors require thorough evaluation. IPT supported an examination of research involving both Indigenous and non-Indigenous
institutions to ensure that unequal power and representation were not continued, and emphasized mutuality and reciprocity (Browne et al., 2005).

IPT provided a constant examination of power, privilege, mutual benefit, and participant experiences in the Kateri-TLLSC partnership; with an understanding that privilege of Anglo centric knowledges, cultures, and institutions continued without question (Battiste, 2004). IPT offered a response to the colonial methods of teaching and learning ever present in U.S. schools and institutions of higher education (Giroux & Giroux, 2008) and reexamined the structural boundaries of teacher preparation by creating a space for Indigenous community voices (Battiste, 2004) about the needs of their children through their participation in a community of learners (Rogoff, 1994). With historical and current colonial systems of oppression impacting urban Indigenous peoples experiences with non-Indigenous institutions (Grande, 2008), I used IPT to explicitly examine and emphasize the benefit gained by the participating Indigenous community organization. In this, I only examined the benefit gained by the urban Indigenous community organization during partnership experiences.

While underused with Indigenous educational research, researchers have employed IPT in a developing body of healthcare and nursing scholarship (Browne et al., 2005). In the nursing field, researchers used IPT to address several interrelated research issues: (a) partnerships and voice, (b) using gained knowledge for social change, (c) impact of socio-historical conditions on modern society, (d) addressing the potential for research to perpetuate colonization and minimizing the potential for such harm, and (e) protecting the Indigenous participants who may suffer from research findings that perpetuate stereotypes (Browne et al., 2005, pp. 25-26). In this dissertation study, I
extended the use of IPT in research around a community-university partnership for teacher preparation. In the next section, I explain how IPT was used in this study and how I drew from the use of IPT in nursing to address similar issues in teacher preparation and U.S. public education.

**Applying the Theoretical Framework**

To investigate the community-university partnership with ITP, I (a) acknowledged the historical and current oppression present in Indigenous communities, (b) recognized the need to decolonize the educational system to develop a postcolonial way of being, (c) endeavored to heal prior traumas, and (d) respected the assets Indigenous communities possess (Battiste, 2000). As a theoretical framework, IPT provided a lens to examine the level of mutuality in interactions between Kateri community partners and TLLSC, considering the privilege of power traditionally held by universities and how that impacted the Indigenous participants who have been historically mistreated within educational institutions (Adams, 1995; Lomawaima & McCarty, 2006).

I employed the principles of IPT in my theoretical framework by examining the interactions between TLLSC candidates and faculty and Kateri community partners as they engaged in a community of learners within TLLSC module experiences, which will be thoroughly explicated in the following chapter. I examined the use of power within the partnership and how the Indigenous knowledges were represented in partnership activities (Browne et al., 2005; Lee & Quijada-Cerecer, 2010). With the partnership aiming to provide Indigenous community members a space to voice their ideas around the knowledge and skills needed by candidates and available community resources to
serve urban Indigenous children, I used the theoretical framework to investigate the outcome of collaboration between the two institutions on Kateri community partners. This guided my examination of the impact the Kateri-TLLSC partnership had on Indigenous participants during teacher preparation activities where Kateri community partners and TLLSC faculty collaboratively prepared candidates to understand the cultures, needs, and resources of urban Indigenous students.

Within this community-university partnership, mature learners (i.e., Indigenous community partners, university faculty) guided the learning experiences of novice learners (i.e., candidates) beginning to take control of their own development. Rogoff (1994) made known that this teaching and learning method was not typical in middle class European American families, but was common in Indigenous, Japanese-American, and East Indian cultures, which made it especially appropriate for an Indigenous community-university partnership. With IPT, I built on traditional Indigenous methods of teaching and learning to examine the partnership’s effort to help candidates understand the urban Indigenous community exclusive of Anglo centric influence (Battiste, 2000; Lee & Quijada-Cerecer, 2010) and the community’s needs and resources. IPT provided a framework to examine the interactions between participants, concentrating on how socio-historical issues impacted the experiences of Indigenous participants partnering with a non-Indigenous educational institution (Browne et al., 2005)—knowing that past educational experiences of Indigenous peoples in U.S. schools were traumatic (Adams, 1995; Lomawaima & McCarty, 2006) and ineffective (Ahlquist, 2011; Dehyle & Swisher, 1997; Pewewardy, 1992; Writer, 2001).
I also applied the framework as an overarching lens to monitor the integrity of the Kateri-TLLSC relationship in advancing efforts of self-determination through self-education with both an awareness of historical traumas impacting present day experiences and a shared commitment for social change (Brayboy, 2005; Browne et al., 2005) between the Indigenous community and university. The Kateri-TLLSC partnership aspired to be a sustainable relationship grounded in trust, mutuality, and reciprocity as defined by Kruger and colleagues (2009)

1. **Trust**: the commitment and expertise that each of the main stakeholders – preservice teachers, teachers, teacher educators – brings to the partnership in the expectation that it will provide them with the benefits each seeks.
2. **Mutuality**: the extent to which the stakeholders recognise that working together does lead to the benefits each esteems.
3. **Reciprocity**: each stakeholder recognises and values what the others bring to the partnership. (p. 10)

The focus and critical examination of a mutually beneficial partnership, where the voices of all stakeholders were equally valued, was an important aspect of employing IPT. I built on Kruger and colleagues’ (2009) understandings of trust, mutuality, and reciprocity and in this study, emphasized the community benefit of engaging in the Kateri-TLLSC partnership—within a unique urban Indigenous context. Trust was an essential component of partnership design and implementation, and mutuality and reciprocity were of particular significance to the Indigenous community and essential in upholding the IPT framework.

Working collaboratively with university faculty, Indigenous community members held the potential to offer an authentic context for candidates to learn about theory and practices as well as respectfully employ Indigenous cultural norms (Battiste, 2004; Brayboy, 2005; Lee & Quijada-Cerecer, 2010)—all supporting the advancement of a
postcolonial community (Battiste, 2004). With IPT, I constantly and critically examined these interactions as they related to the complexity of an urban, Indigenous context involved with a primarily non-Indigenous university. Building on this theoretical approach to my study, I now review the literature to summarize important work put forth by scholars to guide the focus of this study.

**Review of the Literature**

In this section, I review the literature around culturally responsive schooling (CRS) for Indigenous children and community-university collaboration for teacher preparation. I first define CRS as it relates to Gay’s (2010) framework for culturally responsive teaching (CRT) and narrow the lens to CRS for Indigenous children. Within that section, I review the extant literature around historical efforts of CRS with Indigenous communities, traditional Indigenous ways of teaching and learning, and the importance of self-determination, bicultural-bilingual education, school-community collaboration, and implementation challenges.

The second portion of the literature review addresses community-university collaboration for teacher preparation beginning with partnership structures and challenges, preparing urban educators, and meeting the needs of students and communities. The chapter concludes with an examination of the limited research focused on Indigenous community-university partnerships for teacher preparation, identifying the significance of this study in the effort to better prepare teachers to serve urban Indigenous communities endeavoring to advance a postcolonial vision.
Meeting the Needs of Indigenous Children

Brayboy and Castagno (2009) built upon Gay’s (2000) framework for CRT and put forth CRS as a method to meet the needs of diverse students in every aspect of their school experience—teaching methods, curriculum content, teacher-child and teacher-community interactions, and overall school climate. These efforts dated as far back as the 1928 Meriam Report that examined Indigenous boarding school conditions and suggested specific CRS methods to improve school environments (Meriam, 1928). More recently, scholars advocating for educational equality (e.g., Banks, 1994; Gay, 2010; Ladson-Billings, 1992; McCarty, 2012; Pewewardy & Hammer, 2003; Reyhner, 1993) asserted CRT or CRS as best practices for educating diverse students.

Culturally Responsive Teaching

Gay (2000) defined CRT as using the cultural knowledge, prior experiences, and performance styles of diverse students to make learning more appropriate and effective by teaching to and through the strengths of these students. To implement CRT practices aimed at improving the educational experiences and academic achievement of minority children, Gay (2010) argued that CRT manifested itself through teachers, curriculum, and school culture. In 1992, Ladson-Billings called for teachers to develop intellectual, social, emotional, and political learning by "using cultural referents to impart knowledge, skills, and attitudes" (p. 382). Gay (2000, 2010) built on this work and put forth that teachers must be caring demanders with high expectations of students’ performance, but also warm and understanding of their struggles, ultimately teaching to the whole child. Especially important for marginalized students culturally responsive curricula reflected their lived experiences and provided an accurate historical account of their pasts; school
culture shared the high expectations of classroom teachers as well as provided ample resources and materials for teaching (Gay, 2010).

The terms CRT, culturally responsive pedagogy, and CRS were used to explain methods that supported the educational success of diverse children. CRT as defined above provided useful approaches in teaching diverse children and was widely accepted in multicultural education, but did not address specific needs of Indigenous children. I chose the term CRS (Brayboy & Castagno, 2009) to represent the teaching methods, curriculum content, teacher-child and teacher-community interactions, and overall school climate necessary to meet the needs of Indigenous children in an urban context. Brayboy and Castagno (2009) promoted CRS as a holistic approach to meeting the needs of Indigenous children, believing that “community and culture based education best meets the needs of Indigenous children” (p. 32). Next, I explore the necessary components of CRS for a diverse, urban Indigenous community.

**Culturally Responsive Schooling with Indigenous Communities**

Scholars of Indigenous education (e.g., Brandt, 1935; Brayboy & Castagno, 2009; Castagno & Brayboy, 2008; Cajete, 2005; McCarty, 2012; Oakes & Maday, 2009; Pewewardy, 2002; Pewewardy & Hammer, 2003; Reyhner, 1993) provided recommendations for implementing CRS strategies with Indigenous children to improve educational experiences and academic accomplishments. Indigenous communities have experienced marginalization and forced assimilation since European colonization and Indigenous children encountered traumatic experiences with U.S. education (Adams, 1995; Anderson, 1988), thus researchers of Indigenous education argued that specialized
methods of CRS were necessary to overcome the long standing education debt (Ladson-Billings, 2006).

Indigenous education research has substantially contributed to our understanding of culturally responsive approaches to teaching Indigenous children. After reviewing the literature specific to CRS for Indigenous children, I have identified five elements necessary for teachers to consider in their work with diverse, urban Indigenous students: (a) historical efforts of CRS, (b) traditional methods of teaching and learning, (c) bilingual/bicultural education, (d) self-determination, and (e) school-community collaboration. In this section, I provide an overview of these factors and conclude with challenges that prevent the implementation of CRS with Indigenous students.

**Historical efforts of culturally responsive schooling.** Policy makers and educators have discussed the significance of Indigenous languages and cultures in relation to Indigenous students’ academic achievement since the U.S. government’s involvement in Indigenous education. In an effort to review the conditions of BIA boarding schools, The Meriam Report (Meriam, 1928) provided a vivid account of inhumanity experienced by Indigenous children enrolled in these schools and made recommendations for improving Indigenous education. In addition to recommendations for improved sanitation and quality of life, the report called for recruitment of Indigenous teachers, increased early childhood programs, and an incorporation of Indigenous languages and cultures in school curriculum. Meriam also recommended that BIA schools use progressive education methods relative to Indigenous children’s values and experiences in order to advance their academic achievement (Meriam, 1928).
Aligned with The Meriam Report’s (1928) recommendations, Willard Walcott Beatty, the president of the Progressive Education Association (PEA), oversaw John Collier’s agenda for supporting Indigenous cultures and values in education (Reyhner, 2012). While the previous chapter illuminated Beatty’s underlying motives, he specifically identified vocabulary instruction as an area of concern for Indigenous children. Beatty argued that words should not be taught out of context and instead teachers should use literature familiar to Indigenous children when teaching the English language so that they may draw from life experiences to comprehend the new information (Reyhner, 2012)—similar to current recommendations reviewed subsequently.

Following the Meriam Report (1928), select BIA schools implemented CRS methods to improve the education of Indigenous students. Brandt (1935) portrayed these efforts in her report of BIA schools making their own books to connect school curriculum to Indigenous cultures. Brandt depicted teachers developing books and writing activities that represented the lived experiences and cultural understandings of Indigenous children. Her suggestions were pragmatic, arguing that teachers of Indigenous children would be more successful in teaching their students to speak, read, and write in English if the children were familiar with the content and vocabulary. Unfortunately, pleas for bridging the gap between schools and communities were not widely accepted. The launch of World War II put an end to the progressive era in Indigenous education (Reyhner, 2012) and Indigenous children continued to experience a disconnect between their cultures and their education.

**Traditional methods of teaching and learning.** To successfully teach Indigenous children, teachers must understand the diverse methods of teaching and learning between the 566 federally recognized (BIA, 2010) and 100 state recognized (U.S. Department of Health & Human Services, 2012) tribal nations spread across the U.S., including acknowledgement of how the uniqueness of each tribe impacts student needs. While I recognize the extent of inter-tribal variability and do not aim to negate their independent cultures, with 60% of Indigenous peoples residing off-reservation in metropolitan areas (U.S. Department of Health & Human Services, 2012), scholars have
identified commonalities present across tribes regarding teaching and learning as a way to serve diverse groups of Indigenous peoples (Cajete, 1994; Pewewardy, 2002). Next, to frame the integral components for effective teacher preparation for Indigenous students, I examine traditional methods of teaching and learning pertinent to diverse, urban Indigenous communities in the Midwestern region of the U.S. (i.e. Midwest).

**Oral storytelling.** Oral storytelling is a valued method of sharing knowledge in many Indigenous cultures (Cajete, 2005; Castagno & Brayboy, 2008; Pavel, 2005; Quigley, 2006). Cajete (2005) explained that tribes have historically valued oral storytelling because “the spoken or sung word expressed the spirit and breath of life of the speaker and thus was considered sacred” (p. 71), this tradition remains present across tribal cultures (Castagno & Brayboy, 2008; Pavel, 2005; Quigley, 2006). Young children learn from their elders through stories, conversations, observations, ceremony, and songs. Teachers of Indigenous children must learn to recognize the importance of spoken language as a primary form of sharing information and encourage storytelling, oratory, song, and other oral demonstrations of understanding as legitimate forms of literacy in the classroom—knowing that oral literacy may vary from tribe to tribe.

**Integrated learning.** Another traditional Indigenous method of teaching transferrable to present day schooling is integrated learning. Traditional tribal teachings occurred in regular social contexts (Cajete, 2005; Pewewardy, 1998; 2002) where children learned to understand big ideas from a holistic perspective rather than piecing together small parts of information to create the whole (Pewewardy, 2002). Teaching and learning in Indigenous contexts still entails children observing and listening to their elders before attempting to perform independently. Indigenous learners often reflect upon
problems and consider every aspect of the situation before sharing their ideas (Chavez, Ke, & Herrera, 2012; Pewewardy, 2002). This method of teaching and learning should be considered in delivering content to Indigenous children, knowing that the big picture should be shared with children early on in instruction and classrooms should embrace reflexivity.

**Medicine wheel.** The medicine wheel is a common model used for not only teaching, but as a way of being in Indigenous cultures (Pewewardy, 1999). Stemming from the significance of the circle, the medicine wheel connects Indigenous peoples with their pasts, their future, the Spirits, the seasons—all of the natural world (Cajete, 2005; First Nations Curriculum Development Committee, 1992). While medicine wheels vary across tribes, some common components exist. Medicine wheels include the directions east, south, west, and north that contribute to spiritual, intellectual, physical, and emotional beings that impact and are impacted by our surroundings (First Nations Curriculum Development Committee, 1992; Pewewardy, 1999). In school settings, the medicine wheel can be aligned with theories of multiple intelligences and used to address the whole child’s needs in her educational development (Pewewardy, 1999). Using principles of the medicine wheel as a framework for teaching addresses the needs of diverse Indigenous children in a way that acknowledges intertribal methods of teaching and learning.

**Self-determination.** An important aspect of CRS advocated for in the literature, but arguably not emphasized enough, is promoting tribal sovereignty and efforts of self-determination through self-education where Indigenous communities take ownership of the development and implementation of schools serving their children (Brayboy &
Educational services supported by Indigenous leaders succeeded in improving student engagement, lower dropout rates, improved teacher-child relationships, improved communities, increased academic achievement, and increased self confidence among children (Brayboy & Castagno, 2009). Vital to promoting self-determination in Indigenous education, but outside the scope of this study, was the preparation and retention of Indigenous teachers to serve the needs of Indigenous children (Brayboy & Castagno, 2009; Dehyle & Swisher, 1997). Increasing the numbers of high-qualified Indigenous teachers working in the field would ultimately better the experience of Indigenous children through interactions with leaders from their own communities and a reflection of community values in school activities (Belgrade et al., 2002). Until that goal is realized, non-Indigenous teachers may be better prepared to understand and address the needs of Indigenous children by supporting and assisting as allies in efforts of self-determination through self-education.

**Bilingual-bicultural education.** Both educational scholars and Indigenous communities supported the inclusion of bilingual and bicultural teaching to meet the needs of Indigenous children, which promotes students’ abilities to listen, speak, read, and write in Indigenous languages and English (McCarty, 2012). Including students’ native languages and cultures in teaching promoted student engagement more so than the more common assimilation approaches that resulted in low academic achievement and increased school dropout (Reyhner & Hurtado, 2008) and schools that valued children’s Indigenous languages were ultimately more successful than those promoting assimilation (Oakes & Maday, 2009). Negating arguments that bilingual and bicultural education must
take the form of additional programming, scholars put forth that curriculum connections to language and culture should be a both/and approach (McCarty, 2012) resulting in “Indigenous youth who are both academically and culturally prepared to succeed in the mainstream culture and in their tribal communities” (Brayboy & Castagno, 2009, p. 32).

Related to the previous discussion of integrated learning, language and culture should be a part of all school experiences, building on children’s lived experiences and community values to address holistic learning needs (Pewewardy, 1999). However, if non-Indigenous teachers are not prepared to involve themselves in Indigenous communities they will lack the resources and understandings necessary to develop bilingual and bicultural classrooms.

**Community-school collaboration.** Also connected to integrated learning, CRS advocated for collaboration between the community and school to support and improve Indigenous education. Researchers contended that bridging school and community cultures addressed the holistic needs of the child, the curriculum, and the community and was more congruent with Indigenous ways of teaching and learning (Brayboy & Castagno, 2009; Cajete, 2005; Castagno & Brayboy, 2008; McCarty, 2012; Oakes & Maday, 2009; Quigley, 2006). Collaborating with families and community leaders connected school academics to Indigenous cultures and prepared Indigenous children to succeed in both mainstream academics and their own communities (Brayboy & Castagno, 2009). Teachers of Indigenous children can include curriculum content and literature that reflects children’s lived experiences to improve Indigenous student success (Brandt, 1935; Brayboy & Castagno, 2009; Oakes & Maday, 2009; Reyhner, 1993).
Teachers gained information about their students’ cultures and communities by forming relationships with community members and tribal leaders to learn about local values and educational priorities (Lee & Quijada-Cerecer, 2010; Oakes & Maday, 2009), efforts to encourage teachers to collaborate with Indigenous communities lacked an explicit framework for teachers unfamiliar with the culture and community to draw from. Teacher preparation programs must support candidates in learning how to form relationships with Indigenous communities to collaborate with community leaders and amalgamate the school and community cultures, addressing shared goals of educational success (Stachowski & Mahan, 1998). The proposed framework for Indigenous community-university collaboration in this dissertation study will be detailed in the following chapter.

**Culturally responsive schooling implementation challenges.** The use of CRS methods portrayed by Brandt (1935), Brayboy and Castagno (2009), Gay (2010), McCarty (2012), Meriam (1928), Pewewardy (2002), Reyhner (2012) and other scholars working to improve academic achievement for culturally and linguistically diverse students remains largely theoretical. A number of factors lead to challenges of implementation including, but not limited to unequal resources (Darling-Hammond, 2010), educational policy (Reyhner & Hurtado, 2008) and teacher preparation (Rehyner & Jacobs, 2002). Schools with the greatest student diversity continually accessed fewer resources than schools serving primarily white, middle-class students (Darling-Hammond, 2010). Schools serving marginalized children offered the least amount of per-pupil funding, outdated and incomplete curricular resources, the most unqualified
teachers, and decrepit school structures (Darling-Hammond, 2010), exemplifying our nations “continuing comfort with profound inequality” (p. 8).

Scholars made apparent that current policies such as No Child Left Behind (NCLB) (U.S. Department of Education, 2002) furthered the educational inequity experienced by Indigenous children (Ahlquist, 2011; Brayboy & Castagno, 2009; Reyhner, & Hurtado, 2008). NCLB promoted a one-size-fits-all approach to education, discounting the intricacy of Indigenous cultures and the significance of bicultural curriculum in supporting the academic advancement of culturally and linguistically diverse children (Brayboy & Castagno, 2009). NCLB eliminated funding of bilingual education, instead promoted an English-only approach and prevented the inclusion of tribal languages (Reyhner & Hurtado, 2008).

In addition to the elimination of cultural teachings, NCLB emphasized the use of research-based practices (Reyhner & Hurtado, 2008) that did not include CRS methods built from traditional Indigenous education (Ahlquist, 2011; McCarty, 2012). The research-based practices promoted by NCLB have only shown success with samples of primarily white, middle-class children (Reyhner & Hurtado, 2008). Assessments and practices appropriate for white, middle-class children may in fact be unsuitable for Indigenous populations (Dehyle & Swisher, 1997), thus a policy aiming to support all children may in fact widen the education debt (Ladson-Billings, 2006).

A final challenge of actualizing CRS with Indigenous children was preparing teachers to understand and implement CRS methods in classroom settings. Teacher preparation programs have a responsibility to respond to the needs of diverse students and communities by better preparing candidates to understand and implement CRS
(Reyhner & Jacobs, 2002); however, this is not the sole responsibility of university faculty, but instead requires collaboration between communities, schools, and universities (Belgrade et al., 2002). By preparing candidates with communities and schools, candidates are more likely to understand the complexities in teaching diverse student populations (Belgrade et al., 2002, Stachowski & Mahan, 1998). Next, I review literature focused on community-university partnerships for teacher preparation and identify implications for a Midwestern urban Indigenous community.

**Collaborative Community-University Teacher Preparation**

Successful partnerships exist between communities and universities for teacher preparation. Focused on preparing candidates for culturally diverse urban communities, the literature put forth that providing authentic experiences in such communities would better prepare candidates to serve diverse students; however, very little literature exists around community-university partnerships to advance the education of Indigenous children. In this section, I portray the reviewed literature around effective community-university partnerships for teacher preparation focused on meeting the needs of diverse communities. Following that, I examine the limited research regarding community-university collaboration in Indigenous settings and provide suggestions for furthering scholarship to meet the needs of diverse urban Indigenous children and their teachers.

**Partnership Structures**

Scholars suggested several frameworks for developing community-university partnerships for teacher preparation. Murrell (2000) described the *community teachers conceptual framework*, which maintained the first step of transforming teacher preparation to address the needs of communities, was to create enclaves where teachers,
university faculty, parents, and community members could collaborate and communicate. Absent from Murrell’s framework for successful partnerships was a process for developing these enclaves. Approaching community organizations and developing genuine collaborative relationships is complex; university faculty must generate a well-planned procedure to effectively implement the community teacher conceptual framework and assess the impact of their partnership on the community participants.

Murrell’s (2000) second task involved increasing the number of community teachers in the community-university partnerships. Community teachers possessed multicultural competence about the community where they lived and worked. Through their work in community-based organizations, after-school programs, or religious contexts, they advanced the success of their neighborhood by supporting education. Universities partnered with community teachers can provide candidates opportunities to examine and understand community ways of teaching and learning; thus preparing candidates for urban education. For this approach to succeed and missing in Murrell’s research, community teachers must be assured that engaging in a community-university partnership will be a positive, mutually beneficial experience (Kruger et al., 2009).

Finally, community-university partnerships must create an approach to teaching and learning through a practice-oriented technique (Murrell, 2000). Ball and Cohen (1999) outlined an approach for teacher preparation termed practice-based learning theory. In this, they recommended that candidates must learn “in and from practice rather than in preparing to practice” (p. 10). Providing candidates’ experiences to teach diverse children with the support of university faculty, before entering the profession, allowed them to acquire the necessary knowledge and pedagogy needed in teaching and also an
understanding of how to apply knowledge and pedagogy in complex classroom settings (Ball & Cohen, 1999).

Similar to Ball and Cohen’s (1999) practice-based learning theory, Murrell (2000) described practice as involving more than the act of teaching, but acknowledging a teacher’s learning as well. Placing candidates within a community of practice (Rogoff, 1994) allowed them to learn from community teachers and practice applying the content and urban teaching theories of the community teacher and with the community teacher. A process for developing the enclaves proposed by Murrell (2000) was thoroughly detailed by Kruger and colleague’s (2009) who identified trust, mutuality, and reciprocity as the foundations of successful partnerships between schools and universities, but was not specific to partnerships with diverse community organizations.

Structural challenges. Oakes and colleagues (2002) also supported communities of practice to expose candidates to teaching and learning that occurred outside of schools. Oakes and colleagues acknowledged that the primarily white, female candidates were often fearful of urban neighborhoods and that communities of practice can ease anxieties through a genuine education around the strengths that diverse urban communities possess without ignoring their challenges. However, the authors did not explicate upon the impact that engaging with candidates may have on the participating community members, and they took a multicultural approach in serving diverse children instead of addressing the distinct needs of particular cultures and communities. Universities must be cognizant of the complexity involved with bridging the gap between candidates and urban communities when developing collaborative partnerships for teacher preparation,
investing time and energy to develop sustainable relationships with community organizations and stakeholders.

Advancing the notion of community-university partnerships, one study promoted co-construction where communities, schools, and universities, collaborated for educational reform (Carroll, LaPoint, & Tyler, 2001). Carroll and colleagues were aligned with literature promoting partnerships that valued the ideas of all stakeholders (Kruger et al., 2009; Rogoff, 1994), but they included challenges in developing such complex collaborative relationships. Communities, schools, and universities had distinct goals for their organizations and thus divergent expectations for how the partnerships will accomplish these goals. The added time involved in sustaining partnerships increased the difficulty of implementing them successfully, but the authors named reciprocity and democratic processes as the key principles of facilitating community-school-university partnerships. Again, this scholarship did not address the impact of these partnerships on the involved community organizations and their members. This study aimed to address this gap by examining the impact of a complex partnership for teacher preparation grounded in minimizing inequalities on the involved community organization.

An additional challenge existed in power types present in complex partnerships (Carroll et al., 2001; Davies, Edwards, Gannon, & Laws, 2007). Davies and colleagues suggested developing a common language and common aspiration of what the partnership will achieve as a way to meet the expectations of all stakeholders. Ristock and Pennel (1996) investigated eliminating the power types in community-university collaborations, but ultimately recommended using power responsibly because eliminating power roles all together proved improbable. Regardless of how universities address issues
of power, they must realize the influence perceptions of power can have on the outcomes of collaborative endeavors—accounted for in this research through the aforementioned conceptual framework.

While researchers outlined individual frameworks for developing, implementing, and sustaining successful community-university partnerships, several commonalities existed. Scholarship concurred that all stakeholders must be equally valued; with all members having a voice in the partnership’s structure and goals. The literature also emphasized communication between stakeholders. While authors held different methods for accomplishing an open dialogue amongst partners, they agreed that the process of facilitating partnerships should be clear to all involved. A final shared aim within the research was a respect for teaching and learning that occurred outside of the classroom. Appreciating the localized knowledge of communities was a vital principle of successful community-university partnerships for teacher preparation intended to eliminate the inequalities present in our nation’s schools. As stated earlier, the reviewed research was not specific to partnerships with Indigenous communities. This research may be considered in advancing Indigenous community-university collaboration, providing an initial framework rather than a complete approach in addressing the complexity of urban Indigenous education.

**Preparing Urban Educators**

Candidates gained a direct, positive impact from community-university collaborations for teacher preparation through experiences in diverse educational settings and an awareness of community methods of teaching and learning (McDonald et al., 2011; Murrell, 2000; Oakes et al., 2002; Stachowski & Mahan, 1998). By way of
practice-based approaches to learning that allowed candidates to employ teaching methods while gaining in the moment feedback from their professors (Ball & Cohen, 1999; Murrell, 2000) candidates enhanced their dispositions of resiliency and cultural understandings; as a result, they were more prepared for urban teaching. This section of the literature review will examine the impact of candidates’ experiences with community-based organizations on their readiness to teach in urban classrooms.

Accounts from candidates elucidated how experiences with community organizations led them to think about education outside of school settings (Murrell, 2000). Candidates noted that community experiences allowed them to recognize and appreciate the qualities of community teachers and how to include a broader vision of education in interactions with children. Additionally, engagement with community partners influenced candidates to consider social justice issues present in course readings and relate them to real-life experiences during time with community partners. These experiences ultimately helped candidates develop their identities as potential community teachers prepared for urban settings (Murrell, 2000).

Adding to Murrell’s (2000) findings, McDonald and colleagues (2011) concluded that in community-university collaborations for teacher preparation, community members were more influential in teaching candidates about intracultural diversity than university faculty who addressed diversity in general terms. Candidates reported that understanding intracultural diversity assisted them in appreciating the importance of family and community in the lives of children. This was pertinent in researching Indigenous community-university partnerships, as considerable tribal diversity existed in urban areas but Indigenous children were rarely recognized by their tribal citizenship.
Participating in community settings expanded candidates’ awareness of students’ diversity, families, and communities and encouraged them to use this knowledge to develop culturally relevant teaching strategies (McDonald et al., 2011). In this experience, community organizations also valued the candidates as having knowledge and skills in working with children, and thus provided opportunities to engage with community staff as colleagues and work with children in ways they were not afforded in school settings. McDonald and colleagues insinuated that the partnership may have positively impacted the community organization, but without specifically inquiring about the community participants’ experiences, the impact was unclear.

Possibilities to practice skills in low-risk settings presented candidates time to develop their methods before entering high stakes classroom settings (Ball & Cohen, 1999). Candidates with community experiences displayed dismantled assumptions about poverty and urban communities because of their first hand community experiences; realizing that most parents want the best for their children and that communities surrounding schools contained resources for teaching and learning (Buran & Kirby, 2002; McDonald et al., 2011). Candidates also perceived themselves as better equipped to become successful urban educators (McDonald et al., 2011).

Community-university partnerships prepared candidates for urban education by offering field experiences in community organizations where candidates were encouraged to reconsider their stereotypes around urban youth (Onore & Gildin, 2010). In these experiences, candidates observed differences in students’ dispositions in school and out of school and concluded that students have more developed personalities out of school. Candidates began to recognize that what children learn out of school might be of greater
value than in school activities, and that schools should make space for informal learning experiences (Onore & Gildin, 2010). This study did not address what approaches to teaching were valued by the community members that resulted in the children demonstrating a more outward level of engagement.

Research confirmed the importance of community-university partnerships to prepare teachers for urban education. Learning from community teachers provided candidates real life experiences working with urban children in urban settings, thus better understanding the community ways of teaching and learning and preparing them to effectively educate diverse students. Universities must develop these partnerships if they wish to promote a meaningful effort towards preparing teachers to advance educational equality, but they also must consider the impact of their presence in community organizations on the organization and its members to ensure that the partnerships are mutually beneficial.

The focus of this dissertation study aimed to fill the identified gaps in the current literature by considering how providing candidates with experiences in an urban Indigenous community impacted the participating community organization and its members. Including community partners as the focus of this study examined what cultural understandings the community deemed important for candidates to possess to succeed in teaching diverse children and how engaging in the partnerships affected the involved community. As previously described in this chapter, I examined the partnership between an Indigenous community organization and non-Indigenous university to consider how the complex context of the study either upheld or excluded the goals of collaborative, field-based teacher preparation.
Partnerships for Students and Communities

While Kruger and colleagues (2009) proclaimed that the focus of all partnerships must be on the learning needs of kindergarten-to-grade-12 (K-12) students, the impact of community-university partnerships on students, birth-to-grade-12 (B-12), was absent from most of the literature. Of the reviewed literature, only Onore and Gildin (2010) addressed student outcomes in a brief statement about a community-university partnership providing youth participants with a cosmopolitan experience in a supportive environment. Outside of the scope of this study, and absent from the literature was research around student experiences in community-university partnerships for teacher preparation. If universities are engaged in partnerships to advance educational equality, they must examine the impact of these efforts on student participants.

Similarly missing from the scholarship and pertinent to this study were impacts of partnerships on communities and community members. Literature agreed that successful partnerships included a community of learners, where all stakeholder ideas were equally valued and decisions were determined collaboratively (Kruger et al., 2009; Murrell, 2000; Oakes et al., 2002; Rogoff, 1994). However, existing research only limitedly examined the impact of these partnerships on school participants, community members, and organizations. In examining a school-university partnership Borthwick, Stirling, Nauman, and Cook (2003) included the schools’ perceived advantages and disadvantages of the partnership. Advantages included professional development, resources, networking, outside partners, and student supports; disadvantages included teacher resistance, lack of teacher voice, time constraints, and lack of administrative supports.
Another study examined the impact on community-university partnerships for service learning on the community organization (Budhai, 2013). This study reasoned that service-learning projects positively impacted the community organization by advancing the organization’s mission through increased labor provided by the involved students (Budhai, 2013). Budhai (2013) also found that challenges existed with students completing service projects as a required assignment without a dedication to impacting the lives of others, but that community partners viewed themselves as co-educators with university faculty in broadening the students’ awareness around social issues. While Budhai (2013) provided insight into community members’ perceptions of their involvement in community-university partnerships it did not focus on Indigenous communities or partnerships for teacher preparation. Current research on partnerships with community organizations for teacher preparation excluded community perspectives around partnership impacts; in this study, I aimed to contribute to the lack scholarship focused on the community’s experience of community-university partnerships for teacher preparation.

**Indigenous Community-University Partnerships**

Addressing the school-measured achievement gap between Indigenous students and their white peers to improve the quality of education for Indigenous children required collaboration between schools, communities, and universities (Clare & Sampsel, 2013; NCES, 2012a). Universities and communities may collaborate to better prepare teachers of Indigenous students; however, inadequate research existed around community-university collaboration with Indigenous organizations for teacher preparation. Existing partnerships included tribal organizations located on reservation lands, mainly in the
Southwest or Plains regions of the U.S. (Belgarde et al., 2002; Jacobs et al., 2001; Stachowski, & Mahan, 1998; White, Bedonie, de Groat, Lockard, & Honani, 2007). A portion of those programs were specific to preparing Indigenous teachers for Indigenous students (Belgarde et al., 2002; White et al., 2007), whereas this dissertation study aimed to prepare enrolled candidates at a primarily white institution with an urban Indigenous community organization to serve Indigenous children and families in the Midwest.

The partnerships featured in current scholarship shared common themes; they supported enhancing community voice and parental involvement, supporting Indigenous language development, and implementing culturally responsive schooling as methods for improving Indigenous education (Belgarde et al., 2002; Jacobs et al., 2001; Stachowski, & Mahan, 1998; White et al., 2007). Funding was reported as a significant challenge impacting the expansion and sustainability of programs to prepare teachers to meet the needs of Indigenous children in areas with highly concentrated Indigenous populations (Belgarde et al., 2002; White et al., 2007), but no recommendations existed for preparing candidates to meet the needs of urban, Indigenous children in the Midwest.

Although the Midwest houses numerous tribes with sovereign Indigenous lands, and Chicago houses the 3rd largest urban Indigenous community (National Urban Indian Family Coalition, 2000), university and Indigenous community partnerships for teacher preparation have yet to be widely shared with the field through scholarly literature. Stachowski and Mahan (1998) described a program at one Midwest university that aimed to prepare teachers for diverse student populations through rich, authentic experiences with Indigenous communities in the southwestern region of the U.S. (i.e., Southwest). The American Indian Reservation project placed candidates at BIA schools located
across the Navajo Nation in the Southwest. The study reported positive results around preparing teachers for diverse students and collaboration with community organizations (Stachowski & Mahan, 1998). Subsequent studies concurred that community and university collaboration positively impacted candidates’ readiness for diverse classrooms (McDonald et al., 2011; Murrell, 2000), but these studies did not focus on Indigenous communities or the impact of the partnerships on community participants. Intertribal diversity in urban Indigenous communities is complex; future teachers of Midwestern urban Indigenous children must have experiences within those specific intertribal communities through sustainable, mutually beneficial relationships.

Preparing teachers to understand and fulfill the needs of urban Indigenous children with direct input and support from community leaders will aid in overcoming the divide between Indigenous communities and public schools (Clare & Sampsel, 2013; Writer, 2008). With the importance of Indigenous community and university partnerships for teacher preparation in Midwest cities defined, this dissertation study of the Kateri-TLLSC partnership acknowledged the historical complexity in Indigenous education and implemented promising practices for preparing teachers to teach all children, enhancing efforts of self determination through self-education. I conducted this study to improve education for urban Indigenous children by including the voices of Indigenous community members to prepare teachers in culturally responsive schooling (Castagno & Brayboy, 2008; Gay, 2010; Pewewardy & Hammer, 2003; Rehyner, 1993; Writer, 2008) as well as support their commitment of teaching for social justice.

Beyond supporting candidates’ development and improving educational equality, this study addressed a significant gap in the literature that explored the impact of
community-university partnerships on the community organization, its members, and its provided services. None of the reviewed literature examined Indigenous community organization stakeholders’ experiences collaborating with universities for teacher preparation. Understanding the advantages and challenges of community members in partnerships was essential in continuing to develop sustainable, mutually beneficial partnerships that improve teacher preparation and educational experiences for diverse children. With the extant literature put forth and the purpose of this study made clear, I next describe the design of my qualitative, case study research methodology.
CHAPTER III
RESEARCH METHODS

Qualitative Research Methodology

A significant problem exists in U.S. schools serving Indigenous youth. The previous chapter depicted approaches to advance the achievement of urban Indigenous children and methods that effectively prepare teachers to serve these children. In this study, I addressed the identified problems through a proposed solution of collaborative, field-based teacher preparation preparing teachers to serve urban Indigenous youth. In this chapter, I detail the qualitative, single case study design (Erickson, 1986; Stake, 1995) to examine a partnership for teacher preparation between an urban Indigenous community organization and a university teacher preparation program. Using a single case study design allowed me to examine the St. Kateri Center of Chicago (Kateri)-Teaching, Learning, and Leading with Schools and Communities (TLLSC) partnership with comprehensive consideration of the complex relationship between an urban Indigenous organization and a university teacher preparation program.

I begin with a thick description of the case, detailed descriptions of the community organization, the university teacher preparation program, and the partnership between the two institutions. Then, I use the research questions to provide a rationale for applying case study methods. I conclude with a description of data collection and analysis.
methods including participants, procedures, timeline, strengths and limitations, and my role as a researcher.

**The Case: A Community-University Partnership for Teacher Preparation**

To collect, analyze, and interpret data for this study, I cooperated with candidates, community members, and university faculty in a qualitative study (Erickson, 1986) using single case design (Stake, 1995). The partnership between Kateri, an urban Indigenous community organization, and Loyola University Chicago’s (Loyola) School of Education’s (SOE) affinity group TLLSC was the subject of this case. I purposively selected the partnership between Kateri and TLLSC as the subject of this study because of (a) my extensive local knowledge and experience with both organizations, independently and within the partnership, and (b) the uniqueness of an urban Indigenous community organization and non-Indigenous university partnering for teacher preparation. Thomas (2011) supported the rationale for purposive selection asserting that possessing extensive, personal knowledge of the subject enables the researcher to conduct in-depth analysis and examine the case at a deeper level.

Additionally, utilizing the single case design focused on a bounded entity such as an individual or organization, my case study research examined the particularity and complexity of a single case—the partnership between two organizations (Stake, 1995). My familiarity with Kateri and TLLSC advanced this investigation, due to my positionality as an *insider* to the organizations, which provided me an emic perspective of the observed activities—identified as an important strategy in Indigenous research (Sobeck, Chapleski, & Fisher, 2008). My ongoing relationship with Kateri and TLLSC community members and my acceptance as an active participant in community events
granted me access to the case and drew on an established trust with community partners. The object “an analytical or theoretical frame” (Thomas, 2011, p. 513) of this case was the impact of the Kateri-TLLSC partnership on the Kateri community partners. Using the thick description typical to qualitative approaches to research (Erickson, 1986), I further describe the collaboration between Kateri and TLLSC below.

Kateri Center of Chicago

With over ten thousand Indigenous peoples distanced from their lands, tribes, clans, and families calling Chicago home (U.S. Census Bureau, 2013), pan-Indian organizations bring a sense of community to the diverse urban Indigenous population. Kateri first opened its doors in the Uptown neighborhood, known for its Indigenous community, on Chicago’s north side as the Anawim Center in 1982. Since its beginning, Kateri aimed to be a welcoming site for Indigenous peoples from diverse tribal affiliations to join together and create a sense of kinship in an unfamiliar city environment. The Kateri community changed the organization’s name from Anawim in 2010 to honor St. Kateri Tekakwitha as a symbol of recognition and respect for Indigenous peoples by the Catholic Church (Kateri Center of Chicago, 2013). Kateri now welcomes Chicago’s Indigenous community from around the Chicago area to St. Benedict’s parish campus with the aid of Chicago’s Archdiocese, Sinsinawa Dominican sisters, private funding, and individual contributions.

Upon entering Kateri, senses are awakened for anyone familiar with Indigenous cultures. The thick, earthy smell from a recent ceremonial smudging (see Figure 1) is ever present and made real with sea shells full of ash, burnt sage, and charred cedar twigs set on a table or shelf.
Walls are plastered with images of St. Kateri Tekakwitha (see Figure 2), photographs of Indigenous leaders, dream catchers, eagle feathers, beadwork (see Figure 3), sweet grass baskets, and countless fictional and informational Indigenous books.
Figure 3. St. Kateri Center of Chicago, Feathers and Beadwork

With mismatched tables and chairs fit together to accommodate as many people as possible and pieced together kitchenware, it is clear that the warmth and comfort is drawn from the people—the kinship. Usually found organizing events or preparing meals in the kitchen, community leaders put their whole selves into supporting other Indigenous peoples through Kateri services; the Kateri community welcomes both regular members and new faces to community events.

Kateri formally provides spiritual guidance for Indigenous Catholics (see Figure 4), scholarships for Catholic education, Indigenous culture and heritage studies, and opportunities to continue ancestral wisdom and oral histories (Kateri Center of Chicago, 2013).
Figure 4. St. Kateri Center of Chicago Chapel

Acting as a meeting place for Chicago’s urban Indigenous population, Kateri hosts: Sunday worship services, elder luncheons, American Indian Speakers Bureau, prayer circles, powwows, and informal gatherings to uphold a sense of kinship for Indigenous community members separated from their tribal Nations. More than the formal services recognized by the Archdiocese of Chicago and published on the Kateri website, Indigenous community members enjoy friendships, sharing of resources, preservation of customs and traditions, Indigenous languages, foods, ceremonies, traditional healings, music, dance, crafts, and a sense of belonging.

Apart from sponsored activities, Kateri staff and leaders participate in wider community activities and events to support Indigenous peoples and Indigenous causes in Chicagoland and beyond. Families share their needs and achievements, Kateri supports political rallies regarding Indigenous or other minority group causes, and community members regularly attend benefits of Kateri supported events. Kateri also participates in
cross-cultural experiences, such as sharing Indigenous cultures with non-Indigenous and visiting cultural centers in the Chicago area to become familiar with diverse cultural and religious practices. Kateri and its members serve and support people from all backgrounds and beliefs to uphold a strong sense of place in a city far away from home.

**Teaching, Learning, and Leading with Schools and Communities**

Situated in the same urban metropolis, Loyola teacher preparation faculty redesigned its program to better prepare candidates to meet the needs of an increasingly diverse B-12 student population (Oakes, Lipton, Anderson, & Stillman, 2013). Loyola’s teacher preparation program, TLLSC, is structured around four key cornerstones (Ryan et al., 2014): (a) partnerships with schools and communities, (b) teacher preparation for diverse classrooms, (c) authentic teacher practices increase over four years, and (d) participation in professional learning communities (PLCs; McLaughlin & Talbert, 2006). Embodied in its name, TLLSC aims to prepare teacher leaders who serve diverse children through professional and community collaboration and authentic experiences.

TLLSC offers both undergraduate and graduate level programs for initial licensure. This study involved the graduate level program during the first semester of implementation. Graduate level candidates enter TLLSC with bachelor degrees from accredited four-year institutions and hold varying degrees of experience working with children in schools and communities. Graduate level candidates declare majors in elementary education, secondary education, or special education and complete the first three TLLSC sequences over two six-week accelerated summer semesters. Additionally, Loyola’s LU Choice candidates join the TLLSC summer sequence sections; LU Choice offers accelerated licensure focused on serving urban Catholic schools and place
candidates in classrooms as teachers of record after the initial three TLLSC sequences. Graduate level candidates complete the program in four to six semesters depending on their declared major, earning a master’s in education with licensure and an endorsement in teaching English as a second language. During summer 2014, TLLSC graduate candidates were approximately 74% female and 26% male, one candidate identified as Arab-American and the remaining candidates identified as Anglo-American.

TLLSC is grounded in practice-based learning theory where candidates are provided opportunities to implement teaching theories and methods in field-based settings with direct feedback from faculty (Ball & Cohen, 1999) and includes partnerships with schools and communities where all partners share a responsibility with the university for educating future teachers (Heineke, Kennedy, & Lees, 2013). TLLSC is designed around tiered clinical experiences preparing candidates through modules located in schools and communities rather than courses on the university campus; affording candidates opportunities to engage with teachers, administrators, and community leaders experienced in serving culturally and linguistically diverse students and families (Heineke et al., 2013).

Providing extensive field experiences in Chicago’s schools and communities, aims to prepare candidates to serve children and families from diverse social, emotional, behavioral, cultural, linguistic, developmental and academic backgrounds (Heineke et al., 2013). TLLSC emphasizes candidates as professionals in the field of education from the moment they enter the program, acknowledging a process of growth the three-tiered program is structured with beginning, developing, and mastering phases (Ryan et al., 2014). Finally, TLLSC recognizes the need for candidates to reflect upon their teaching
and learning in PLCs (McLaughlin & Talbert, 2006); at the end of each semester, candidates in all phases of the program meet together one evening a week for three weeks with a mentoring professor in their chosen area of specialty to dialogue with one another about their experiences. The PLC sessions offer candidates opportunities to co-create knowledge, making meaning through self-reflection and discussions of their field-based experiences (Heineke et al., 2013). A graphic representation of TLLSC (see Figure 5) portrays the three phases of the program with brief descriptions of sequences and modules.


Figure 5. Teaching Learning and Leading with Schools and Communities (TLLSC) B.S.Ed. Program Phases
What does collaborative teacher preparation look like? Candidates begin work in TLLSC during their first semester at Loyola. Along with university core course requirements, candidates enroll in sequences, semester-long experiences composed of modules ranging from two- to eight-week experiences, held in school and community partner facilities. Candidates complete modules at assigned partner sites that exemplify the content of their studies. Along with candidates, university faculty are also at the school or community site for the duration of the module. Professors support candidates while they participate in school and community activities, ensuring that candidates engage in meaningful discussions bridging theories from assigned readings to the practical experiences embedded in each module. Additionally, school administrators, classroom teachers, community leaders, and families partake in the experiences and model teaching and learning practices most appropriate to their given context. As a result, candidates gain knowledge from experiences, professors, practicing administrators and teachers, community leaders, and families—with the aim to equip candidates for the complexity of teaching upon graduation.

Community partnerships. TLLSC faculty purposefully included community organizations as partners to prepare candidates to meet the needs of diverse urban students, believing that candidates must understand and experience the cultures and communities of students and families to succeed in future practices. TLLSC community partners include museums, community-based organizations or agencies, businesses, and government organizations. The majority of community partners are located near Loyola’s Lakeshore Campus in the culturally and linguistically diverse Edgewater and Uptown
neighborhoods where 24% and 27% of the respective residents were born in a country outside of the U.S. (City-Data, 2013a; City-Data, 2013b).

**The Focal University-Community Partnership**

Kateri began collaborating with Loyola in spring of 2012 and is now a TLLSC community partner. During the initiation of the partnership, I was in my first year of doctoral studies at Loyola and beginning to involve myself in the Kateri community. I acted as a liaison between Kateri and Loyola faculty to develop a sustainable, mutually beneficial relationship. The partnership began with Kateri leaders wishing to develop resources that portrayed the magnitude of St. Kateri Tekakwitha as the first recognized Indigenous saint and Loyola needing to provide candidates with culturally diverse field experiences. To achieve their respective goals, both Kateri community leaders and Loyola faculty participated in initial discussions to develop a partnership grounded in trust, mutuality, and reciprocity (Kruger et al., 2009). Community and university stakeholders spent significant time building the relationship to develop genuine trust—a foundational component of the partnership that demanded time and commitment. Community and university stakeholders focused on unique educational, personal, and professional experiences and commonalities that would inform and advance the partnership.

Once the Kateri stakeholders and Loyola faculty established a positive working relationship, they outlined the needs of their respective institutions to uphold the tenet of reciprocity. Kateri identified curriculum materials about St. Kateri Tekakwitha that emphasized important happenings in her life leading to sainthood, based in both traditional and mainstream school methods of teaching, as a community need. Loyola
faculty put forth that candidates would gain rich field experiences to study culturally responsive teaching, as well as opportunities to write curriculum and plan units. University faculty and myself as a graduate student would use the project for course development, conference presentations, and publications. Once the partners identified individual needs, they reviewed the outline of the partnership and assigned roles and responsibilities to ensure mutuality, agreeing that each organization gained equal benefit from the time spent dedicated to the partnership.

Kateri expressed interest and agreed to partner with TLLSC to continue collaborating in a mutually beneficial partnership to prepare candidates to understand and meet the needs of urban, Indigenous children. In the summer of 2014, Kateri partnered with Loyola to host TLLSC Sequence One: *Introduction to TLLSC*, with a particular focus on the second module of Sequence One: *Community Immersion*. The sequence occurred over two weeks in summer 2014 with TLLSC graduate students participating in and learning from the Kateri community with the support of their Loyola professor. TLLSC faculty paired each Kateri community partner with two candidates to mentor and assist with their module projects. Each TLLSC candidate pair had a specific topic to research within the urban Indigenous community to develop an asset map of known Indigenous resources and new resources to serve community needs. Kateri leadership was interested in working with candidates to develop their awareness and understanding of the needs and available resources of Chicago’s Indigenous families, and diverse cultures in general.

While the Kateri leaders and TLLSC faculty designed the partnership to hold each module session of Sequence One at Kateri, only three sessions occurred on site. The first
Community Immersion module session was held at Kateri where Paul, a young adult community partner, presented on Indigenous cultures and issues of media representation. After the presentation, TLLSC faculty introduced candidates to Kateri community partners who would provide mentorship during their asset mapping projects. Three days later, candidates met with community partners to conduct interviews for their asset mapping projects. All interviews took place for one to two hours at Kateri, with the exception of the interview with community partner Joanie, who led her candidates on a tour of Indigenous organizations throughout Chicago’s north side neighborhoods. The final session at Kateri occurred on the last day of the module where candidates presented their asset map projects to TLLSC faculty and Kateri community partners. In these presentations, community partners were passive audience members, and were not asked to provide feedback or explicate upon community experiences, resources, or needs.

During the implementation of the Community Immersion module, the following questions guided my case study research:

- What aspects of Indigenous cultures do Kateri community partners believe teachers should understand to serve urban Indigenous children?
- How do Kateri community partners view their roles in preparing teachers to meet the needs of urban Indigenous children?
- How does the involvement of teacher candidates in an urban Indigenous community based organization impact the community partners and their experiences?
Rationale for Case Study

The complexity of preparing teachers collaboratively with an urban Indigenous community organization required a case study design so that I was able to thoroughly examine the interactions of the project in a single setting (Ragin, 1999). Dedicated to discovering the impact of the Kateri-TLLSC partnership on the community, I did not intend to formally generalize my findings to a wider audience. A case study design allowed me to capitalize on the uniqueness of Kateri and its partnership with TLLSC (Hodkinson & Hodkinson, 2001) and the sincere relationship I maintain with the Kateri community provided an optimal context for learning about the impact of the partnership on the community. While I was not looking to put forth formal generalizations regarding the findings to this study, argued by Flyvbjerg (2006) as being “overvalued as a source of scientific developments” (p. 228), I did expect that the in depth examination and uniqueness of this case may provide understandings to inform the practices of other university and urban Indigenous community partnerships (Flyvbjerg, 2006).

In addition to the uniqueness of the partnership, the use of case study research promoted examination of the partnership’s impact on Kateri in an urban Indigenous setting. Case study emphasized the importance of understanding the interactions of a case in its context (Stake, 1995) and in this study, the context in which the partnership existed and the interactions that occurred within the case were essential to examining the research questions. Additionally, the complexity of an urban Indigenous community required specific attention and “because of the depth that is possible, case studies can engage with complexity” (Hodkinson & Hodkinson, 2001, p. 3). Elucidating the interactions between community partners, TLLSC faculty, and candidates allowed me to
collect data around the community partners’ experiences in the partnership and
determined the impact of the partnership on the organization, its members, and its
services.

Methods of Data Collection and Analysis

I chose data collection and analysis methods to address the research questions in a
manner appropriate within an Indigenous community. In this section, I detail the research
methods of the single case design (Stake, 1995) as they related to the cultural context of
the involved Indigenous community organization. I begin with an overview of the
community partners and methods of data collection, which included: focus groups,
observations and interviews. I describe my data analysis and measures taken to ensure
validity: member checking, positionality, and researcher role. Then, I share the
procedures of my study and conclude the chapter with known strengths and limitations of
this research design.

Participants

Indigenous community members from diverse tribal nations, residing in the
Chicago area participated in this study. Community partners were over the age of 18,
with an explicit goal to have a representation of elders recognized as leaders within the
urban Indigenous community, as well as younger participants with more recent school
experiences. In this way, the diverse ages and tribal affiliations of the participants
provided multiple perspectives around engaging in collaborative, field-based teacher
preparation and what candidates should know when serving urban Indigenous children.
Active members of Kateri interested in improving the educational experiences of
Indigenous youth and advancing efforts of self-determination through self-education
joined the study as community partners. They demonstrated an interested in collaborating with TLLSC for teacher preparation to share their experiences and knowledges of urban Indigenous cultures, needs, and resources. Community partners possessed expertise as community teachers (Murrell, 2000) in meeting the needs of urban Indigenous children and ideas around bridging the gap between schools and Indigenous communities. In the following subsections, I provide a brief description of each community partner and the perspective that he or she brought to the study.

**Doreen.** Doreen is a recognized elder and spiritual leader in Chicago’s urban Indigenous community and essential to the Kateri leadership. She is Ojibway from the First Nation M’Chigeeng and has spent a lifetime of service with Chicago’s Indigenous peoples. Anishinaabemowin is Doreen’s first language and she has completed coursework around reading and writing the language as well as teaching Anishinaabemowin to non-native speakers. Doreen attended Catholic schools through high school and is devout in her service to the Church, but recognizes the historical and ongoing mistreatment of Indigenous peoples through Catholic education. Doreen’s grandchildren currently attend both CPS and Catholic schools providing her with an understanding of Chicago’s current educational landscape. Doreen took part in each focus group and mentored two candidates.

**Ann.** Also an elder Ojibway from the First Nation M’Chigeeng and a native Anishinaabemowin speaker, Ann has resided in Chicago for the duration of her adult life. She is an active leader in the Kateri community, with most of her work done behind the scenes, in the kitchen or quietly after hours. Ann is a mother of four adult children, all graduates of CPS. Ann expresses skepticism of educational institutions, but consistently
voices her interest in Indigenous peoples becoming highly educated to enact change in the community. Ann advocates for language revitalization, believing that without Anishinaabemowin, the culture cannot survive. In this study, Ann chose to partake in the initial focus group to advocate for improved urban Indigenous education, but did not continue on to mentor candidates and thus, did not partake in the final focus group.

**Leah.** Leah is an elder from Little Traverse Bay Band of Odawa Indians and an active Kateri member with a devout Catholic faith. Leah spent the first eight years of her life on an island primarily inhabited by Odawas and one Catholic priest. There, she learned English as a second language and experienced a traditional Odawa upbringing. She then moved to a larger, colonized island and spent a short time on the mainland at a Catholic boarding school. In this study, Leah shared the abuse suffered at the boarding school that caused her to escape the institution and return home. She then attended public schools, where she endured ongoing racism and oppression. Leah left her home as a young teenager, moving to Detroit, MI and then Chicago where she has resided for her entire adult life. Leah took part in both focus groups and mentored two candidates.

**George.** George is an Ojibwe elder from Bad River Band and regularly attends Kateri events. George is an active leader in multiple Chicago Indigenous organizations and well versed in Anishinaabe culture. He speaks a beginning level of Anishinaabemowin and continuously works to improve his fluency. George spent his childhood in Chicago, where his parents masked their Indigenous identities to gain acceptance in Chicago’s work force. George spent summers with his grandparents in Bad River, and maintained an awareness of Ojibwe traditions. George joined this study after the first TLLSC module session, thus he did not partake in the initial focus group, but he
collaborated with Leah to mentor two candidates and joined the final focus group discussion.

**Paul.** Paul is a young adult Ojibway from the First Nation M’Chigeeng and has lived in Chicago his entire life, graduating high school from CPS and attaining a bachelor’s degree from University of Illinois Chicago. Paul is an active member of Chicago’s Indigenous community, with a strong voice around issues of media misrepresentation. Paul works to overcome colonial oppression through increased self-representation, shedding light on successful Indigenous peoples as models for urban Indigenous youth. Paul took part in the initial focus group and mentored two candidates; due to a scheduling conflict, Paul did not partake in the final focus group and declined an interview.

**Joe.** Joe is a young adult Chippewa from Bad River Band of Lake Superior. He attended public school off of the reservation in a school with a large population of Indigenous students. During the study, he actively collaborated with TLLSC faculty to facilitate module experiences and coordinate events. Joe sees himself as a natural leader and teacher within the Kateri community. He enjoys working with youth groups and cross-cultural ministry events. Joe was an essential stakeholder in the Kateri-TLLSC partnership, helping to organize scheduling of module experiences and communicating the partnership goals with other community members. Joe began the study with a one-on-one interview, mentored three candidates, and partook in the final focus group discussion.

**Joanie.** Joanie is a young adult Ojibway from the First Nation M’Chigeeng and has lived her entire life in Chicago, graduating high school from CPS and completing a
master’s degree from National Louis University. Joanie is an active member of Chicago’s Indigenous community, involving herself in every Chicago Indigenous community organization. Joanie advocates for urban Indigenous youth who are at risk for substance abuse, suicide, school dropout, and other hazardous circumstances. She was eager to join this study, and regularly put forth that the community must do more to strategically improve urban Indigenous education. Joanie partook in both focus groups and mentored two candidates.

Table 1 details the participants’ age group, gender, tribal affiliation, and focus group or interview participation.

Table 1

Participant Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Tribe</th>
<th>Focus Group 1</th>
<th>Focus Group 2</th>
<th>Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doreen</td>
<td>Elder</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Ojibway</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann</td>
<td>Elder</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Ojibway</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leah</td>
<td>Elder</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Odawa</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George</td>
<td>Elder</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Ojibway</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Young Adult</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Ojibway</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>Young Adult</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Chippewa</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanie</td>
<td>Young Adult</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Ojibway</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Collection

I collected data through focus groups, participant observations, and interviews, with the multiple data sources employed to triangulate the findings (Merriam, 2009). I included methods of data collection supported in the literature around qualitative research.
(Erickson, 1986; Merriam, 2009), single case design (Stake, 1995), and Indigenous studies (Deloria, 1991; Sobeck et al., 2008) to develop a framework that was both valid and culturally congruent. In this section, I depict my methods for conducting focus groups, observations, and interviews explaining how each point of data collection was grounded in Indigenous traditions and aligned with IPT (Battiste, 2000).

Focus groups. Focus groups with community members prior to and immediately following the Community Immersion module served as a primary data source. Sobeck and colleagues (2008) recommended focus groups to interpret information in Indigenous research to create a sense of community similar to talking circles, which are traditional Indigenous ways of sharing information and discussing problems. Focus groups provided a setting for participants to make sense of their experiences in a social context, where they developed their own understandings and the understandings of other community members (Patton, 2002).

In focus groups, the participants gained space to discuss their experiences of TLLSC activities and their interactions with TLLSC professors and candidates at Kateri amongst each other. As the researcher, I guided these discussions as needed, but maintained a minimal role in the conversations, knowing that the participant experiences were the main source of focus group data. I used semi-structured questions to guide the focus groups; my observations guided the questions for the final focus group. The questions maintained dialogue around unique participant experiences related to my research questions, were used flexibly, and in no particular order (Merriam, 2009). Focus group questions are listed in Table 2 and Table 3; discussions were audio recorded and transcribed for data analysis, which is described in the following section.
### Table 2

*Initial Focus Group Questions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guiding Questions</th>
<th>Sub Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will you share your thoughts on teaching urban Indigenous students?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you think teachers should know about Indigenous cultures for children to</td>
<td>How can non-Indigenous teachers support urban Indigenous children?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have good school experiences?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should Indigenous people be involved in supporting non-Indigenous teachers?</td>
<td>How?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How do you view yourself in helping teacher candidates?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What can you teach them?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will you share your thoughts about working with the Loyola graduate students/faculty</td>
<td>How may it impact you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How may it impact Kateri?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(events, activities, luncheons, services)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are there parts of the partnership you like? Don’t like?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does anything surprise you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you think/how do you feel about having Loyola Graduate students/faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there anything else you would like to discuss?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3

*Final Focus Group Questions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guiding Questions</th>
<th>Sub Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will you share your experience working with the Loyola graduate students?</td>
<td>What did you discuss?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What did you like and dislike about working with the students?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Did anything surprise you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you see yourself helping to prepare teachers of urban Indigenous children in</td>
<td>How?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the future?</td>
<td>Should the community have a role in university work? If so, what and why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you think the teacher candidates learned about teaching Indigenous</td>
<td>How can non-Indigenous teachers support urban Indigenous children?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>children?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss some pros and cons to having Loyola students at the Kateri Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there anything else you would like to discuss?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All Indigenous community partners were invited to engage in focus groups, with a total of five community partners in initial and final discussions (Merriam, 2009). Each focus group spanned approximately two-hours and some community partners only partook in one focus group session. The initial focus group included Doreen, Ann, Leah, Joanie, and Paul; the final focus group included Doreen, Leah, George, Joanie, and Joe. George’s absence from the initial focus group occurred because he chose to participate in the study after observing other community partners being paired with candidates; he then collaborated with Leah to support two TLLSC candidates. Joe’s absence from the initial focus group was due to a family emergency, and thus was replaced by a one-on-one interview. Ann chose not to serve as a mentor to TLLSC candidates and to partake only in the initial focus group discussion; she wanted to share her ideas around urban Indigenous education, but was not comfortable interacting directly with candidates—so she did not partake in the final focus group. Paul had prior commitments during the final focus group discussion and elected not to partake in an interview. Table 1 above depicts the participation of each community partner.

**Observations.** With understanding the case and the impact of the partnership on the community organization as my primary goal, my secondary data source was direct interpretation of social interactions (Stake, 1995) between community partners, candidates, and university faculty during module experiences at Kateri. These observations focused on how Indigenous community partners’ interactions with candidates and university faculty impacted Kateri and its members. Taking an observer as participant researcher (Merriam, 2009) as my only role while collecting data in this study, I observed module experiences held at Kateri including interactions between
Kateri community members and candidates, community member discussions regarding their involvement with TLLSC, and any other occurrences related to the partnership or community members’ experiences with the partnership. Observing is a common way of gaining knowledge in Indigenous cultures (Cajete, 2005); watching, listening, and reflecting upon the experiences to collect data in this study aligned with the traditional values and methods of sharing information in Indigenous contexts. Prior to data collection, I intended to employ observation as a main data source, but due to the minimal time candidates spent at Kateri observations were limited and used as a secondary data source.

Based on my observations, I recorded the experiences of Indigenous community partners through note taking after observed activities to “provide a relatively incontestable description for further analysis and ultimate reporting” (Stake, 1995, p. 62). My time observing in the field was the full length of module sessions held at Kateri, and an additional one to two hours spent at Kateri before and after each session. I arranged a quiet, private workspace at Kateri where I recorded my observations immediately following the activities while they were still fresh in my memory. Writing detailed notes after the observations instead of during ensured that I was wholly present during Kateri-TLLSC interactions and able to interpret the impact of the activities on the Kateri community without missing important occurrences. Some brief notes were taken during observations to remember key details or individual participant experiences for later analysis. The information gained from the observations guided the questions posed during the final focus group discussion as well as which participants were most informative during the final focus group (Merriam, 2009).
**Interviews.** In addition to the focus groups and observations, I invited all participants to engage in one-on-one interviews. Joe elected to partake in an interview prior to interacting with TLLSC candidates due to his absence from the initial focus group. In my interview with Joe, I used the same semi-structured interview questions used in the initial focus group discussion (see Table 1) to gain a deeper understanding of his perceptions of the Kateri-TLLSC partnership and urban Indigenous education. The questions were open ended to encourage descriptive responses (Merriam, 2009) regarding his experiences and ideas around the Kateri-TLLSC partnership. The protocol was drawn from Patton’s (2002) six types of interview questions with particular attention to opinion and values questions and feeling questions to gain information about community partner beliefs and opinions around collaborative, field-based teacher preparation for urban Indigenous children and how they feel the partnership with TLLSC impacted them as individuals and the Kateri community.

I offered to conduct interviews after each focus group discussion to gain more specific information from community partners who had either a great deal to share in focus groups and had more to say, who may have been hesitant to express their thoughts in the group setting, or who chose not to engage in focus groups. Community partners were invited to partake in a one-on-one interview and were informed that participation was strictly voluntary and they held the right to refuse or withdraw at anytime without consequence. As stated above, Joe was the only community partner to partake in an interview. My interview with Joe was conducted at Kateri and was approximately one hour in length. With Joe’s consent, I audio recorded the interview for transcription and analysis. I informed all community partners that if they wished not to be recorded, I
would take detailed notes during and after the interview for later analysis, but community partners consented to audio-recording. Table 4 lists the interview questions used with Joe prior to the start of the TLLSC sequence.

Table 4

*Interview Questions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guiding Questions</th>
<th>Sub Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will you share your thoughts on teaching urban Indigenous students?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you think teachers should know about Indigenous cultures for children to have good school experiences?</td>
<td>How can non-Indigenous teachers support urban Indigenous children?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should Indigenous people be involved in supporting non-Indigenous teachers?</td>
<td>How? How do you view yourself in helping teacher candidates? What can you teach them?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will you share your thoughts about working with the Loyola graduate students/faculty</td>
<td>How may it impact you? How may it impact Kateri? (events, activities, luncheons, services) Are there parts of the partnership you like? Don’t like? Does anything surprise you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you think/how do you feel about having Loyola Graduate students/faculty come to Kateri?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there anything else you would like to discuss?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Analysis**

To analyze the focus group and interview data, I audio recorded all sessions with a digital voice recorder and transcribed the recordings verbatim using ExpressScribe software. Transcribing the focus groups and interviews myself allowed me to become intimately familiar with my data during the analysis process (Merriam, 2009, p. 110). I uploaded the transcriptions and observational notes to Dedoose, a web based qualitative research data analysis software, to explore the data and discern findings relevant to my
research questions. I analyzed the data through an open coding method, allowing for an emergence of results instead of limiting my findings to predetermined categories influenced by my own biases and preconceptions (Hartmann & Gone, 2012).

Using conventional content analysis (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005), my coding was an iterative process where I read and reread the transcripts to make meaning from participant ideas and began sorting information in broad categories related to my research questions. Reading word by word, I developed codes using community partners’ exact words to capture their key thoughts and ideas. During this, I determined which codes represented more than one key thought and aggregated the data in emerging categories. This categorical aggregation allowed me to organize participants’ experiences as they related to my research questions (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005; Stake, 1995). I also made direct interpretations of individual instances that were important to the focus of this dissertation study (Stake, 1995), knowing that in case study a central occurrence relative to my findings may have only happened once (Stake, 1995). Repeatedly examining the data, reading the transcripts again and again to find patterns and meanings, I used Dedoose to narrow the categories and individual instances into more specific themes using multiple descriptors to connect findings with research questions (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005; Merriam, 2009). In this, I created definitions for each category, subcategory, and code, using direct quotes to define codes as they answered each research question. Table 5 depicts the coding scheme for data analysis.
Research Question One: *What aspects of Indigenous cultures do Kateri community partners believe teachers should understand to serve urban Indigenous children?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>Direct Quote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Knowledge and skills for teaching urban Indigenous children | Storytelling            | “I think for them there could be more work and cultivation regarding really preparing them about what storytelling is” (Joanie, Final Focus Group, June 10, 2014)
|                                               | Language               | “I thought it was important we talk about language because language is an important part of growing up and who you are and identity and I spent some time talking about language with them (Doreen, Final Focus Group, June 10, 2014).” |
|                                               | History (Three generations of school) | “I think the one thing they need to know is not in great detail, but they need to at least know a little bit of our history and culture.” (Joe, Interview, May 28, 2014) |
|                                               | Special ways of being | “I want (the teachers) to know that my children are Native and they have a special way of learning” (Doreen, Initial Focus Group, May 20, 2014) |
|                                               | Different Tribes       | “there's so many of us in the city and we come from different tribes and Nations…” (Joe, Interview, May 28, 2014) |
|                                               | Resources              | “There were a handful of teachers that would say where can we get resources? Where can we get people to come talk? Where?” (Doreen, Initial Focus Group, May 20, 2014) |
Research Question Two: *How do Kateri community partners view their role in preparing teachers to meet the needs of urban Indigenous children?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>Direct Quote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active role in preparing teachers</td>
<td>Experiences with Native peoples</td>
<td>“We enter their space, it’s a classroom four walls you know. Let them come walk into our homes and let them see what’s on the walls.” (Doreen, Initial Focus Group, May 20, 2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development</td>
<td></td>
<td>“If there was a professional development day, (the CPS T7 director could) invite each teacher with a T7 kid (to) come and maybe have lunch at one of the centers or just come and see our faces and ask questions” (Joanie, Initial Focus Group, May 20, 2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
<td>“There can be no healing… without community… community for survival and culture for survival” (George, Final Focus Group, June 10, 2014).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question Three: *How does the involvement of teacher candidates in an urban Indigenous community based organization impact the community partners and their experiences?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>Direct Quote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potential for Impact</td>
<td>We get to learn from them</td>
<td>“I would say a positive thing about them spending time with us is we get to learn as well.” (Joe, Interview, May 28, 2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Depth of experiences</td>
<td>“It’s not enough time for them. They need more time to learn.” (Doreen, Final Focus Group, June 10, 2014)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hsieh and Shannon (2005) recommended that the theoretical framework be used to guide the study’s conclusions and implications. I employed IPT (Batiste, 2000) as a critical lens when drawing conclusions and determining implications of my findings. I followed Battiste’s (2000) principles to examine the Kateri-TLLSC partnership’s efforts toward postcolonialism; throughout this study, I asked if the Kateri-TLLSC partnership (a) acknowledged the historical and current oppression present in Indigenous communities, (b) recognized the need to decolonize the educational system to develop a postcolonial state, (c) endeavored to heal prior traumas, and (d) respected the assets Indigenous communities possess (Batiste, 2000). Each conclusion section in the final
chapter of this study ended with a discussion of the findings as they related to IPT, and the framework was woven throughout the implications of this study. Using IPT provided a strong lens for how the Kateri-TLLSC partnership addressed the particular needs of an urban Indigenous community organization working to enact positive change in their children’s educational experiences.

**Validity.** To develop a safe environment for community partners, candidates, and university faculty to co-construct knowledge and learn from each other’s experiences, I utilized research methods that minimized positions of power (Rickstock & Pennel, 1996) and equally valued community partner voices. Using my theoretical framework to drive the study’s design and implementation, I considered the tumultuous history between Indigenous communities and Anglo-American research institutions where researchers have harmed Indigenous communities and misrepresented information about Indigenous cultures (Deloria, 1991; Sobeck et al., 2008). Responding to negative experiences with Indigenous research, this study was sensitive to the needs and cultures of the participating Indigenous community organization and its members (Hartmann & Gone, 2012; Sobeck et al., 2008) and the data collection and analysis plan triangulated the findings through multiple data sources described above and member checking, thus ensuring validity and reliability (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005; Merriam, 2009).

**Member checking.** To begin this study, I presented my research proposal to Kateri leadership and gained feedback regarding the content and design of the proposal. During data analysis to uphold the principles of my theoretical framework, I provided opportunities for all participants to share their teaching and learning experiences. I continued this approach in the iterative interpretation of the findings; I shared the results
with community partners and allowed opportunities for feedback regarding their impressions of the findings. This was primarily done informally at community gatherings, with a final presentation to the Kateri community prior to my defense of this dissertation study. This member checking ensured that my data was an accurate representation of participants’ experiences (Merriam, 2009). I transparently shared the data and my initial conclusions with community partners and considered their experiences in relation to data interpretation. I will share the conclusions drawn from this study with the greater Indigenous Chicago community at the Chicago Title VII’s annual Achievement Celebration in June 2015, where Indigenous community members share their work supporting Indigenous education and efforts of self-determination, in an effort to move beyond research on the community towards researching with the community.

**Positionality.** All participants knew my role as researcher, and any activity in sequence events was secondary to my observations (Merriam, 2009). I wrote my field notes immediately following my observations and analyzed the notes using conventional content analysis “a research method for the subjective interpretation of the content of text data through the systematic classification process of coding and identifying themes or patterns” (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005, p. 1278). This method of data collection was appropriate for gaining an understanding of the impact of the partnership on community members, as little research existed around this topic (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005). My approach was noninvasive to the daily routine of the partnership and did not interfere with the development of stakeholder roles in their community of learners (Rogoff, 1994).
Procedures. I invited community members to participate in the research study prior to the beginning of the TLLSC sequence. Kateri community members with an interest in sharing their experiences and understandings of urban Indigenous cultures with mainly non-Indigenous candidates were invited at community gatherings including Sunday service community event announcements, Friday taco sales, and senior luncheons. I posted written invitations at Kateri with my contact information for those interested in participating. Both verbal and written invitations informed community members about the nature of the research, their role in the study, the partnership with TLLSC and involvement with candidates, my role as a researcher, and the anticipated length of focus groups if they chose to participate. I informed community partners of any potential risks involved in participation such as sharing personal stories around being Indigenous in an urban, non-Indigenous community and past school experiences; as well as possible benefits including impacting candidates’ positive beliefs around teaching diverse children.

Research Design Strengths and Limitations

As with all research designs, my methodology had strengths unique to the context of the study that also limited aspects of the study’s integrity. My methodology and sources of data collection emphasized cultural congruency between the university structures and Indigenous knowledge sources. Through case study research, I had the advantage of gaining an in-depth understanding of the community partners’ experiences with the Kateri-TLLSC partnership, which was essential to advance the interests of the Kateri community and work to overcome past traumas associated with education and research (Battiste, 2000; Deloria, 1991).
To investigate my research questions, I chose data collection techniques that were suitable to the case both methodologically and culturally. Using observations as a data source adhered to Stake’s (1995) guidelines for case study research. Observing and listening to gain information and understandings also aligned with traditional methods of sharing knowledge across Indigenous cultures (Cajete, 2005). Focus groups are a respected source of data collection in qualitative research (Merriam, 2009) and also aligned with Indigenous talking circles. The community partners’ familiarity with talking circles to share ideas, experiences, and struggles provided a space to learn about their experiences collaborating with university faculty to prepare candidates to serve Indigenous children (Sobeck et al., 2008). I designed the data collection to value the cultures of the community partners and to emphasize their experiences as the focus of this study, while also drawing from valid and reliable qualitative research methods.

**Limitations**

With this case study design, I examined the unique experiences of seven community partners in a particular context, the Kateri-TLLSC partnership. I did not design this study intending to disseminate findings that generalized to greater populations, or even other partnerships within TLLSC. The process of discovery in this study shed light on other areas of investigation within the TLLSC program, but the findings in no way drew conclusions related to other areas of teacher preparation. Another limitation in this design was the length of the study. Gaining an understanding of the sustainability of the partnership would necessitate researching the repeated implementation of TLLSC modules at Kateri. This study did not examine the possibility of longevity; it only examined the initial implementation of a single TLLSC module,
which was a novel experience for community partners. I recommend continued investigation of the Kateri-TLLSC partnership, as well as other partnerships within TLLSC to ensure mutuality and sustainability is present in efforts of collaborative, field-based teacher preparation.

**Researcher Role**

My role as an insider with Kateri influenced the inquiry process of this study. As an Odawa descendant and active member of the Kateri community, I was ever conscious of historical wrongdoings through research in Indigenous communities and the ongoing trauma that resulted from these poorly designed studies (Deloria, 1991). I worked to design a study that respected Indigenous cultures and protected Indigenous community partners by utilizing culturally congruent research methods and employing IPT (Battiste, 2000) as a constant lens of mutuality within the partnership and power structures between Kateri and TLLSC. With IPT, I examined how the Kateri-TLLSC partnership advanced self-determination through self-education in an effort to attain a postcolonial state.

In addition to my involvement with Kateri, I also worked as a graduate assistant and part-time faculty member with TLLSC. As described in Chapter I, I assisted in the design of TLLSC and have taught multiple modules in the undergraduate early childhood special education program and graduate program. I encouraged Kateri leaders to host modules in an effort to improve urban Indigenous education through collaborative, field-based teacher preparation. I also acted as a liaison between Kateri and TLLSC to facilitate module experiences for TLLSC graduate level candidates, who completed the module depicted in this study. I used my insight of Kateri and TLLSC to design this
study in a way that accounted for the uniqueness of each organization and intended to benefit all stakeholders.

Conclusion

The collaborative, field-based model for teacher preparation increased the already complex nature of an urban Indigenous community organization and non-Indigenous university partnership. I designed the research methods depicted above and theoretical framework described in chapter two to account for this complexity and address the sensitive nature of Indigenous research, particularly with non-Indigenous organizations. In the following chapter, I share the findings of this study in relation to each research question with IPT as a lens for mutuality in the Kateri-TLLSC partnership.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Outcomes of a Collaborative, Field-Based Teacher Preparation Experience as Depicted by Urban Indigenous Community Partners

In this chapter, I answer the research questions that guided this dissertation study (a) What aspects of Indigenous cultures do Kateri community partners believe teachers should understand to serve urban Indigenous children?, (b) How do Kateri community partners view their role in preparing teachers to meet the needs of urban Indigenous children?, and (c) How does the involvement of teacher candidates in an urban Indigenous community based organization impact the community partners and their experiences? I used conventional content analysis to make sense of the St. Kateri Center of Chicago (Kateri) community partners’ beliefs around preparing teachers to meet the needs of urban Indigenous children. As described in the previous chapter, the themes identified for each research question derived primarily from the exact words used by community partners during focus group discussions, observations, and interviews. By maintaining the community partners’ language, I endeavored to represent their beliefs and experiences in field-based teacher preparation as they related to each of the research questions to the fullest extent possible. The subsequent sections depict the findings of each research question and conclude with connections to the literature.
Six Facets of Teacher Understandings for Urban Indigenous Education

In this section, I answer the first research question: What aspects of Indigenous cultures do Kateri community partners believe teachers should understand to serve urban Indigenous children? The following themes represent what community partners identified as necessary knowledge and skills for teaching urban Indigenous children: (a) storytelling, (b) language, (c) history, (d) special ways of being, (e) different tribes, and (f) resources. In the subsections that follow, I address each theme individually and conclude this section with the interrelatedness of these themes, grounded in the literature.

Storytelling

Telling stories as a way of sharing information has emerged as a common approach to teaching and learning across tribes (Cajete, 1994). Elder community partners regularly told stories during their time with candidates, in discussions with other community members, and during our formal data collection to share their beliefs and experiences around urban Indigenous education. The use of storytelling as a method of teaching and learning was unique to candidates’ interactions with elders, as the young adults engaged with candidates using the dominant culture’s communication methods. During our final focus group, I asked community partners to discuss the candidates’ competency in deciphering messages of stories told to them by elders; both elder and young adults agreed that candidates may not have received important messages told to them through stories. They conveyed the importance of preparing teachers to decipher information told through stories, believing that most teachers are not prepared or competent in this type of communication.
During interactions with elders, candidates often appeared oblivious to the teachings embedded in stories. I observed an exchange between two candidates and two elders, Leah and George, where George shared a story about the “discovery” of Indigenous medicines by Anglo settlers and during a pause in his speaking the candidates requested, “Can we start asking our questions now?” (Observation Two, June 5, 2014), indicating that they would not gain the information they needed for the asset mapping project by listening to stories. Another elder, Doreen, shared that she also told stories to the candidates whom she mentored. Doreen explained,

I told them a story about a student that came to me and not even considering respect (he) just expected…to unpeel me so I said OK, you know what? I'm going to let you do it to me because I'm going to teach you a lesson. So that's what I did. I taught him a lesson. So I told them the story about this young man that (disrespected) me, and they listened. I told them little stories like that. (Final Focus Group, June 10, 2014)

The story Doreen shared held teachings about appropriate ways to engage with Indigenous peoples, particularly elders, but she was not certain that the candidates received her message. I raised the question of whether or not the meanings of these stories were lost on candidates, or if they understood that teaching occurred through storytelling and Joanie, a young adult community partner, responded that teachers need preparation to make sense of Indigenous ways of passing on knowledge through storytelling.

Anna: I wondered how the candidates made sense of the stories… if they understood that the stories you were telling had important information.
Joanie: You're asking a question that's not just one dimensional it's three. Because we're assuming that the lessons that we're sharing…that they can comprehend them, but we comprehend them because we connect with our people and we know that stories are set up to teach us how to go through our journeys our path, but if we don't preface that to them like a hint….this is the set up, then I think for them there could be more work and cultivation regarding really preparing them about what storytelling is. (Final Focus Group, June 10, 2014)

Through this dialogue, Joanie made clear that storytelling, as a form of teaching, was unique to Indigenous peoples and that candidates needed preparation to make sense of important information that Indigenous peoples, particularly elders, delivered through stories. Joanie suggested systematically preparing candidates to decipher the messages of stories, similar to the methods used to prepare students for reading comprehension tasks, because unlike Indigenous peoples, non-Indigenous teachers did not naturally connect with parents and grandparents of Indigenous children—resulting in possible misunderstandings.

In addition to community partners discussing the importance of candidates becoming aware of storytelling as a form of teaching, they also used storytelling in every aspect of their involvement in this study. Storytelling was seen as a distinct facet of Indigenous cultures that candidates must become competent in, but it was also woven through other themes, as community partners' beliefs and experiences with urban Indigenous education were repeatedly delivered through stories. In the subsequent sections, I depict each theme through my analysis of focus group and interview
discussions, observations, and community partners’ stories told during our time together in this study.

**Language**

Community partners declared awareness and acceptance of Indigenous languages as an essential understanding for teachers of Indigenous children. Community partners believed that teachers’ continual rejection of Indigenous languages in schools has resulted in generations of misunderstandings and poor school experiences for Indigenous children. They shared beliefs of language as a vital component of Indigenous cultures that teachers, schools, and governments have worked to eliminate. A conversation from our initial focus group clearly represented this conviction,

*Ann:* What do you think was the most successful thing they (the government) did in your time or my time?

*Anna:* For who?

*Ann:* For the teachers.

*Paul:* Kill the Indian save the man.

*Ann:* The language.

*Paul:* No matter what they did as long as they did something around cultural shame they succeeded because that's what the…government wanted.

*Ann:* And it was successful.

*Paul:* Yeah it was successful, cultural genocide.

*Doreen:* Do you think our teachers are still stuck in that mentality?

*Paul:* Oh yes. (Initial Focus Group, May 20, 2014)
Community partners directly indicated that government efforts to eliminate Indigenous languages benefited teachers working to assimilate Indigenous children into the dominant culture. With this belief affirmed, the community partners shared experiences of teachers’ negative responses to children’s use of Anishinaabemowin in the classroom. Ann discussed her own school experiences of teachers telling her to speak English at home and her confusion when her mother protested that demand,

    I said, ‘we're supposed to be speaking English here at home’. And she said, ‘no, you don't speak English’. I'm stunned you know I'm trying to follow this. I'm very stunned. And (my mother says), ‘you tell your teacher she should learn Ojibway’.

(Initial Focus Group, May 20, 2014)

Ann indicated pride in her mother’s determination to protect their language and culture, and also the difficulty she experienced as a child navigating the contrasting expectations of school and home. Doreen and Ann expanded on their experiences in an English-only classroom by describing how their teachers favored English-speaking children,

    Doreen: I was so happy that some of (the) students we went to school with, our peers, some of them were able to get it, get it, get it good.

    Ann: And they responded (to the teacher in English) and the teacher would (be pleased).

    Doreen: Right.

    Ann: Those are the people that had a parent that speaks good English.

Community partners discussed historical experiences of language oppression as common understandings, but they also disclosed present day incidents of teachers’
reprimanding Indigenous children for speaking Anishinaabemowin. Doreen provided an example through a story told by her grandson,

He tells me Grandma you know what? That language Ojibway you speak? They don't speak that in school. Uh uh he says nooo, they speak Spanish in school and English. They don't know what ambe means he tells me, ‘let's go’...the teacher don't know. And the teacher says no, they don't want to hear it. (Initial Focus Group, May 20, 2014)

Doreen added that her grandson’s experience was not an isolated incident by sharing another story of a teacher forbidding a child from speaking Anishinaabemowin in school. She said, “I know for a fact one of our little nieces wrote a story and she had a word, an Ojibway word in it because she knows how to write some of it and the teacher said ‘English-only please!’ ” (Initial Focus Group, May 20, 2014).

Community partners were less accepting of accounts depicting current instances of language oppression than they were of historical conditions. They believed that teachers should be prepared to embrace diversity in classrooms and that policies should be in place that prevent such mistreatment. Ann declared that Indigenous languages should be accepted as equivalent to other foreign languages, she stated, “We should know at this time (that) people should know more than one language. It's a standard now” (Initial Focus Group, May 20, 2014). Joanie expressed her astonishment in hearing that present day teaching practices still hindered children from speaking Indigenous languages, she asked, “Can you tell a student not to speak their own language in their classroom? I'm wondering if that’s a human rights violation?” (Initial Focus Group, May 20, 2014).
In this discussion, community partners moved beyond their dismay at the struggles Indigenous children must endure to gain an education and suggested ideas for improvement through aspects of multiculturalism and language instruction that schools are accustomed to. Joanie declared,

If a child was to speak Polish or any other language I'm sure it would be encouraged for communication purposes and the learning environment you know? Maybe they could set aside a time for each child to teach each other a word or a sentence in their language to foster that education and to have that teachable moment. (Initial Focus Group, May 20, 2014)

Community partners supported this prospect of teachers becoming proficient in embracing language diversity, and they believed that sharing the importance of Indigenous languages with candidates could make a difference. Doreen discussed how she explained this to the candidates, “I thought it was important we talk about language because language is an important part of growing up and who you are and identity and I spent some time talking about language with them” (Final Focus Group, June 10, 2014).

Community partners were committed to teachers holding responsibility for understanding the cultural needs of Indigenous children and were willing to support their efforts, but they also understood the complexity of such an endeavor. Joanie and Paul signified this by saying,

*Joanie:* We're fighting for language and culture all those things you can't put a price tag on and if our teachers aren't educated in it, how can they even wrap their brains around the topic?

*Paul:* That is very true.
Joanie: You can't standardize culture, that's the problem that's why it's a wild
card. (Initial Focus Group, May 20, 2014)

The discussions around negative school experiences with Indigenous languages and the
importance of preparing culturally competent teachers concluded positively with a small
success, and hope for a better future. Doreen disclosed that the director of the Chicago
Public Schools (CPS) Title VII Indian Education Grant program (T7) persuaded
administration at a CPS world languages school to include a flag inscribed with Boozhoo,
an Anishinaabemowin word for hello, in the hallway that displayed flags with the native
language greetings from students’ countries of origin. She expressed satisfaction in
saying “(The T7 director) worked really hard (and) we finally got Boozhoo on there. We
finally got our language too” (Initial Focus Group, May 20, 2014). Although Ann
illustrated the complexity of this success by declaring that Aanii is the preferred greeting
and should have been used in place of Boozhoo, community partners displayed optimism
in the potential for an improved future while discussing the difficulties of urban
Indigenous education. While their beliefs of essential understandings for teachers of
Indigenous children remained unwavering, they acted as agents of support for candidates
and teachers willing to take on the challenge.

History

In the previous subsection, I alluded to historical implications on present day
practices of multilingual education; however, the community partners overtly expressed
the importance of teachers’ demonstrating an awareness of Indigenous histories to better
serve today’s urban Indigenous children. When asked what teachers should know to serve
urban Indigenous children Joe responded:
I think the one thing they need to know is not in great detail, but they need to at least know a little bit of our history and culture. You know not in great detail, but just some generic stuff. Because again there's so many of us in the city and we come from different tribes and nations and what have you, so it's going to be hard to really get a concise history for everybody, but I think a brief history (is important). (Interview, May 28, 2014)

Joe believed that an awareness of Indigenous history was essential for teachers, even if the topic was complex. Leah had a similar response to the same question, she said, “Teachers should be taught some of the Indian history, I think. Not just Columbus. Columbus was an evil man” (Initial Focus Group, May 20, 2014). Leah conveyed the importance of teachers of Indigenous children becoming familiar with Indigenous histories and also her dissatisfaction with the current curriculum. Adding to the discussion of teacher’s awareness of Indigenous histories, Doreen depicted her own experiences as an Indigenous parent whose children attended CPS. She made clear that familiarity with Indigenous histories correlated to success in serving Indigenous children, stating,

It's really hard to educate the teachers. But there were some teachers that were very good. There were some teachers that had some knowledge of Native history you know and they were sensitive, so there was a handful, (but) there was a few that were very blind to the history, of Native history. (Initial Focus Group, May 20, 2014)
In this study, community partners depicted the significance of Indigenous history in serving Indigenous children, but disclosed much of the topic of history as an essential understanding through accounts of poor school experiences spanning generations.

**Three generations of school.** Indigenous peoples’ negative school experiences have circulated across generations. In this study, community partners explicitly addressed three generations of shared school experiences, many of which were detrimental to students’ success. During our initial focus group, Leah detailed her own negative school experiences of racism and violence. She explained,

The parents were very prejudiced and they taught their children to be the same way. And we used to have fights, Indians and whites and us Indians always won. Oh my God, we got in so many battles. I know I knocked a girl’s teeth out, they always started throwing stones and we threw them right back and that’s what we were aiming for, to hit somebody, so mine ended up in someone’s mouth. (Initial Focus Group, May 20, 2014)

I asked Leah, “Do you think your son’s school experience was different than yours?” She responded, “No” (Initial Focus Group, May 20, 2014). Doreen confirmed the notion that Indigenous children endured the same racism and inadequate education in today’s public schools as they did generations ago; in a vivid account, she described her eldest child beginning school in a classroom upholding Indigenous stereotypes and her daughter and grandson enduring offensive curriculum teachings. She shared,

I think back in 1979 when my son started school… and I experienced racism in the classroom. I…take my son to school, so when I get there I am kind of worried because my son is just his second day starting… So I walk in there and I'm telling
the teacher that my son... doesn't know how to say the pledge of allegiance yet and she goes “oh don't worry don't worry he'll know eventually”. And tying his shoes, he's not good at tying his shoes yet you know? And I was just going to tell her he's a Native child and so I feel that there's better ways where you could teach him, and before that comes out of my mouth she yells in the classroom at her children she goes “Will you guys stop being a bunch of wild Indians?!?” And I just like (gasp) I said uh oh and then I go and let it go. And when I was walking home I thought I'm not going to ever let that happen to me again.... Then my daughter also experienced (the same thing) when she started and… my daughter and son have a big age difference ya know, that's a 13 year difference between the two of them... she learned about Columbus and she got mad at me when she learned about Columbus that I was part of Columbus you know saying that you wear jewelry mom, you wear gold, you use spices, you're part of Columbus. And did I hear it again? Guess what? My grandson now, he goes to school and he learned about Columbus and he's in prekindergarten and he learned about Columbus. And he tells me Grandma, there's a man that's really important that's being celebrated today. He's more important than God he tells me. And I say really, who could this be? So he tells me it's Christopher Columbus, he found us. He found us and named us. So that's what he learned at school mmmmm. So look at that, three generations of school. (Initial Focus Group, May 20, 2014)

Ann reiterated this lack of change in school experiences across generations. In her accounts, she discussed teachers’ consistent use of stereotypes when teaching her children. In depicting a first day of school for her youngest son, we conversed,
Ann: I said (to the teacher), you know this is (my son) and he's Native American Indian. (The teacher said) Ohh oh wow that's great, therefore he should know how to sit Indian style… (laughing) and he cannot sit Indian style!

Anna: And that was your fourth child?

Ann: Yeah…and Oh my God, I’m supposed to know by now.

Paul: Yeah four generations of Native children and they aren't doing any better.

That's trouble. (Initial Focus Group, May 20, 2014)

Discussions moved beyond the topic of transgressions on the part of schools and teachers and identified the importance of teachers recognizing the historical patterns of inadequate education to better serve Indigenous children. Referring to her time spent with candidates during this study, Doreen explicitly stated, “I did talk about the generations a little bit, about my time of education and then today's education” (Final Focus Group, June 10, 2014). The community partners agreed that candidates might learn about Indigenous histories and improve methods of teaching today’s urban Indigenous children. Doreen concluded this topic by setting a path forward, one where Indigenous peoples take a role in leading efforts of change in school curriculum and instruction to improve Indigenous education. She discussed the status quo of teachers using outdated materials that misrepresent Indigenous histories, thinking about how to resolve this problem she declared,

Those teachers are going to start again, they're going to have new kids another generation and they're going to learn from the same books again. The same books…And we all learn on Columbus Day that we were found by Columbus and
it's all about that…they just talk about the past…We could rewrite our stories.

(Initial Focus Group, May 20, 2014)

Community partners depicted trans generational trauma around Indigenous school experiences and then put forth recommendations to end the cycle through efforts of self-determination; they demonstrated hopefulness in improved teacher competency with community support.

**Special Ways of Being**

Community partners referenced special ways of being as traditional ways of teaching and learning across Indigenous cultures. While methods vary tribe-by-tribe, as described in detail in Chapter II, community partners shared Anishinaabe lineage and understood teaching and learning as experiences taking place in real-life contexts where children watch, listen, and reflect upon the actions of elders to develop new understandings. The belief that Indigenous children have special ways of knowing, learning, and being emerged throughout the data. Community partners agreed upon the difficulty to make this concrete but emphasized the importance for teachers to become familiar with special ways of being. Doreen made this clear in discussing her experiences engaging with CPS teachers as an Indigenous parent,

> It was really important for me to share that I was Native and I want (the teachers) to know that my children are Native and they have a special way of learning, I believe. For me I believed my children had a special way of learning. They need to see it and feel it you know? (Initial Focus Group, May 20, 2014)

She believed in the importance for teachers to understand her child’s needs; by saying, “they need to see it and feel it” Doreen referenced her tribe’s tradition of teaching and
learning through real-life, hands-on experiences. Doreen continued to depict a disconnect between school and home cultures that challenged students in their overall school experiences even when teachers, parents, and children shared goals for success. Describing a situation where the classroom teacher regarded her daughter as unsuccessful when she and her daughter endeavored to reach classroom expectations Doreen stated,

And how many times did they say your child is not participating in class? Your child is just quiet, too quiet. So I ask my daughter what's going on why are you so quiet? Why are you not participating in class? I know you're a smart little girl. And she goes Mom the teacher said if you behave yourself, and you're good, and pay attention you'll get a star. So she was trying to get the star. So I told the teacher this is why she's not participating because you have this system and she wants to get a star and she has not received one. (Initial Focus Group, May 20, 2014)

Doreen’s story illuminated the difference of expectations for participation and reward systems between the dominant culture of public school classrooms and her Indigenous home culture where adults encouraged children to observe and reflect upon their experiences. Paul and Ann reiterated the common Indigenous approach of sharing information and knowledges through observations embedded in real-life experiences as different than the approaches they experienced in school settings:

Ann: That's how it goes in the family. We were always around our mother's measurements; she's not saying to you this is how you do it.

Paul: You watch. (Initial Focus Group, May 20, 2014)
Community partners consistently reiterated the importance of teachers becoming familiar with Indigenous ways, while making clear that their interactions with teachers have not exhibited progress or competency in areas of cultural understandings. Community partners instead shared experiences of teachers’ lacking awareness or value of Indigenous cultures. Joe explained his perception of children’s school experiences in CPS compared to his own upbringing on the reservation, explicating that the experiences of urban Indigenous children were vastly different from Indigenous children on reservation or in highly populated Indigenous regions. He asserted, “With the students that I've interacted with here, they're basically in a non Native setting and that's how they're being taught. Back home on the reservation, I was taught…in a Native way. Very circular instead of linear” (Interview, May 28, 2014).

Joe defined “Native” or “circular” ways of teaching as interrelated, contextual sets of teaching, always circling back to the Mother earth. Joe emphasized the different approaches to teaching that he has experienced and observed with Indigenous children in non-Indigenous school settings, his awareness of the different approaches to teaching stemmed from many years of reflection and discussions with his teachers to make sense of the difficulties he faced in his own educational journey and transition to a primarily non-Indigenous setting. In sharing a turning point in his school success, Joe stated:

So when they (the university) found out I was Native American then that changed the ball game completely because they had no real services to offer me at (my university). And that's where after a while we got into the discussion of teaching styles. Because there was this lecture and I'm not used to that. So my first
semester was difficult, but after a while and talking everything out I succeeded.

(Interview, May 28, 2014)

The community partners concurred that their school experiences and those of children in CPS shared similar challenges engaging with teachers unfamiliar with Indigenous cultures. Doreen expanded on the disconnect between schools and Indigenous cultures with a specific, reoccurring challenge of losing loved ones while school was in session. She explained common funeral ceremonial traditions and problems that occurred in schools for children and families grieving the death of a loved one,

One of the biggest issues we've talked about are children that are going to their family’s wakes and there's not enough time and the child comes back angry in school and doesn't understand…It's not how it was growing up, for us to mourn our families and to do this journey you know. Today we go, we travel, we leave the school and a lot of time the school doesn't allow you to leave more than one day and no way, the Native families are going (to the reservation) no matter what because the ceremonies are three to four day ceremonies, some even more. And then one year later you relive the whole thing, but you have depending on which tribe there's rituals and all kinds of things. And then the kids go back to school wounded and the families are wounded and the teachers don't know what to do.

(Initial Focus Group, May 20, 2014)

Community partners made clear that teachers must become familiar with Indigenous cultures to succeed in teaching Indigenous children. Ann summarized this in saying, “If you can't see a teacher that's enlightened you stop learning. If you see a teacher that's very enlightened…it's going to be good” (Initial Focus Group, May 20, 2014). However,
the group also acknowledged the complexity of this endeavor given the tribal diversity present in urban settings, which I discuss in the next section.

**Different Tribes**

Community partners noted tribal diversity as a topic necessary for teachers to understand and also a challenge facing teachers of urban Indigenous children. Community partners’ believed that meeting the needs of students from different tribes was unique to urban settings and difficult to address in public school classrooms. Joe explained this complexity in declaring, “there's so many of us in the city and we come from different tribes and nations and what have you, so it's going to be hard…for everybody” (Interview, May 28, 2014). Community partners concurred that awareness of different tribes proved challenging for teachers to address and expanded on the diversity of Indigenous peoples to include children with multitribal and multicultural backgrounds. Joe explained:

> As we're looking more and more at our students, the students that come through here more and more are mixed. I don't think there's any that aren't, they are all…mixed tribe for sure, but a majority of our students are mixed race. (Interview, May 28, 2014)

Community partners discussed tribal diversity as a difficult challenge to address in urban Indigenous education, and one where candidates needed extensive support. Community partners believed awareness of distinct tribal cultures centered on familiarity with Indigenous histories and spending time with Indigenous peoples. Doreen discussed the benefits of having candidates spend time at Kateri, she said “We have a partner come…and they’re going to learn Native history for the first time. I think this is a
wonderful program… Yes and then how many tribes are here? The diversity here itself can also be hard” (Initial Focus Group, May 20, 2014). Discussed later in this chapter, direct experiences with Indigenous peoples served as an important component of the community’s role in preparing teachers for the needs of urban Indigenous children, where community partners explicated on the complexity of understanding the cultures and needs of urban Indigenous children.

**Resources**

In addition to essential understandings for serving urban Indigenous students, community partners identified access to appropriate Indigenous curriculum resources as an obstacle for teachers working to teach lessons addressing Indigenous histories or cultures and effectively serve Indigenous communities. Community partners depicted experiences they had with teachers wanting access to Indigenous curriculum resources that the schools did not provide, rather community partners experienced teachers’ dissatisfaction with stereotypical activities provided in their school curricula. Doreen and Paul discussed a situation where a teacher accessed inappropriate materials for a lesson about Indigenous peoples around the Thanksgiving holiday. The teacher showed Doreen what the school provided for a lesson on Indigenous histories—stereotypical cut outs of “pilgrims and Indians” with buckle hats and feather headbands. Doreen and Paul detailed the interaction and how the Indigenous community was able to help that teacher gain appropriate materials. They said:

*Paul:* Aren't those (resources) pre-packaged though, like they stick them under your door or was it her choice to do it?
Doreen: Well it's a manual, we met with a teacher and she was flipping through her curriculum and she said this is what we have for Natives. It was cut outs and poetry and I'm trying to look at it and process it in my mind. And she wanted the resources; (she said) I want what you have so I can teach my kids.

Paul: See, curiosity.

Doreen: So, we were able to help that school. (Initial Focus Group, May 20, 2014)

Doreen continued to depict ways in which she helped teachers locate appropriate resources to meet the needs of Indigenous communities. In describing a workshop she provided to children and families focused on Anishinaabe culture and language, Doreen explained that in addition to families, teachers were also interested in gaining information,

There were a handful of teachers that would say where can we get resources? Where can we get people to come talk? Where? Where can I go? Where are the books? The poems? Anything they're asking. So I think that's one of our problems we have a lack of resources. (Initial Focus Group, May 20, 2014)

The community partners shared consensus that teachers needed appropriate resources to address Indigenous cultures in their teaching and that those resources were difficult to access. Joanie indicated this as she discussed challenges teachers’ face in serving Indigenous children and the role Indigenous community members can take in spreading cultural awareness. She asserted,

I think the bigger issue is the systemic issue as far as offering teachers resources, authentic Native people to work with and learn from. I don't know if there was ever a time that someone came and said I want to learn about Natives can I
volunteer two times a week would you turn them away? (Initial Focus Group, May 20, 2014)

Community partners consistently suggested direct collaboration and experiences with Indigenous peoples as an important aspect of teacher preparation. In relation to resources, Doreen expanded on the idea of learning directly from Indigenous community members and suggested a standard protocol to provide general information about Indigenous cultures to share with large numbers of people. Doreen discussed her work on a committee to develop protocols for hospitals treating Indigenous patients and in the excerpt below she discussed how that effort might transfer to school settings as a helpful resource,

Protocols (for) hospitals how to treat a Native person. That was a success, that was printed and it's supposed to be in every hospital… I know there's a few that use it. So we were asked, every year we go to the university to talk to the nurses about (Indigenous cultures). Every year (we) go. Maybe that's what we need for all of our teachers. Protocols right? (Initial Focus Group, May 20, 2014)

While community partners expressed support for access to Indigenous curriculum resources and believed they had a role in addressing that need, they expressed a level of skepticism in teachers’ genuineness of wanting to incorporate Indigenous cultures. Doreen declared,

I think when the teachers are concerned about our people is Native heritage month. That's when a flare goes off, oh how can we celebrate? What can we do? How can we get Native people here? You know? Oh let's go back to the old curriculum. Let's make these silly hats and walk around the school. Let's bring
some Native people here and let's honor them. Let's all make some feather hats again and we're going to honor these people when they come (in) October and November. We're Indian. Every month. Every day. You know? (Initial Focus Group, May 20, 2014)

Along with a critical lens of incorporating Indigenous cultures into classroom activities, community partners shared how a lack or misuse of resources has resulted in negative experiences for Indigenous students. Leah shared a story about a child she knew in CPS whose teacher led an activity where the children were told to “hit their hand over their mouth and pretend to be an Indian”. When the boy refused to participate, telling the teacher “Native people don’t do that,” he was dismissed to the hallway (Observation Two, June 5, 2014). Joanie and Paul reiterated the prevalence of inappropriate instruction around Indigenous cultures through their own experiences of making feather headbands and “Indian” cut-outs, explaining that when they were in school they “didn’t know any better” (Initial Focus Group, May 20, 2014). Community partners determined that a lack of resources presented difficulties for well-intended teachers serving Indigenous children and covering Indigenous histories in their teaching. While they were not naïve in believing that all teachers endeavored to improve their practices by gaining access to appropriate resources to advance urban Indigenous education, they accepted a responsibility to support those who did.

Discussion: Teacher Understandings

In this section, I depicted six facets of teaching that community partners identified as essential understandings for teachers of urban Indigenous children. However, segmenting these understandings as individual facets inaptly simplifies the complexity
involved in urban Indigenous education. Just as Indigenous peoples nurture their intellectual, spiritual, emotional, and physical selves as one being (Pewewardy, 1999), community partners depicted interrelated themes around teacher understandings: (a) storytelling, (b) language, (c) history, (d) special ways of being, (e) different tribes, and (f) resources. These recommended understandings were not individual components of teaching, but rather interrelated facets of culturally responsive curriculum and instructional methods. Community partners asserted six facets of teaching from their own lived experiences and world views that aligned with the extant literature specific to meeting the needs of urban Indigenous children. In this discussion sub-section, I connect the community partners’ beliefs around necessary teacher understandings for urban Indigenous education to the extant literature.

In Chapter II, I identified critical aspects of culturally responsive schooling (CRS) with Indigenous communities; these aspects were reflected in the community partners’ beliefs as related to what teachers of urban Indigenous children must understand to meet the needs of their students. Storytelling and language, as defined by the community partners, directly corresponded to the established research around oral storytelling as a traditional method of teaching and learning (Brayboy & Castagno, 2009; Cajete, 2005; Quigley, 2006) and bilingual education (McCarty, 2012; Oakes & Maday, 2009; Reyhner & Hurtado, 2008) as necessary tenets of CRS for Indigenous children. Community partners discussed both themes – storytelling and language as uniquely important in teaching Indigenous children because of the value they hold in Indigenous communities and cultures.
Community partners described the remaining four understandings using different terminology than extant literature, but the understandings were clearly aligned with the reviewed research. They expressed the importance of teachers becoming aware of Indigenous histories to better serve urban Indigenous children. This study was grounded in the U.S. government’s historical mistreatment of Indigenous children through public education as depicted by scholars (e.g., Adams, 1994; Battiste, 2000; Dehyle & Swisher, 1997) detailed in Chapter I and aligned with community partners’ beliefs that Indigenous histories held implications for present day teaching and curriculum practices. Community partners looked beyond teacher preparation and envisioned a better future for Indigenous communities and children through improved education. They discussed how engaging with universities, schools, teachers, and candidates may enact change in school curriculum and teaching methods. Battiste (2004) suggested that Indigenous peoples write their own histories to advance efforts of a postcolonial state, where Indigenous peoples are afforded the same opportunities as their non-Indigenous counterparts.

Community partners made similar recommendations around school curriculum and teacher professional development, with Doreen specifically stating “We could rewrite our stories” (Initial Focus Group, May 20, 2014). Rewriting Indigenous histories, developing curriculum resources, and facilitating field-based experiences with Indigenous communities all represented community partners advanced efforts of self-determination through self-education by claiming a space in teacher preparation.

Community partners also identified special ways of being as a necessary understanding for teachers of Indigenous children, which was aligned with the research around traditional methods of teaching and learning depicted in chapter two as three sub-
sections (a) oral storytelling (Brayboy & Castagno, 2009; Cajete, 2005; Quigley, 2006), (b) integrated learning (Cajete, 2005; Chavez et al., 2012; Pewewardy, 2002), and the (c) medicine wheel (Cajete, 2005; First Nations Curriculum Development Committee, 1992; Pewewardy, 1999). Community partners described each of these traditional methods of teaching and learning of Indigenous children as having special ways of being that teachers must address in their classroom practices.

Extant literature has acknowledged the complexity of tribal diversity, which community partners identified in the theme different tribes. Cajete (2005) specifically referenced the uniqueness of varying tribal cultures and the difficulties those differences present for teachers. Cajete worked to identify similar methods of teaching and learning that spanned tribes to provide a general framework for professionals working to improve Indigenous education through CRS. Community partners agreed that teachers should be familiar with tribal methods of teaching and learning, but rather than make assumptions that what they understand about serving a student from one tribe will transfer to a student from a different tribal nation they suggested that teachers place themselves in urban Indigenous community settings to become familiar with the distinct cultures of their Indigenous students.

Finally, community partners identified a lack of resources as a challenge teachers face in their efforts to better serve urban Indigenous children and improve the representation of Indigenous cultures in school curricula; community partners asserted that providing community support might assist teachers in overcoming that challenge. The extant literature concurred that limited resources account for one aspect of why teachers are unable to consistently uphold the tenets of CRS (Darling-Hammond, 2012).
Community partners regularly proposed a willingness to offer their time to support candidates and practicing teachers’ understanding of Indigenous communities through direct experiences with Indigenous peoples as a way to bridge school and community cultures. The community partners’ recommendations of increased contact with Indigenous communities to improve teaching practices aligned with the literature around community-school collaboration as a method to improve Indigenous education (Brayboy & Castagno, 2009; Cajete, 2005; Castagno & Brayboy, 2008; McCarty, 2012; Oakes & Maday, 2009; Quigley, 2006). Community partner beliefs in this section were aligned with current research, but community partners expected teachers to move beyond an awareness of these facets for serving urban Indigenous children and instead gain competency in these understandings through direct interactions with urban Indigenous peoples, which is discussed in the next section.

**Active Role in Preparing Teachers**

In this section, I answer the second research question: How do Kateri community partners view their role in preparing teachers to meet the needs of urban Indigenous children? The community partners indicated three themes in response to this question: (a) experiences with Native peoples, (b) professional development, and (c) community; through each of these themes, community partners depicted an active role for urban Indigenous community members. In the ensuing subsections, I address each of these themes and conclude with connections to the established literature.

**Experiences with Native Peoples**

Findings from the first research question indicated that community partners recognized the importance of direct experiences with Indigenous peoples for teachers to
acquire the knowledge needed to serve urban Indigenous children. In considering their role in teacher preparation, community partners believed they should hold an active role facilitating interactions between candidates and Indigenous peoples in a manner that provided candidates safe spaces to explore a community different from their own and gain what community partners identified as essential understandings for teachers of Indigenous children. Community partners expanded this commitment through suggestions of increased community responsibility for preparing teachers to meet the needs of urban Indigenous children through extended field-based teacher preparation.

Reflecting on her time mentoring two candidates, Joanie suggested that the field-based experience be extended to better support the candidates’ understandings of teaching urban Indigenous students while allowing them time to make meaning of their experiences. She stated:

I think the time needs to be spread out. It's too much for them... We expect them to take everything they think and know about Indians, change that in three hours (after an initial) presentation, then meet us, then talk about having our interview questions… it's almost a disservice to the kids (candidates)… It's like Indian 101 in 2 days. (Final Focus Group, June 10, 2014)

Doreen and Joe also signified a community responsibility for fostering candidates’ direct experiences with Indigenous peoples. In reflecting on the three sessions with candidates at Kateri, they believed the candidates needed to spend more time at Kateri to gain a genuine understanding of urban Indigenous communities. They dialogued:

Doreen: I think one of the things they need to see is there's a continuing story here.
Joe: I think what needs to be done is, especially if these are students that are going into the field of education, a two week initial course. Like this is wonderful, but something on going… This needs to be something that is on going. Not just we host them for four days or however long we hosted them and then here you are go out into the world. (Final Focus Group, June 10, 2014)

Community partners indicated sensitivity to the needs of candidates preparing to be effective multicultural educators and a willingness to give more of their own time to provide meaningful experiences in an Indigenous community setting. Community partners reflected on the field-based teacher preparation model and suggested that in addition to time spent in community organizations, candidates spend time in Indigenous homes to gain an awareness of what it means to be an urban Indigenous person. They believed that for candidates to become familiar with Indigenous lifestyles and equipped to serve Indigenous children in their future classrooms, they needed to engage with Indigenous peoples in authentic settings. By entering Indigenous homes, community partners believed candidates would gain a genuine understanding of Indigenous peoples and their cultures and therefore, better understand the needs of Indigenous children.

Community partners conversed,

*Doreen:* Somebody recently asked me if we can take people into our homes to show them. For instance teachers, bring them to our homes. Invite them to dinner. This is our home. This is how we live.

*Joanie:* Host a teacher night.

*Leah:* And show them what, Indian blankets?
Doreen: We could be Indians today. We could be ordering Chinese food… We could watch shows. It’s just like come on in and share this family. I would have loved one of (my daughter’s) teachers to come into our home and see truly how this child is in the home.

Joanie: That could be like the final maybe of the host(ing) series.

Leah: That sounds like a good idea.

Doreen: It’s like entering your space you know. We enter their space, it’s a classroom four walls you know. Let them come walk into our homes and let them see what’s on the walls. (Initial Focus Group, May 20, 2014)

Joanie’s involvement with two candidates reiterated her commitment to community members taking an active role in teacher preparation by demonstrating her willingness to offer her time and personal space to support candidates’ awareness and direct experiences with urban Indigenous communities. Beyond meeting with the candidates to complete an interview regarding Chicago’s Indigenous community’s needs and assets, she provided a guided tour of Indigenous community organizations throughout the city. Joanie arrived at Kateri early on the day of the interviews with doughnuts and juice for the candidates she was mentoring. She learned that her candidates were focusing their projects on urban Indigenous educational services and she responded by scheduling meetings with educational leaders at three Indigenous community organizations. Beyond acting as a guide, Joanie expressed concern about the candidates’ comfort level asking community partners difficult questions about Indigenous peoples and cultures, and emphasized the importance of creating a safe place for them to learn about Indigenous communities. She shared,
I found myself wanting to create a safe place for them from the get go, so I told them you won't insult me I've heard it all… I also think that you've got to get that foundation out. If they can speak about diversity you have to talk about commonalities. Because I'm not going to bond with you if I don't see you know, middle ground. So with that being said, I tried to do that at the beginning. You know feed them, bonding, that's not just specific to the Native community it's human. But then when it came to the Native information I think they were more willing and open because… they got to experience it themselves and they did good. (Final Focus Group, June 10, 2014)

Joanie also made recommendations for enhancing the field-based experience during the next implementation. Again, her recommendations required community partners to have a more active role in facilitating the candidates’ direct experiences with Indigenous peoples to foster learning through engagement with Indigenous communities. She suggested,

And maybe next time (take) ten minutes to have each of us introduce ourselves to let the students choose who they're going to migrate with. Let them migrate to who they want to because you know we have the church, elders, child workers, diversity. It offers the fundamental choice, I want to learn from Doreen, how did she get here? You know what I mean? And if they feel connected to someone there goes again that commonality that's just nipped in the bud because they get to choose. And then they become more engaged. (Final Focus Group, June 10, 2014)

Community partners committed to increase their role in field-based teacher preparation to improve urban Indigenous education, believing that candidates must partake in genuine
interactions with Indigenous peoples over extended periods of time to understand the needs and assets of urban Indigenous children and communities. Joe and Joanie discussed the importance of structuring their time to foster opportunities for community partners and candidates to learn about each other; conveying that they must learn about each other as individuals to develop a relationship where candidates feel comfortable inquiring about the needs and assets of the community. Community partners concluded that candidates may not have felt comfortable presenting their projects to their Indigenous mentors because they did not develop meaningful relationships during their time at Kateri. Additionally, the community partners did not discuss a structure for meeting with their candidates before beginning the field-based module. Discussing the candidates’ hesitance to express what they learned from community partners in their asset map presentations, they stated:

*Joanie:* Some of them with the words during the presentation (were) afraid of not taking away from the words they were given or lessons or the information. They were afraid to interpret that for themselves because they didn't have time to decompress it and put it back together. And the other thing is providing time where they can address us as a group one by one, why did they want to be a teacher? What influenced them? We didn't get anything to know about them. It was one sided.

*Joe:* I think I engaged my students pretty well. I don't know how you did your interviews, but I want to know a little about them for God’s sake.

*Joanie:* Well they told me a little about them, but I didn't know if that was common. (Final Focus Group, June 10, 2014)
Building from the importance of knowing each other as individuals, Joe added that he perceived the asset map presentations as demonstrating a shallow representation of the community. He applauded the candidates for taking a risk by entering a community different from their own, but believed that the presentations should have been more representative of the conversations exchanged during his time with the candidates. He asserted:

I personally think on one aspect them getting outside of their comfort zone they did an ok job on, but they could have as far as… their awareness wasn't as great considering they talked to all of us and we know the community, they didn't use our knowledge. (Final Focus Group, June 10, 2014)

Joanie also contributed to the idea of fostering relationships between the candidates and Indigenous community members. She repeatedly put forth the importance of sharing a meal together as a way of creating a comfortable environment for candidates to engage with Indigenous peoples. She stated, “I recommend that next time we have to eat with them… serve them…give them Indian tacos” (Final Focus Group, June 10, 2014). The community partners agreed with Joanie and brainstormed ideas for structuring time to share meals within the field-based teacher preparation model. They considered (a) hosting a pot-luck luncheon for candidates to share their favorite foods while also exploring Indigenous foods, (b) including the candidates in a Friday fry-bread taco sale where candidates partook in a community fundraiser and shared a meal, or (c) including traditional Indigenous foods at an introductory session where candidates and community partners would take time to introduce themselves and learn about each other before advancing into more formal meetings. Ultimately, the community partners saw value in
each of these suggestions and agreed that moving forward it would be important to host a meal at Kateri to welcome candidates into that space and take time for all involved to learn about each other as people, before focusing on the complexity of urban Indigenous education.

The community partners also acknowledged that not all community members would be interested in taking an active role in teacher preparation. They believed that within the Indigenous community, there was an innate sense of mistrust around engaging with people from outside the community. Doreen raised this point in saying, “I think some of the community is shy about people coming in, because a lot of our people were not taught to trust. Right away what are you here for? How much are they taking from me?” (Initial Focus Group, May 20, 2014). The community partners agreed that lack of trust and previous negative experiences with non-Indigenous peoples impacted the community members who chose not to participate as mentors. However, community partners agreed that this mistrust must be overcome and facilitating positive experiences with candidates, university partners, and other non-Indigenous allies would advance efforts of openness in collaborative, field-based teacher education.

While community partners acknowledged the challenges, they undoubtedly supported the field-based approach to teacher preparation. They saw value in candidates entering their space and learning about Indigenous cultures from direct encounters with Indigenous peoples, especially in an urban setting where community members represent tribes from across North America. They also believed that embedded experiences with Indigenous communities would have a greater impact on teaching practices if candidates gained these experiences before entering the profession. Joe made this clear by saying:
That’s the prime time, in the first 7 years of education/the work force, that's when you should broaden your horizons. Because when you're tainted by the life in the work force and then you have to go through this professional development you're going to dig your heels in because you're going outside the norm and they're just going through the process because they have to. They aren't open to the process they're just working the process. So if you get it before hand while their mind is still absorbent then go for it, so they're not tainted. (Interview, May 28, 2014)

Community partners agreed that it could be more difficult to enact change in teaching practices with experienced teachers who have preferred teaching methods and styles. However, community partners did not believe that improvement in established classroom practices was unattainable; the next subsection depicts how candidates viewed their role in supporting in-service teachers.

**Professional Development**

While community partners demonstrated a genuine commitment to providing candidates opportunities to engage with Indigenous communities prior to entering the teaching profession, they also recognized their role in supporting in-service teachers to better serve today’s urban Indigenous students. Discussing the need to collaborate with CPS teachers to improve Indigenous children’s school experiences, Joe explained the professional development that occurred between his own tribe and teachers at a school near his reservation:

Back home on the reservation there was a lot of community meetings with our teachers. We would have talking circles and so not just the teachers on the reservation, but the teachers off the reservation… It took a lot of dialogue... And
then finally the school district said, we need to fix this because most of the population attending the public school system off the reservation is Native American. So they had to re-evaluate because even though we are the minority we are the majority. So they reevaluated and did some exercises and there's a nice college in (my home town) that has a really nice Native Studies program. So all of the teachers were required to in the summer take, audit this course just to get a better understanding. (Interview, May 28, 2014)

I asked Joe to consider if the approach he witnessed between his tribe and teachers at the local school could transfer to Chicago’s urban Indigenous context. He acknowledged the difficulty in providing professional development specific to the needs of Indigenous children in CPS because Indigenous children constitute such a small percentage of the student body and attend schools spread across the large metropolitan district. He also offered suggestions for structuring professional development opportunities for CPS teachers of Indigenous children. In considering if the on-reservation professional development structure may transfer to Chicago, he responded,

We really can't do that universally, systematically because (CPS) is so vast. But… if we concentrated our efforts to where the majority of our Native students are, in that one zone, and if we find out our students attend these three to four different schools, I think we could do what we did on the reservation and have this dialogue with these certain schools that our children attend. (Interview, May 28, 2014)

Joe concluded his ideas around a community driven professional development model for teachers of urban Indigenous children with a positive outlook:
It's possible; I mean the old adage Rome was not built in a day. We can't systematically go and change everything about (the) CPS system, but we can chip away at it. And if we start at this level and chip away at it hopefully it will get bigger and then it will be a universal at least in CPS it will be a universal requirement. (Interview, May 28, 2014)

He believed that Chicago’s Indigenous community could begin working with CPS teachers to provide professional development sessions focused on how to better meet the needs of urban Indigenous children and, with persistence, the sessions may be required for all teachers of Indigenous students.

Community partners concurred that community-led professional development to inform teachers of the particular needs of urban Indigenous children was an important facet of improving Indigenous education. Joanie reiterated Joe’s idea of targeting specific teachers of Indigenous children and considered the possibility of the CPS T7 director leading that effort. She suggested, “If there was a professional development day, (the CPS T7 director could) invite each teacher with a T7 kid (to) come and maybe have lunch at one of the centers or just come and see our faces and ask questions” (Initial Focus Group, May 20, 2014). Joanie remained hopeful that bringing teachers into Indigenous communities would help them understand the importance of addressing the particular needs of Indigenous children. She consistently reiterated her belief that teachers were committed to serving all children and that Indigenous community members must act as resources for teachers who need more information around Indigenous communities, cultures, and the needs of their children.
In the previous section of this chapter, I depicted community partners’ experiences collaborating with teachers to provide resources responsive to the needs of urban Indigenous children. In these accounts, community partners shared their efforts supporting teachers who were interested in better understanding Indigenous cultures and the needs of urban Indigenous students. The community partners depicted these efforts as a responsibility they felt as urban Indigenous peoples, a responsibility to contribute positively to CPS so Indigenous children today may have better educational experiences than previous generations. Joe summarized the importance of Indigenous peoples actively engaging with in-service teachers to improve urban Indigenous education, recognizing that leaders outside of the Indigenous community would not be as committed to improving Indigenous education as the Indigenous community itself. He declared:

We have to have an active role. As it is now we're putting 110% trust in these non-Native instructors without really knowing anything about them. I'm sure some of them come with prejudices, and if they do that's being, not necessarily consciously, but sub consciously it's being taught to our students who are picking up on that. (Interview, May 28, 2014)

Community partners concurred that they must take an active role supporting in-service teachers in their work with urban Indigenous children because no other group was accountable for leading that effort. They also believed that greater community work was necessary to support the needs of urban Indigenous children and their teachers, which is discussed as the final theme in this section.
Community

Along with community partners having an active role in supporting teachers to meet the needs of urban Indigenous children, they believed the greater Chicago Indigenous community held responsibility for supporting the needs of Indigenous children and their teachers. In this study, community was defined as all Indigenous peoples residing in Chicago, and Indigenous community organizations that support the urban Indigenous population. Community partners believed that this extended network was relevant in addressing the needs of urban Indigenous children, in-service teachers, and candidates, while also recognizing the challenges they faced. Joe advocated for increased community effort in voicing their concerns around Indigenous education, so teachers may aspire to better serve Indigenous children. He considered the complexity of collaborating with non-Indigenous institutions and was critical of his community, believing that they must put forth more effort towards enacting change, he asserted:

I think even if our parents and grandparents stepped up to the plate a little bit more and helped their students in vocalizing something and getting to help the teachers get a better understanding of how we do things. You know we've discussed that a lot of people, we, our people complain that we were set up to fail in society and they want the dominant society to give everything to us so we can at least… balance things out. But they're not willing to achieve this success. They want everything given to them. So I think it goes back to educating each other.

(Interview, May 28, 2014)

This excerpt captured the complexity of Indigenous peoples’ role in collaboration efforts with non-Indigenous schools and teachers to improve urban Indigenous education, with
Indigenous peoples working toward equal opportunities for their children by explaining their cultures and ways of teaching and learning to non-Indigenous teachers. Reflecting on the challenges faced as an urban Indigenous community working together to support each other’s needs, Doreen displayed pride in the community’s resilience and ability to maintain solidarity in spite of the tribal diversity. She stated,

> I've been in this community oh my goodness how many years now, I think I started here in 1986 working for the Indian community… and there's been struggles…there's lots of diversity… in our community, but there's one thing we should be proud of we're still here. We are here. And we have some powerful people. We have some educated teachers. And we have the grandmas to teach us, we have the grandpas, and now we're elders… It’s amazing; we have so much to do! (Initial Focus Group, May 20, 2014)

The community partners also displayed negative feelings around the challenges of collaborating as an urban Indigenous community. All community partners agreed that tribal diversity within the community and limited funding sources for urban Indigenous communities posed challenges for enacting change. Responding to why some community efforts to improve urban Indigenous education have not come to fruition, Doreen made a decisive statement about the lack of progress. Placing responsibility on Chicago’s Indigenous peoples, she stated, “Because we don't know how to work together. That's why nothing happened” (Initial Focus Group, May 20, 2014). Doreen continued to question if community efforts of improved education have found success. Considering the past directors of CPS T7 and the varying programs and supports they endeavored to administer, she asked, “What are (they) doing? Did they make a difference for our
children?” (Initial Focus Group, May 20, 2014). Paul pondered this question and considered his own experience as a CPS student who was not made a part of the CPS T7 program. He stated:

If you want to know when your kid was in school, who was in charge, you should be able to reflect back and it's shame on them (for not being accessible). And it's really upsetting because all my peers, I could have been friends with them my whole dang life; grow up with Indians since I was in kindergarten. All my peers are my age. It's ridiculous, all my peers, its just… no connection. Zero connection. (Initial Focus Group, May 20, 2014)

Paul was explicit in describing how a lack of community support impacted his experiences as an Indigenous child without a peer group who shared his identity, describing himself as disengaged from school because he felt isolated in a setting without other Indigenous children. He continued the conversation by depicting how taking a job with an Indigenous community organization after completing high school allowed him to form connections with Indigenous peers. He recognized the importance of the community organization in developing his identity as an Indigenous young adult living off-reservation, and implied that Chicago’s Indigenous community organizations are a source of support for urban Indigenous children that both families and schools must recognize and value. Reflecting on this experience, Paul, Joanie, and I dialogued about the importance of community organizations in urban Indigenous education and the possibility of isolation as an urban Indigenous youth in a mainly non-Indigenous setting,

Paul: It's amazing that I was able to coincide at 18, 19 and work at the (community organization). And what if I didn't? I could have gone and got some
stupid, any job and decided that money was better than working at the (community organization).

Anna: And remained disconnected from the community?

Paul: Exactly.

Joanie: A lot comes from strength in numbers and a voice.

Paul: Yes. And yeah, maybe this is sort of the grand scheme of things, not to have my age range… not to have your peers there and have a similar voice you know.

Joanie: Cause you're urban already, by the time you get your voice you're already modern. (Initial Focus Group, May 20, 2014)

Responding to the discussion of damaging school experiences, Joanie, who consistently demonstrated a desire to maintain a positive outlook around the possibilities to enact change, asked the group, “So are you going to sit around and complain or strategize about it?” (Initial Focus Group, May 20, 2014). Her question reiterated the role of community involvement to improve Indigenous education. The community partners responded to her question with examples of proactive community efforts and Paul added that as long as there was space to talk about difficulties faced as urban Indigenous peoples they would continue moving forward as activists for generations to come.

In addition to challenges collaborating and connecting as a tribally diverse community, community partners discussed the difficulties faced with insecure funding sources. The community partners dialogue about losing resources and also feeling unrepresented in policy as an urban, off-reservation, Indigenous community.

Doreen: That's hard when we have funding and it disappears for the people and our people are left and the doors are closed. It's terrible you know.
Joanie: Especially when what is it 78% of us according to the census live in the city.

Doreen: Yeah at one point it was 50% on reservation and 50% off, but it's higher now.

Joanie: You'd think that those numbers alone would (mean something). (Initial Focus Group, May 20, 2014)

Paul discussed this challenge with the candidates he mentored, sharing the need for increased funding to sustain and improve the educational services offered to urban Indigenous children. When the candidates asked about Indigenous educational programs in Chicago he described the services provided by multiple Indigenous organizations and his involvement with each. As they worked to gain information about the assets and needs of Chicago’s Indigenous community the candidates asked what additional resources could be used for educational programs and Paul simply replied “Funding. We need funding” (Observation Two, June 5, 2014).

Regardless of existent challenges, the community partners shared examples of Chicago’s diverse, urban Indigenous community coming together in constructive ways. In response to Paul’s experience of detachment from other Indigenous children during his schooling, the community partners discussed ways the community could extend the existing Indigenous educational services to reach a greater number of children and families; bringing Indigenous children together to develop supportive peer groups. I asked if they believed that bringing Indigenous children together in school settings impacted their educational success, and Doreen responded with a story about the
community led school, Little Big Horn, which was highlighted in Chapter II. She depicted,

I remember my nephew and his sister, and my brother and sister in law had their children there. I remember (my niece) getting very excited that there was this school that was Native and they could do their crafting and show and tell and be with other Natives, to eat together and to have the events to support it. There was a very high level of self-esteem. (Initial Focus Group, May 20, 2014)

Expanding on the community’s effort to bring Indigenous children together to share school experiences, and conviction that connections with Indigenous peers would improve school success, Doreen discussed a collaborative effort between CPS T7 and Milwaukee’s Title VII Program. In this effort, the CPS T7 and Milwaukee Title VII programs developed a conference for non-Indigenous teachers to learn more about the needs of their urban Indigenous students with the support of Indigenous community members. She depicted the effort of these two urban Indigenous communities embracing their roles in addressing shared struggles around the quality of Indigenous education,

We came together and… had a little conference… And we went there to talk about how we (could) better serve our Native children. How do we work with the pain in the past and the present and on and on? So that was a wonderful workshop. It was very amazing to learn about their communities and what they do with their children. To better understand, these were Native teachers that were talking about non-Native teachers. How could they better understand? So there were non- Native teachers that were at that presentation to learn from the adults that were there and the parents of these children or community people. So we kind
of paired up in groups and had these mini discussions. So it was, it was an amazing day. (Initial Focus Group, May 20, 2014)

Community partners displayed pride in this level of collaboration, grounded in community-driven work to improve urban Indigenous children’s school experiences. Reaching out to other urban Midwestern Indigenous communities to address Indigenous educational issues demonstrated an extraordinary effort.

The community partners also discussed an educational collaborative group that Chicago’s Indigenous community created to combine resources of the individual community organizations and address shared goals for improving urban Indigenous education. In this effort, community partners from varying Indigenous organizations met monthly to discuss the work of each organization and their roles in addressing community issues. Community partners described this group as a starting point to making a greater impact on mutual causes, including teacher preparation and in-service teacher professional development. They believed that Indigenous community organizations must come together as a unified network to support the needs of urban Indigenous children, families, and their non-Indigenous teachers and schools.

The topic of greater community efforts as a role in preparing teachers for the needs of urban Indigenous children was succinctly concluded with George’s reflection of a discussion he had during a weekend retreat. He stated, “There can be no healing… without community… community for survival and culture for survival” (Final Focus Group, June 10, 2014).
Discussion: Preparing Teachers

Community partners’ ideas around the role of Indigenous community members in preparing teachers for the needs of urban Indigenous children moved beyond the established literature. Community partners identified three facets of active involvement to support the needs of urban Indigenous children and their teachers (a) experiences with Native peoples, (b) professional development, and (c) community. Each of these themes advanced the conversations around the role of Indigenous communities in primarily non-Indigenous school settings.

Experiences with Native Peoples

Community partners believed that candidates must have direct experiences with Indigenous peoples to understand and meet the needs of urban Indigenous children. They also believed that Indigenous community members held responsibility for facilitating these experiences in varying contexts. Extant literature portrayed the importance of field-based experiences for candidates to develop an understanding of community ways of teaching and learning (McDonald et al., 2011; Murrell, 2000; Oakes et al., 2002; Stachowski & Mahan, 1998). These studies mainly examined preparing teachers for urban schools, with Stachowski and Mahan (1998) collaborating with the Navajo Nation to provide candidates at one Midwestern university cross-cultural experiences, but they did not explicate upon the role of community partners in such programs or the uniqueness of preparing teachers for urban Indigenous communities.

Community partners contributed significantly to the discourse of teacher preparation for urban Indigenous education. They moved beyond accepted models of teacher preparation and suggested that urban Indigenous community members must
actively engage with candidates, facilitate opportunities for candidates to have direct
experiences with Indigenous peoples, and assist candidates in developing authentic
relationships with Indigenous families and communities to genuinely understand what it
means to be Indigenous in an urban setting. Community partners demonstrated deep
convictions to providing their children with opportunities for high quality education by
generously offering their time and resources to support candidates’ awareness and ability
to address the needs of urban Indigenous children.

**Professional Development**

Findings moved outside of teacher preparation, as community partners depicted
their role in supporting in-service teachers through community led professional
development. They described instances where they have provided teachers with
appropriate resources for teaching about Indigenous cultures and information around
better serving urban Indigenous children. Community partners also identified
opportunities for expanding community led professional development for in-service
teachers seeking to improve their practices in Indigenous education. This theme advanced
the extant literature, which identified the importance of preparing more Indigenous
teachers to serve Indigenous children (Belgrade et al., 2002; Brayboy & Castagno, 2009;
Dehyle & Swisher, 1997) and instances of self-education through community led schools
(see Little Big Horn; Rough Rock Community School), but did not emphasize the role of
Indigenous communities in supporting the development of in-service teachers’
knowledge and skills around the needs of their Indigenous children. Community partners
in this study outlined ways in which they may enter classrooms and schools and invite
teachers into community organizations to increase teachers’ awareness and competencies
in urban Indigenous cultures and education, thus recognizing a new area of inquiry for scholars of Indigenous education.

**Community**

The reviewed research indicated the importance of school-community collaboration to meet the needs of Indigenous children (Brayboy & Castagno, 2009; Cajete, 2005; Castagno & Brayboy, 2008; McCarty, 2012; Oakes & Maday, 2009; Quigley, 2006). Studies elucidated the importance of community-school collaboration to address the holistic needs of Indigenous children. The community partners in this study believed that the community held a responsibility for facilitating communication with non-Indigenous teachers to express their children’s needs and strategies for improving urban Indigenous education. The community partners’ ideas also aligned with the literature in considering the needs of Indigenous children to succeed in both Indigenous and non-Indigenous settings. Brayboy and Castagno (2009) addressed the importance of connecting school academics to Indigenous cultures for Indigenous children to make connections between these two very different contexts. Community partners believed that for Indigenous children to excel, schools, teachers, and CPS T7 leaders must foster strong Indigenous community supports and peer groups in school settings.

The literature addressed self-determination as an essential factor in sustaining quality Indigenous education, putting forth that schools supported by Indigenous leaders resulted in improved success for Indigenous students (Brayboy & Castagno, 2009; Castagno & Brayboy, 2008; McCarty, 2012). Community partners did not explicitly reference self-determination, but they did reference the importance of Indigenous peoples taking leadership roles in educational programming. They depicted the success of Little
Big Horn as a school developed specifically for the needs of urban Indigenous children and expressed their desire to develop more opportunities for Indigenous children to engage with peer groups in programming designed to address their particular needs. They also expressed the importance of Indigenous peoples communicating their needs with non-Indigenous teachers and taking a role in helping teachers understand how to best serve Indigenous children. Community partners clearly valued Indigenous led initiatives to create better school experiences for their children, which was supported in the established scholarship (Adams, 1974; Battiste, 2000; Oakes & Maday, 2009).

Research supported the value of extended community networks as resources in serving diverse children in mainstream school settings. Gonzalez, Moll, and Amanti’s (2005) *Funds of Knowledge* provided sound evidence for the value of extended resource networks in primarily Latino communities; where families were able to rely on each other to sustain their needs while disconnected from their native lands. The community partners in this study discussed the importance of urban Indigenous communities forming extended networks to offer support away from tribal resources. Gonzalez and colleagues (2005) explained how teachers might learn from these networks by placing themselves in their students’ homes and communities to learn about the community resources. Similarly, findings from this study suggested that Indigenous peoples must facilitate these interactions between candidates and communities to support teachers in better understanding urban Indigenous community cultures, resources, and needs.

Community partners made clear that the community must actively engage with candidates and in-service teachers to improve urban Indigenous education. To this point, I have depicted what community partners believed teachers should know to serve
Indigenous students and how community partners should facilitate teachers’ experiences with Indigenous communities. Next, I will discuss the final research question regarding the impact of collaborative field-based teacher preparation on the involved community partners.

**Potential for Impact**

In this section, I answer the third research question: How does the involvement of candidates in an urban Indigenous community based organization impact the community partners and their experiences? My findings were drawn from community partners’ beliefs that candidates must spend more time in the community to gain meaningful experiences and to impact the Kateri community and its members; however community partners indicated that the potential for positive impact exists. Community partners depicted two themes connected to this question (a) we get to learn from them, and (b) depth of experiences. The first theme held concrete examples of how field-based teacher preparation benefited community partners. In the second theme community partners identified the potential for and lack of impact due to the briefness of the field-based experience, while discussing the positive and negative aspects of their experiences. In the following subsections, I describe each theme and conclude with connections to the literature.

**We Get to Learn From Them**

In considering how the Kateri-Teaching, Learning, and Leading with Schools and Communities (TLLSC) partnership impacted the Kateri community, community partners disclosed the potential to gain new understandings and information by engaging with candidates. The community partners displayed confidence in how they supported
candidates to meet the needs of urban Indigenous children, but they also believed that the candidates had unique life experiences that would enhance the richness of their time together. Community partners sought out opportunities to learn about the candidates’ backgrounds, interests, and aspirations as a way to create stronger bonds and also to gain an understanding of the candidates’ perspectives. Joe responded to the question of community impact,

I would say without knowing the students and knowing their backgrounds, I would say a positive thing about them spending time with us is we get to learn as well. We get to learn from them…While they're learning from us we're learning from them… That's a preliminary positive. (Interview, May 28, 2014)

Joe exhibited this commitment to learning from the candidates during his time with them at Kateri. He asked the candidates questions regarding their future teaching careers, why they aspired to teach, and what grade levels they were interested in pursuing. Joe also asked the candidates questions about their backgrounds and life experiences and how those influenced their perspectives of working with children from diverse backgrounds. Additionally, Joe shared aspects of his own personal life with the candidates. He told stories of what it was like growing up on the reservation, how he has come to think of himself as a teacher, and his vacation plans for the coming summer months. This extended interaction demonstrated Joe’s interest in gaining new knowledge from his time spent with people from backgrounds different from his own. During the final focus group, he reflected on his participation in the field-based model and made apparent that he valued his time spent engaged in meaningful conversations with the candidates. When Joanie asked about the structure of his interview with the candidates, he declared, “I think
I engaged my students pretty well. I don't know how you did your interviews, but I want to know a little about them for God's sake” (Final Focus Group, June 10, 2014).

Joe expanded on the impact of engaging with non-Indigenous candidates as a learning opportunity, believing that by exposing the Kateri community to people from diverse, non-Indigenous backgrounds they may expand their conceptions of diversity and gain a broader perspective of multiculturalism. Joe believed that the Kateri community may learn and benefit from experiences with people from other minority groups, he explained that these interactions may result in Indigenous participants learning from the experiences of others and overcoming stereotypes based on race and ethnicity. In discussing how bringing non-Indigenous candidates may challenge community partners’ own cultural understandings, he stated:

Because of the dynamics of the community if there was a candidate of a particular skin tone some community members would be less willing to participate, (but) why are there issues to that particular skin tone? Why do you have issues with that? And I think if they were put in a setting with that particular individual for things to move forward they have to address those issues, and what better way to address that issue than with an individual of that background. You have to overcome and I think that's a benefit of having these candidates with us. Let them overcome some misconceptions of people and in doing that hopefully we as Natives it would help us overcome some misconceptions about particular ethnicities. (Interview, May 28, 2014)

The community partners also commented on the candidates’ asset map presentations and indicated that those projects offered new information about the
neighborhood surrounding Kateri. While dialoguing with Doreen, Joe sated “I didn't know there were that many things in the North Center neighborhood” (Final Focus Group, June 10, 2014). Responding to Joe’s statement about the presentations uncovering potential community resources, George shared that as a board member of multiple Indigenous community organizations, he believed that the asset map presentations could bring valuable information to each organization. However, community partners also critiqued the extent of information some of the candidates presented, identifying valuable community resources that were not included in the asset maps. As a group we discussed the successes and challenges of the candidates’ presentations:

George: I know when I was on the board for AIC and Indian Health Services to hear these presentations, I think it would be very very eye opening to the board.

Anna: In what way?

George: Well for one thing the availability and interest in non-profit facilities around (Kateri), even the park district.

Doreen: Mmmhmm. And I do think they did really good with the Mitchell Museum, they really elaborated on that. That was pretty amazing.

Anna: The Mitchel Museum has a lot of resources for teaching.

Doreen: So does CPS, but there was no information about Title VII in those. Title VII is an important resource for our people.

Joe: But you have to realize they didn't meet with anyone from Title VII to interview, so those things are lost by them… In the community we know what a great value they are, but as an outsider coming in they don't have that direction, it's lost. (Final Focus Group, June 10, 2014)
In this excerpt, the community partners disclosed their beliefs that the candidates had the potential to contribute positively to the community through their asset map presentations, but that the information presented was not extensive enough to create an impact. They also conceded that the candidates were not fully responsible for the missing content in the presentations, but that the community involved with each organization must actively engage as mentors for the candidates’ projects to positively impact the Kateri community.

**Depth of Experiences**

The findings from the second research question depicted community partners’ beliefs about the depth of experiences supporting the needs of urban Indigenous children, candidates, and in-service teachers. In relation to the impact of engaging with candidates at Kateri, community partners once again referred to having an active role in teacher preparation. George put forth that bringing candidates into Kateri was important work that positively impacted the greater Indigenous community. He explained that engaging with candidates was the only way to share Indigenous peoples’ stories and cultures with the public, and he believed that conveying Indigenous stories and cultures was vital to improving Indigenous education. Doreen considered Kateri’s relationship with another educational institution and shared that bringing those students into the Kateri community for two full semesters benefited both the students and the community. She explained that by spending prolonged time at Kateri the students became contributing members of the community and everyone worked together to achieve the students’ goals:

This person journeys with us and learns and listens a while for the first semester and learns and learns and has goals that he needs to fulfill too, and we work
together on the goals. And he's going to get from us and we're going to get from him. (Initial Focus Group, May 20, 2014)

Doreen believed that this model of extended community engagement could transfer to teacher preparation and had the potential to positively impact both the Kateri community and the candidates. However, community partners concluded that the three sessions candidates spent at Kateri did not afford enough time to impact either party. Doreen and George made this sentiment clear:

*Doreen:* It’s not enough time for them. They need more time to learn.

*George:* A lot more time.

*Doreen:* I think it should be a lot longer, seven months maybe, or even a year… engaging fully not you know just learning something and off you go and that’s it and you have very little information… We don’t want you to become and expert in this you know, we want them to...

*George:* Listen to our stories.

*Doreen:* Yes, that’s all. (Final Focus Group, June 10, 2014)

Community partners remained committed to providing the candidates with rich, meaningful experiences during their time at Kateri and doing so required the community partners to adapt their schedules, daily routines, and activities to support the candidates’ understandings of the urban Indigenous community. Community partners primarily discussed these adaptations positively, considering how they may foster candidates’ development as teachers prepared to serve urban Indigenous children. When meeting to determine the module schedule regarding which sessions would occur at Kateri and when the Indigenous community partners would interact with candidates, they wrote the dates
in their calendars and were willing to be available for full day, half day, or evening sessions. Community partners never objected to candidates using the space at Kateri and encouraged candidates to partake in community events outside of the module experiences such as Friday taco sales or Sunday church services. However, community partners critiqued the changes made to the module schedule that minimized candidates’ engagement with the Kateri community. While the community willingly adapted their schedules to accommodate the module schedule and support the candidates, the limited time candidates’ spent at Kateri disheartened them. Doreen and Joe explicated this:

Joe: We changed our scheduling considerably, because I was set to go to that training in Florida and Doreen was going to go to Canada.

Doreen: Oh yeah, lots (of changes).

Joe: And then (the field-based experience) happened and we talked and discussing it that was happening while we were both gone, so I canceled my seminar in Florida, but Doreen had to go to Canada. And then in the mean time talking more she changed her trip to Canada to accommodate the students and then with the end result, hell we could have both went to Canada and Florida.

(Final Focus Group, June 10, 2014)

The community partners discussed the outcome of the module structure and believed that the candidates could have gained a richer experience by spending each session at Kateri. They discussed that simply being around Indigenous peoples would help prepare them to teach Indigenous children and that if they had been at Kateri each day, Kateri community partners could have planned focused experiences for them during that time.
Joe and Doreen also made clear that they expected the field-based experience to be different than traditional clinical experiences with candidates. They described the traditional experiences as brief and inadequate, where candidates came to Kateri to complete community-based clinical hours, observing and conducting short interviews with community members, and left without authentically engaging with Indigenous peoples or gaining a real understanding of Chicago’s Indigenous community. They also described the traditional model as one that used the Indigenous community partners’ time, experiences, and knowledges without giving anything back in return. Upon planning the field-based module at Kateri, Joe and Doreen believed this model would increase the level of mutuality between the community and university stakeholders. They believed that bringing candidates into the Kateri community would benefit Indigenous children’s future school experiences and provide space for Indigenous community members to have a voice in how teachers may better serve their children. However, at the conclusion of the field-based module Joe and Doreen expressed disappointment that the candidates’ time at Kateri replicated traditional models for community-based clinical hours rather than meaningful engagement with community members over a prolonged period of time. Overall, community partners expressed dissatisfaction when they considered the potential of the field-based experiences compared to the reality. When asked if they would engage as mentors of candidates in future modules, community partners each responded, “Yes” (Final Focus Group, June 10, 2014), but as expressed throughout this section they desired a deeper level of engagement to genuinely support the candidates’ understandings of teaching urban Indigenous children and to positively impact the Kateri community.
Discussion: Potential for Impact

Drawn from their experiences with candidates, community partners elicited two themes regarding the impact of field-based teacher preparation on the community (a) we get to learn from them, and (b) depth of experiences. These themes advanced the topic of collaborative, field-based teacher preparation with urban, Indigenous community organizations as an effort to better serve Indigenous children; the findings also identified areas in need of improvement, which will be further detailed in the next chapter.

We Get to Learn From Them

Findings moved beyond the extant literature, which lacked research around how field-based teacher preparation with an urban Indigenous community organization impacts the community. Existing research focused primarily on the experiences of candidates, indicating that candidates engaged with diverse communities gained understandings of how to best serve children of those communities (McDonald et al., 2011; Murrell, 2000). Research also concluded that candidates with clinical placements in community organizations gained practiced-based experiences that improved their readiness to teach compared to school-based placements and that children in these community-based programs benefited from candidates’ additional attention and positive role modeling (McDonald et al., 2011).

While the extant literature provided a sound rationale for candidates’ participation with diverse communities, this study advanced the research by focusing on how field-based teacher preparation impacted the involved community. Community partners put forth that while candidates have much to learn about the needs of Indigenous children and will benefit from their time spent with Indigenous peoples, Indigenous community
members may benefit from engaging with non-Indigenous candidates. Community partners believed that the candidates came with unique backgrounds and perspectives about teaching that should be shared during their time engaged with Indigenous communities to build more genuine relationships. Although community partners identified learning from candidates as a benefit of taking part in teacher preparation, they also identified design flaws in the field-based model that prevented substantial impact from occurring. These findings advanced the scholarship around sustainable, mutually beneficial partnerships (Kruger et al., 2009), which to this point have focused solely on partnerships with K-12 schools.

**Depth of Experiences**

Findings around how the Kateri-TLLSC partnership impacted the community indicated a need for programmatic changes and further research, which will be discussed in the next chapter, they also provided the foundations for examining the potential benefits of advancing such collaborative, field-based teacher preparation models and extensive information around how to better design future implementations of TLLSC sequences held at Kateri. These findings addressed the dearth of literature around the community role in teacher preparation and the impact of community partners engaging as mentors in a field-based model. The community partners’ voices advanced understandings of the community role in community-university collaboration as active leaders working to improve teacher preparation for urban Indigenous education. While the findings made clear that the community was not able to assume this active role due to the module design and limited time, they suggested structural adaptations to increase the
community’s involvement for the next implementation—hoping for a positive impact on the involved community.

Based on community partners’ experiences, findings also identified methods for upholding trust, mutuality, and reciprocity put forth by Kruger and colleagues (2009) as necessary components of successful, sustainable partnerships. Community partners identified instances in which the partnership failed to maintain these components and offered suggestions for adapting the field-based model to better align with an urban Indigenous community context. In this, community partners recognized their role in preparing teachers as an effort of self-determination through self-education that was vital to serving the needs of their children and community through improved education.

Conclusion

Findings addressed the complexity of preparing teachers to serve urban Indigenous children and the important role of Indigenous community partners in field-based models aiming to improve teacher preparation. Community partners identified essential understandings for teachers of urban Indigenous children, their active role in working to prepare these teachers, and the potential impact of partaking in collaborative, field-based teacher preparation. Each of these findings encompassed multiple themes that aligned with Indigenous Postcolonial Theory (IPT) (Battiste, 2000; Kumar 2009) by community partners active engagement as leaders in teacher preparation and thus, furthering self-determination through self-education.

IPT included efforts of decolonization and urged Indigenous peoples to move forward, independent of western ideologies. Findings aligned with the IPT framework in placing Indigenous community members as partners in teacher preparation. Instead of
portraying contentment with candidates observing Indigenous activities during clinical experiences, community partners contended that candidates must spend prolonged periods of active engagement with Indigenous peoples to understand the needs of Indigenous children. Community partners continuously depicted opportunities for increased community involvement to advance candidates’ competency in teaching urban Indigenous children and support teachers and schools by providing resources and curriculum development, inherently naming themselves the most qualified and appropriate stakeholders to improve urban Indigenous education. The following chapter expands on these conclusions, situates the implications of these findings in the broader landscape of teacher preparation for urban Indigenous education, and identifies areas in need of further research.
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION

Conclusions and Implications: Improving Urban Indigenous Education

In the previous chapters, I presented my research on collaborative, field-based teacher preparation with the St. Kateri Center of Chicago (Kateri), an urban Indigenous community organization and Loyola University Chicago’s (Loyola) teacher preparation program—Teaching, Learning, and Leading with Schools and Communities (TLLSC). I examined community partners’ experiences in this community-university partnership for teacher preparation, which highlighted an effort to better prepare teachers for the needs of urban Indigenous children. The following questions guided my research: (a) What aspects of Indigenous cultures do Kateri community partners believe teachers should understand to serve urban Indigenous children?, (b) How do Kateri community partners view their role in preparing teachers to meet the needs of urban Indigenous children?, and (c) How does the involvement of teacher candidates in an urban Indigenous community-based organization impact the community partners and their experiences?

Confirming a need for this study, national, state, and local data presented in Chapter I portrayed Indigenous children’s poor school experiences and inadequate academic achievement in United States (U.S.) public schools. With 60% of Indigenous children residing off-reservation in urban settings (U.S. Department of Health & Human Services, 2012), institutions of teacher preparation must reconsider the ways in which

Through an Indigenous Postcolonial Theory (IPT; Battiste, 2000) framework, I investigated the Kateri-TLLSC partnership through the community’s perspective—attending to the level of mutuality between an Indigenous and non-Indigenous organization (Rickstock & Pennel, 1996). IPT provided a lens to examine any pertinent power structures or systems of oppression present between the community organization and university partners. With IPT, I examined how the Kateri-TLLSC partnership (a) acknowledged the historical and current oppression present in Indigenous communities, (b) recognized the need to decolonize the educational system to develop a postcolonial state, (c) endeavored to heal prior traumas, and (d) respected the assets Indigenous communities possess (Battiste, 2000).

In this case study research (Stake, 1995), using qualitative (Erickson, 1986; Merriam, 2009; Patton, 2002; Stake, 1995) and Indigenous (Cajete, 2005; Deloria, 1991; Sobeck et al., 2008) methodologies of data collection and conventional content analysis (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005), I documented the community partners’ experiences and beliefs around the aforementioned research questions. I identified what they believed teachers must understand to serve urban Indigenous children, their perceived roles in preparing and supporting teachers of urban Indigenous children, and the potential impact of collaborative, field-based teacher preparation with urban Indigenous communities.
Findings captured the complexities of partnering to prepare non-Indigenous teachers for urban Indigenous children. Community partners disclosed six facets of understanding for teachers of urban Indigenous children, and declared that Indigenous community partners must have an active role in preparing primarily non-Indigenous candidates to serve their children. Ultimately, findings portrayed the potential of realizing sustainable, mutually beneficial partnerships (Kruger et al., 2009) between urban Indigenous communities and university teacher preparation programs to address issues of (in)equality in urban Indigenous education.

In this final chapter, I span out to address the overarching focus and purpose of this study. Building upon the findings presented in the prior chapter, I discuss the impact of the partnership on the community organization, its members, and its services as they collaborated with a university to prepare candidates to understand and meet the needs of urban Indigenous children. I organize my discussion of these findings through following four subsections: (a) Conclusions, (b) Implications, (c) Future research, and (d) Reflections.

Conclusions

Through this dissertation study, I represented the voices of Indigenous community partners regarding their experiences and beliefs around collaborative, field-based teacher preparation to improve urban Indigenous education. In this section, I discuss the findings presented in Chapter IV: (a) Teacher understandings of urban Indigenous education, (b), Community roles in preparing and supporting teachers, and (c) Potential for impact. In each sub-section, I span out to consider what these findings suggest for collaborative, teacher preparation with urban Indigenous communities working to advance
postcolonialism and realizing self-determination through self-education in tribally
diverse, urban contexts. Through efforts promoting postcolonialism, urban Indigenous
communities may gain a voice in the educational experiences of their children; with the
potential of moving beyond Anglo dominated curricula and methods of instruction and
thus, achieving a decolonized Indigenous education system.

**Teacher Understandings for Urban Indigenous Education**

Findings of this study made clear that schools and universities must collaborate
with Indigenous community leaders to prepare non-Indigenous candidates for the
particular needs of urban Indigenous children. Community partners identified six facets
of teacher understandings for urban Indigenous education (a) storytelling, (b) language,
(c) history, (d) special ways of being, (e) different tribes, and (f) resources. Participants
described these understandings as knowledge and skills for teachers to develop with the
support of Indigenous community members, or curricular resources through community-
school collaboration. A key aspect of these findings was that in collaboration with
Indigenous communities, non-Indigenous teachers had the potential to effectively and
compassionately meet the needs of urban Indigenous children. The reviewed literature
around preparing candidates for the needs of Indigenous children included an essential
movement of recruiting and supporting Indigenous peoples to gain teaching credentials
and serve schools on their reservations (Belgrade et al., 2002; Brayboy & Castagno,
2009; Dehyle & Swisher, 1997), but no research existed to date around preparing
candidates, specifically non-Indigenous candidates, to serve the needs of urban
Indigenous children. This study indicated a clear need for reformed teacher preparation
inclusive of urban Indigenous education.
Research around culturally responsive schooling (CRS) for Indigenous children supported community-school partnerships. Prior studies recognized that when schools and teachers engaged with Indigenous communities, Indigenous children demonstrated increased school success (Brayboy & Castagno, 2009; Castagno & Brayboy, 2008; McCarty, 2012; Oakes & Maday, 2009), and additional research depicted Indigenous knowledges relevant to serving Indigenous children across tribes (Cajete, 2005; Oakes & Maday, 2009; Quigley, 2006). Findings from this study reiterated the importance of community-school collaboration, but also addressed the particular needs of urban Indigenous children and the potential of preparing primarily non-Indigenous teachers to meet these needs prior to entering the work force. In this, community partners recognized a need to decolonize the curriculum and instructional practices cultivated in teacher preparation and employed in our nation’s public schools, to provide an equal education for urban Indigenous children. Community partners acknowledged the importance of using community assets to enact change, and believed that collaborative, field-based teacher preparation provided space for community driven school reform.

Including Indigenous community partners in teacher preparation programs requires a substantial change in university structures. As it stands, universities value Anglo knowledge systems and recognize primarily Anglo scholars as the holders of information with a responsibility to convey their knowledge to the next generation (Brayboy & Maughan, 2009). For teacher preparation programs to recognize and value Indigenous community knowledges as essential teacher understandings, university administrators and faculty must redefine who they consider experts in preparing teachers for urban Indigenous communities. To reach a postcolonial state, where Indigenous
peoples enjoy genuine equality, communities must rewrite their histories (Battiste, 2004). Retelling U.S. history through an Indigenous perspective will allow Indigenous communities to regain control over how others recognize and understand Indigenous people and cultures (Battiste, 2004).

Through collaborative, field-based teacher preparation, Indigenous community partners must also work to rewrite teacher preparation curricula inclusive of Indigenous education. Redesigning teacher preparation to value community-based knowledges and acknowledge historical and current forms of oppression (Battiste, 2000) will prepare candidates cognizant of Indigenous histories, cultures, and ways of teaching. Including Indigenous community partners as valued stakeholders in preparing candidates for urban Indigenous education holds the potential to vastly change the educational experiences of Indigenous children—respecting Indigenous community assets and healing prior traumas (Battiste, 2000).

**Community Role in Preparing and Supporting Teachers**

Building on the community partners’ recognition of their assets to support candidates’ understandings of urban Indigenous education, they expanded on their role in such an endeavor. Community partners continuously emphasized the importance of candidates gaining direct experiences with Indigenous peoples to understand their cultures and needs, and believed they had a role in facilitating such engagements. Recognizing that they held important information and experiences around urban Indigenous education, community partners envisioned having an active role in collaborative, field-based teacher preparation. They asserted that candidates would gain important competencies around serving urban Indigenous children by spending time with
Indigenous peoples and involving themselves in urban Indigenous community organizations. These findings revealed that urban Indigenous communities encompassed knowledge and resources, not held by universities and school organizations, which they perceived as holding the capacity to benefit candidates’ development as culturally responsive teachers.

These findings advanced research around clinical placements in community organizations to support candidates’ development in serving culturally diverse children (McDonald et al., 2011; Stachowski & Mahan, 1998), overcoming fears around entering neighborhoods inhabited by peoples of color (Oakes et al., 2002), and the value of candidates’ learning about community ways of teaching and learning with children from backgrounds different than their own (Murrell, 2000). Findings of this study conceptualized urban Indigenous community partners as essential stakeholders in teacher preparation, taking an active role supporting candidates to address the needs of urban Indigenous children. For communities to actively engage in teacher preparation, community partners and teacher educators must work to sustain mutually beneficial partnerships (Kruger et al., 2009). Additionally, university partners must respect Indigenous community assets as critical resources in preparing candidates to serve urban Indigenous children (Battiste, 2000). Community partners reiterated these claims and believed that their expanded involvement in collaborative, field-based teacher preparation could improve the overall climate of urban Indigenous education, by recognizing and healing historical and current forms of oppression and inequities in U.S. schools.

As detailed in Chapter I of this study and restated above, U.S. schools fail to meet the needs of Indigenous children in every aspect of their education. In response to
inadequate schooling, Kumar (2009) stated, “education is regarded as the most rigorously engineered institutional domain by the assimilationist policies of colonial apologists” (p. 43); and put forth that decolonization is widely recognized as a necessary effort to overcome colonial oppression, but added that attending to a future after decolonization (i.e., postcolonialism) is essential (Battiste, 2004; Kumer, 2009). Indigenous peoples hold a responsibility for upturning patterns of colonial oppression on the part of public education by taking an initiative to reform school curricula with Indigenous perspectives. By recognizing and revitalizing Indigenous cultures, knowledges, and ways of teaching, and transforming contemporary systems of education inclusive of Indigenous peoples, Indigenous communities may realize a postcolonial state—offering all children equal opportunities.

**Potential for Impact**

Findings of this study revealed that collaborative, field-based teacher preparation has the potential to positively impact community organizations. Addressing the dearth of research around the impact of community-university partnerships for teacher preparation on the involved communities, community partners explicated upon partnership experiences that could benefit their organizations. They believed that candidates’ asset mapping projects held the potential to elucidate new resources to serve the needs of urban Indigenous peoples, moving beyond a focus on candidates’ development and instead viewing the assignment as reciprocal (Kruger et al., 2009).

These findings advanced the research around the benefit of clinical placements in community organizations. Prior research put forth that clinical placements in community-based organizations improved candidates’ cultural responsiveness and offered teaching
experiences not afforded in school-based placements (McDonald et al., 2011; Stachowski & Mahan, 1998); and demonstrated that community members held valuable information about community ways of teaching and learning that benefited candidates understandings of teaching culturally and linguistically diverse children (McDonald et al., 2011; Murrell, 2000; Oakes et al., 2002; Stachowski & Mahan, 1998). This study added to the literature base, with community partners finding value in fostering genuine relationships with candidates. Findings indicated that candidates must experience extended interactions with Indigenous peoples to gain an authentic understanding of Indigenous cultures; but in addition to serving the candidates’ needs, community partners displayed interest in learning about the candidates’ backgrounds and experiences. By forming relationships between community partners and candidates, findings suggested that Indigenous peoples may benefit from interactions with non-Indigenous candidates; asserting that these interactions will work to overcome cultural and racial stereotypes held by some community members. This conclusion is critical in considering the structure and outcomes of community partners’ interactions with candidates, and the potential benefits of community-university partnerships.

Community partners identified additional resources and multicultural relationships as potential positive outcomes of the Kateri-TLLSC partnership; but after completing the module, community partners agreed that the time spent at Kateri was not substantial enough to impact the community. Findings also made clear that for candidates to develop a genuine understanding of urban Indigenous cultures, peoples, and student needs the Kateri-TLLSC partnership must offer candidates prolonged experiences with the community. Community partners were optimistic that with extended experiences,
repeated throughout the candidates’ preparation, both the candidates and community members would benefit and ultimately the candidates would be better prepared to address the needs of urban Indigenous children.

Community partners’ optimism around the potential benefits of collaborative, field-based teacher preparation aligned with the historical resilience demonstrated by Indigenous communities continuously oppressed by colonization (Grande, 2008). Indigenous communities worked to maintain their values and traditions to preserve their cultures for future generations—upholding Indigenous ways of teaching, in spite of colonial systems of education (Cajete, 2000). Community partner experiences depicted in this study were a passive continuation of unequal partnerships between Indigenous and non-Indigenous institutions. In this sense, the Kateri-TLLSC partnership: (a) acknowledged the historical and current oppression present in Indigenous communities, but failed to, (b) recognize the need to decolonize the educational system to develop a postcolonial state, (c) endeavor to heal prior traumas, and (d) respect the assets Indigenous communities possess (Battiste, 2000).

Findings did not depict the partnership as an overtly negative experience for community partners, but rather community partners’ shared that the experience was more of the same in regards to university clinical placements with Indigenous communities as brief encounters for candidates to experience otherness. To sustain mutually beneficial partnerships, working to advance postcolonialism, Indigenous community-university partnerships must include prolonged experiences grounded in authentic relationships between Indigenous community partners and candidates. Recommended changes for the
Kateri-TLLSC partnership to address issues of mutuality and increase commitment to postcolonialism are detailed in the following section.

**Implications**

In this study, I examined community partner experiences in collaborative, field-based teacher preparation, working to improve urban Indigenous education through community-university partnerships for teacher preparation. Through an IPT framework (Battiste, 2000), I considered how an urban Indigenous community and non-Indigenous university partnership, with a focus on meeting the needs of urban Indigenous children, impacted the involved community. Implications for improving urban Indigenous education through collaborative, field-based teacher preparation signified community driven change to attain equal and postcolonial systems of education; these implications are organized in the following subsections: (a) Changes in TLLSC, (b) Changes in teacher preparation, and (c) Changes in policy and practice.

**Changes in Teaching, Learning, and Leading with Schools and Communities**

In Chapter II, I proposed that a successful, sustainable Kateri-TLLSC partnership must uphold Kruger and colleagues’ (2009) tenets of (a) trust, “the commitment and expertise that each of the main stakeholders – preservice teachers, teachers, teacher educators – brings to the partnership in the expectation that it will provide them with the benefits each seeks,” (b) mutuality, “the extent to which the stakeholders recognise that working together does lead to the benefits each esteems,” and (c) reciprocity, “each stakeholder recognises and values what the others bring to the partnership” (p. 10) as they apply to Indigenous communities seeking to advance postcolonialism in partnership with non-Indigenous organizations. Findings indicated a need for structural change within the
Kateri-TLLSC partnership to improve the level of sustainability, mutuality, and reciprocity (Kruger et al., 2009), and that doing so would enhance the candidates’ experiences and understandings of urban Indigenous education.

The most apparent and perhaps most significant recommended change was to increase the time spent at Kateri. For the Kateri-TLLSC partnership to continue, modules paired with Kateri should hold each session at Kateri rather than meeting primarily on campus. In doing so, candidates would spend more time engaged with Indigenous peoples and as a result gain greater understandings of Indigenous cultures and urban Indigenous education. Findings also suggested that experiences with Indigenous peoples should expand beyond Kateri into Indigenous homes and other community organizations. Such expansions would require TLLSC faculty to re-envision the roles of community partners, outside of formal organizations, in preparing candidates for the needs of urban Indigenous children, their families, and the greater community.

Expanding the time spent at Kateri and other Indigenous settings with community partners was complicated by the TLLSC summer semester timeline. With each module lasting approximately one week, candidates lacked prolonged engagement in any setting. To foster mutuality and a respect for the assets urban Indigenous communities possess (Battiste, 2000), TLLSC faculty must reconsider the structure of sequences completed during summer semesters. Redesigning the TLLSC accelerated summer graduate level program for initial teacher certification could potentially strengthen the partnership and improve candidates’ experiences with urban Indigenous communities—thus recognizing the assets of urban Indigenous communities pertinent to decolonizing school structures
(Battiste, 2000) and increasing the level of mutuality and reciprocity within the Kateri-TLLSC partnership.

**Changes in Teacher Preparation**

Indigenous peoples hold a responsibility to enact systemic change in our nations' schools to better serve Indigenous children. Findings from this study illustrated the potential of urban Indigenous community-university partnerships for teacher preparation as one approach towards improved Indigenous education. For collaborative, field-based teacher preparation to succeed and sustain with urban Indigenous communities, universities must rethink the structure of their teacher preparation programs. University faculty must dedicate time to sustain mutually beneficial partnerships with Indigenous communities, which require long-term commitments from faculty to gain respect from and access to urban Indigenous organizations. Long-term commitments and ongoing relationships between Indigenous community organizations and universities are made difficult with increased expectations of university faculty, and large numbers of part-time faculty who are often less involved in partnership development and under compensated for the work they do. To support faculty members’ involvement in partnerships with Indigenous communities, university leadership must provide the necessary time and resources to uphold mutuality and reciprocity.

Field-based teacher preparation, such as the model depicted in this study, holds great potential in addressing community needs and improving birth-to-grade-12 (B-12) education. By holding teacher preparation courses in partnership with communities and schools, located in field-sites instead of on university campuses, universities addressed the gap between teacher preparation and classroom practices (Oakes et al., 2002; Ryan et
al., 2014); and candidates gained authentic experiences with diverse communities while accessing university resources and support from teacher educators (Zeichner, 2010). Additionally, time spent practicing in the field prior to entering the profession created a safe place for candidates to navigate the complexities of teaching (Ball & Cohen, 1999). While the literature supported field-based models for improved teacher preparation, the aforementioned research did not address the particular needs of urban Indigenous communities or the significance of collaboration in such models.

Despite the growing presence of field-based teacher preparation programs around the U.S. (Zeichner, 2010), successful community-university partnerships require expanded space for community voice (Rickstock & Pennel, 1996), with university faculty considering who are valued stakeholders in teacher preparation (Clare & Sampsel, 2013; Kruger et al., 2009; Murrell, 2000). For teacher preparation programs to sanction change in Indigenous education, they must embrace community partners’ active role in fostering candidates’ understandings around teaching Indigenous children (Clare & Sampsel, 2013)—thus, faculty must value Indigenous knowledges and ways of being, as defined in Chapter IV and more broadly described by Brayboy and Maughan (2009).

Valuing Indigenous communities’ knowledges and cultures as important assets in teacher preparation will require universities to change the structure of their programming and underlying beliefs of faculty members as the holders of information. My findings put forth that community partners have a responsibility to support teachers’ understandings around Indigenous knowledges, cultures, languages, and histories. This would require changes in university curricula and instructional methods. Indigenous community members hold information candidates need to better serve urban Indigenous children;
thus, university-based teacher preparation programs will need to include community partners as valued resources in preparing candidates for Indigenous education. By developing teacher preparation curricula inclusive of Indigenous content and in collaboration with Indigenous communities, university administrators and faculty members may act as allies and leaders in issues of Indigenous education.

**Changes in Policy and Practice**

Findings from this study suggested that decreased standardization in teaching and teacher preparation would make room for increased cultural responsiveness and community voice. These findings depicted Indigenous community partners’ appeal for changes in the way teachers serve urban Indigenous children. Additionally, documented achievement discrepancies between Indigenous children and their Anglo peers (NCES, 2012a) presented in Chapter I made clear that U.S. schools are not working for Indigenous children. However, localized Indigenous community efforts and systemic reform in teacher preparation are not solely responsible for improving Indigenous education; changes in educational policies, and subsequently instructional practices, must work to support established efforts to improve Indigenous children’s educational experiences. In this study, I identified ways in which teachers may better serve their urban Indigenous children through community collaboration, but I did not address the broader policy initiatives impeding such efforts.

Accreditation standards and increased monitoring at the state and federal levels have impacted teacher preparation reform efforts (AACTE, 2014). Federally mandated rating systems for higher education aligned with PK-12 value added measures based on standardized test scores, and favored enrollment of candidates eligible for financial aide
without increased funding (U.S. Department of Education, 2014). With increased measures of federal regulation, teacher preparation is at risk of becoming increasingly systematic, undermining the “hard-won progress of current teacher preparation program reform efforts” (AACTE, 2014). Elevated levels of standardization and accountability, and a mandate to increase enrollment of low-income candidates without subsidies, hold the potential to minimize community involvement in teacher preparation and further escalate the regulation of university curricula.

Directly impacting Indigenous children, educational policies such as No Child Left Behind (NCLB) and Common Core State Standards (CCSS) have increased standardization in teaching (Au, 2011; McCarty, 2009; Papola-Ellis, 2014; Patrick, 2008) and teacher preparation (Cochran-Smith, 2005; Selwyn, 2007). Such standardization resulted in rigid classroom practices, using “English standardized tests as the sole measure of proficiency” (McCarty, 2008, p. 2) and diminished culturally relevant practices and programming offered to Indigenous children (Patrick, 2008). These policy initiatives and subsequent assimilative school practices resulted in Indigenous children’s reduced school success and increased dropout rates (Reyhner & Hurtado, 2008).

Policy makers and school leaders must support educational initiatives, inclusive of Indigenous communities, with funding to benefit urban Indigenous education. Currently, school funding sources and accreditation are tied to standardization of curriculum and assessment, which impede efforts to include Indigenous cultural programming in public education (Lomawaima & McCarty, 2002; Patrick, 2008). I conclude that resources must be made available for Indigenous community partners to support the development of candidates and practices of teachers around better serving
urban Indigenous children, calling for redistribution of funding streams from standardization reforms to community driven reforms. Chicago has not received substantial funding for urban Indigenous education since the mid 1970s; the numbers of programs serving Chicago’s Indigenous children have consequently decreased and those that maintain have struggled to endure with donations and volunteers (U.S. Department of Education, 2012). For Indigenous community partners to take an active role in teacher preparation, working to advance the quality of education for urban Indigenous children, funding for reform must be allocated to community-school-university collaboration efforts.

In doing so, schools, teacher preparation programs, and Indigenous communities may address the knowledge and skills necessary to serve urban Indigenous children. Montana’s Indian Education for All (Carjuzaa, et al., 2010) serves as an example of one such policy change that, in partnership with tribal communities, included Indigenous peoples in school curriculum—working to improve Indigenous education statewide. Additionally the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) American Indian Education standards for economics, geography, health mathematics, language arts, physical, and social studies education (Bureau of Indian Affairs, 1998) offer both teacher educators and classroom teachers with a framework for integrating Indigenous education into national standards for K-12 curriculum. With policy changes made to value Indigenous Knowledge Systems (Brayboy & Maughan, 2009) of individual communities, schools may upturn the historical and ongoing hegemonic structures that accept western knowledge as superior to Indigenous knowledge—thus evolving a postcolonial education system (Battiste, 2000).
**Directions for Future Research**

My research with the Kateri-TLLSC partnership examined the impact of the partnership on Indigenous community partners, explored their ideas of what teachers need to know to serve urban Indigenous children, and what roles Indigenous community members may have in collaborative, field-based teacher preparation. As disclosed above, the findings of this study indicated necessary changes to the structure of TLLSC, teacher preparation at large, and educational policy and practices to improve the educational experiences of urban Indigenous children. This section describes four proposed directions of future research for improved urban Indigenous education.

**Non-Indigenous Understandings of Indigenous Knowledge Systems**

Due to the scope of this study, I focused my research on community perspectives of collaborative, field-based teacher preparation. Findings identified six necessary understandings for teachers of urban Indigenous children, which were closely aligned with Brayboy and Maughan’s (2009) Indigenous Knowledge Systems. Future research should examine how non-Indigenous candidates make sense of Indigenous Knowledge Systems, and how they are able to utilize these understandings in practice with urban Indigenous children. Urban Indigenous education is vastly under-researched and examining how primarily non-indigenous teachers can serve the distinct needs of Indigenous children from diverse tribal Nations may improve their school experiences.

**Sustainable, Mutually Beneficial Partnerships**

This study worked to address the dearth of literature around community-university partnerships for teacher preparation with urban Indigenous communities. My findings made clear that community partners recognized a need for taking an active role
in preparing candidates and supporting practicing teachers to better serve urban Indigenous children. Future studies must continue to examine how partnerships, such as Kateri-TLLSC, may benefit urban Indigenous communities. I propose that continuing to employ the same projects (e.g. asset mapping) with the same community partners serves the needs of candidates, but will not uphold mutuality within the partnership. Research focused on how to sustain partnerships that serve the needs of all stakeholders is vital to successful community-university collaboration for improved Indigenous education and teacher preparation.

**Universities and Indigenous Self-Determination**

Grounded in IPT (Battiste, 2000), I questioned how each aspect of this study upheld or dismantled power structures between an Indigenous community organization and a non-Indigenous university. I considered the greater goals of collaborative teacher preparation as an avenue to self-determination through self-education. My findings supported the potential for collaborations, such as Kateri-TLLSC, to create space for community voice in teacher preparation, thus gaining community control over the educational experiences of urban Indigenous children. That said, future research must examine how non-Indigenous universities may contribute to efforts of self-determination and postcolonialism. With universities representing colonial education structures, I ask how can they contribute to the dismantling of a system they work to uphold and advance?

**Language Preservation and Revitalization**

Findings of this study identified Indigenous languages as necessary understandings for teachers of urban Indigenous children, putting forth that candidates must value and respect Indigenous languages as an important cultural asset of urban
Indigenous communities. Community partners believed that through English only school policies, government officials purposefully prohibited their language in an effort to diminish Indigenous cultures. While these findings depicted the importance of preservation and revitalization of Indigenous languages in urban contexts, future research should examine the use of Indigenous languages and Indigenous language programming in urban communities. Chicago’s Indigenous community organizations occasionally offer Indigenous language workshops and they aim to include programming for various languages to serve the needs of a tribally diverse community. Research around these types of efforts is needed to understand how Indigenous languages may be revitalized and preserved in tribally diverse settings where multiple languages are represented.

**Reflections**

I made the decision to pursue a research agenda around urban Indigenous education the first semester of my doctoral studies. This decision was purposeful and directly connected to my Odawa lineage and the school experiences of my grandmother and ancestors. I was committed to learning more about the history of Indigenous education and positive approaches to address the struggles currently faced by Indigenous children in U.S. public schools. Throughout the past four years, a particular memory has driven this work and inspired me to complete my dissertation study and move forward in my contributions to Indigenous education. I remember my grandmother telling me that she taught herself to read; she said her teachers would not teach her, so she taught herself. As a child this seemed unbelievable. I thought, how could my grandma teach herself to read? And, why would a teacher deny her literacy?
My grandmother never mentioned her racial background in telling her stories, but as an adult immersed in research around Indigenous education I know why her teacher refused to believe in her ability to read or her right to do so. I also know that my grandmother’s parents, their parents, and all of my relations since European colonization experienced at best, instances like my grandmother’s and more often, much worse. My great aunts and uncle depict varying accounts of miseducation, as multicultural children in a time when U.S. schools openly favored Anglo children. I learned that my great-great-grandfather, John Willis, attended Carlisle Indian Industrial School, which was detailed in Chapter I as leading the nation’s effort to “kill the Indian and save the man” (Pratt, 1892, p. 261). Nellie Webster-Willis, my great-great-grandmother, and all of her children were enrolled at Mt. Pleasant Indian Industrial School, which replicated an environment of forced assimilation fostered in Indian boarding schools of the time. These few accounts of educational wrongdoings as told by my ancestors and the continuation of poor schooling for Indigenous children told in Chapter IV of this study were atrocious. However, Indigenous peoples overcome these offenses. My grandmother taught herself to read; her grandparents maintained their language, culture, and raised an Odawa family in spite of their time spent at Carlisle and Mt. Pleasant Indian Industrial Schools; and the community partners in this study believed their children could find success through education.

Through my doctoral journey I have learned the strength of Indigeneity. I believe that all I do in my life is connected to the seven generations before me and the seven generations to come. In this, Indigenous peoples have the power to make change—change in their relationships with non-Indigenous communities, change in how their
children are taught and treated in systems of education and beyond, and change in
government structures that uphold systemic oppression. Indigenous peoples have the
power to create a postcolonial state, one that values diversity and offers equal opportunity
for all children. I am confident that as Indigenous peoples, in collaboration with non-
Indigenous allies, the educational experiences and futures of our Indigenous children will
occur in a postcolonial state. With these aspirations, I conclude this dissertation in the
words of Tatanka-Lyotanka (Sitting Bull), “Let us put our minds together and see what
life we can make for our children.”
APPENDIX A

DISSERTATION RECRUITMENT SCRIPT
Hello, my name is Anna Lees. I am an Odawa descendent, Little Traverse Bay Band, and a Loyola University Chicago student. As part of my dissertation, I am researching how Kateri Center’s partnership with Loyola students to support their understanding of how to teach urban Indigenous children impacts the Kateri community.

I am asking for you to partner with a Loyola professor to help graduate students understand needs of Chicago’s Indigenous community and identify resources that can support the community’s needs. During your time with graduate students, you may also share what it means to be Indigenous off reservation and what they should know and be able to do when teaching Indigenous children in urban schools.

Apart from working with graduate students, I ask that you allow me to observe the interactions. You will also be invited to participate in a focus group discussion before and after your time with the Loyola students. The focus groups will be a time to discuss how the partnership with Loyola affects you during Kateri Center activities. If the focus group does not help you to share your ideas, I can arrange a one-to-one interview instead. Focus group sessions will last about one hour and interviews will last about one half hour. You can choose to participate in the focus group, the interview, or both, but all participants will be involved in observations. All information collected during observations, focus groups, and interviews will exclude your personal information, focus groups and interviews will be recorded and transcribed.

After you are finished working with Loyola students, I will share what I am learning with you and ask for your input about the how the partnership impacted the Kateri Center community and what went well or what should be changed in the future.

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. You can choose to participate or stop participating at anytime. You can choose to share as much or as little information about your experience as you like, my goal is only to learn how the partnership impacts the Kateri community.

Do you have any questions about this research study?

If you are interested in participating, I will provide a consent form and arrange a time for our first focus group or interview at the Kateri Center.

If you have any questions later on you may reach me by email at amorrish@luc.edu or by phone at 231-818-6526.
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CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH
Consent to Participate in Research

**Project Title:** A University-Community Partnership: Collaborating to Improve Teacher Preparation for an Urban Indigenous Community  
**Researcher(s):** Anna Lees  
**Faculty Sponsor:** Dr. Amy J. Heineke

**Introduction:**
You are being asked to take part in a research study being conducted by Anna Lees for a dissertation under the supervision of Dr. Amy J. Heineke in the Department of Curriculum & Instruction at Loyola University of Chicago (Loyola).

You are being asked to participate because you are an Indigenous community member involved with the Kateri Center of Chicago interested in improving the educational experiences of urban Indigenous children. Your involvements with the Kateri Center of Chicago and experiences as an Indigenous person residing in an urban area provide you with knowledge to share with teacher candidates learning how to serve urban Indigenous children. Your agreement to collaborate with Loyola University Chicago faculty members to prepare teacher candidates to serve the needs of diverse children provides you with understandings to share around the impact of the partnership on the Kateri Center of Chicago community.

Please read this form carefully and ask any questions you may have before deciding whether to participate in the study.

**Purpose:**
The purpose of this study is to gain information regarding the impact of the Kateri Center of Chicago’s partnership with Loyola University Chicago’s Teaching, Learning, and Leading with Schools and Communities teacher preparation program on the Kateri Center of Chicago community. This study aims to gather information about what you believe teacher candidates need to understand about Indigenous cultures to serve urban Indigenous children and how your experiences in the partnership impact the Kateri Center of Chicago community.

**Procedures:**
If you agree to be in the study, you will be asked to:

- Participate in two focus group discussions where Kateri Center of Chicago participants will discuss what knowledge and skills teachers need to serve Indigenous children. Focus group sessions will occur before and after your involvement with teacher candidates and each focus group will last approximately one hour. Focus group discussions will be held at the Kateri Center of Chicago and will be audio taped and transcribed for analysis.
- Participate in a one-on-one interview if you have more information to share about your experiences in the partnership activities that the focus group did not address or if you find that you are more comfortable sharing your thoughts in a private setting rather than a focus group. Interviews will be held at the Kateri Center of Chicago.
Chicago and will last approximately 30 minutes. Interviews will occur one time after each focus group discussion. You may elect to participate in the focus group, but deny an invitation to participate in an interview without consequence. You may also choose to participate in an interview without participating in the focus group. Interviews will be audio taped and transcribed for analysis.

- The researcher will observe all participants during all partnership activities. Observations will focus on interactions between participants and teacher candidates to gain information about how the partnership impacts the Kateri Center of Chicago community.

**Risks/Benefits:**
There are no foreseeable risks involved in participating in this research beyond those experienced in everyday life.

There are no direct benefits to you from participation, but the results may impact the school experiences of urban Indigenous children by preparing teacher candidates to understand the particular needs and resources of Chicago’s Indigenous community.

**Compensation:**
One $20.00 Visa gift cards will be provided for each participant at the conclusion of this study. Gift cards will be given to each participant who actively engages with teacher candidates during their time at the Kateri Center of Chicago, participates in each focus group discussion and/or interview. Additionally, meals and beverages will be provided during the focus group discussions.

**Confidentiality:**
- Observations, focus group transcriptions, and interview transcriptions will be coded so that no names appear on any documentation. Pseudonyms will be used in place of legal names and will not align with any participant characteristics to protect anonymity.
- Audio files from focus groups and interviews will be saved to a USB flash drive and uploaded to a transcription software program on the researcher’s computer. Files will be discarded immediately after they are transcribed and the researcher will remove any personal information that would disclose the identity of the participants from transcriptions. At the conclusion of the research, transcriptions will be destroyed.

**Voluntary Participation:**
Participation in this study is voluntary. If you do not want to be in this study, you do not have to participate. Even if you decide to participate, you are free not to answer any question or to withdraw from participation at any time without penalty.

**Contacts and Questions:**
If you have questions about this research study, please feel free to contact Anna Lees at 231-818-6526 or amorrish@luc.edu, or Dr. Amy J. Heineke at 312-915-7027 or aheineke@luc.edu.
If you have questions about your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Loyola University Office of Research Services at (773) 508-2689.

**Statement of Consent:**
Your signature below indicates that you have read the information provided above, have had an opportunity to ask questions, and agree to participate in this research study. You will be given a copy of this form to keep for your records.

Please indicate which aspects of this study you wish to be involved in:

[ ] I agree to be included in observations during partnership activities

[ ] I agree to partake in focus groups before and after partnership activities.

[ ] I agree to be partake in interviews before and after partnership activities.

Participant’s Signature __________________ Date __________

Researcher’s Signature __________________ Date __________
APPENDIX C

SAMPLE FOCUS GROUP PROTOCOL
Sample Focus Group Protocol

- Will you share your thoughts on teaching urban Indigenous students?
- What do you think teachers should know about Indigenous cultures for children to have good school experiences?
  - How can non-Indigenous teachers support urban Indigenous children?
- Should Indigenous people be involved in supporting non-Indigenous teachers?
  - How?
  - How do you view yourself in helping teacher candidates?
  - What can you teach them?
- Will you share your thoughts about working with the Loyola graduate students/faculty?
  - How has it impacted you?
  - How has it impacted Kateri? (events, activities, luncheons, services)
  - Are there parts of the partnership you like? Don’t like?
  - Did anything surprise you?
- What do you think/how do you feel about having Loyola Graduate students/faculty come to Kateri?
  - Is there anything else you would like to discuss?
APPENDIX D

SAMPLE INTERVIEW PROTOCOL
Sample Interview Protocol

- Can you tell me more about what we discussed in the focus group?

- What do you think is most important for teachers to learn about Indigenous cultures?
  
  - Do you think you should be supporting their understanding of urban Indigenous cultures? Why? How?

How do you think non-Indigenous teachers can support Indigenous children?

How do you feel about working with Loyola graduate students? What about the faculty?

How do you feel about the Loyola graduate students spending time at Kateri?

What about the faculty?

What do you like best about partnering with Loyola?

What are your least favorite parts of partnering with Loyola?

Is there anything else you would like to share?
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