Indigenous Family Engagement: Strong Families, Strong Nations

M. Bang, C. Montaño Nolan, and N. McDaid-Morgan

Contents

Introduction 2
Historical Overview of Family Engagement Research 4
The Rise of Family Engagement Policy 5
Refusing Settler-Colonial Enclosure 6
  Racism, Invisibility, and Exclusion 6
  Tokenism and Inclusion 8
  False Decision-Making: Railroading and Rubber Stamping 9
Resurgence in the Everydayness of Families 9
  Renewing and Remembering Roles, Relations, and Responsibilities with Lands, Waters, and More-than-Humans 11
  Renewing and Remembering Relationships Across the Life Span 12
  Reimagining Relationships with Non-Indigenous Educators and Systems 16
  Impacts of Indigenous Family Engagement on Academic Outcomes 16
Implications and Conclusions 17
References 19

Abstract

In this chapter we argue for amplifying and renewing Indigenous family leadership and engagement in systems of education that aim to support Indigenous communities' resurgence. Families are the heart of Indigenous nations and communities. For many Indigenous people and communities, families include all of our relations – reflecting multiple generations, extended family, other community members, more-than-humans, and the lands and waters of our homes. While forms of everyday resistance and resurgence are enacted by Indigenous families and communities, systems of education for Indigenous children and youth often remain sites of trauma, assault, and aims of Indigenous

M. Bang (✉) · C. Montaño Nolan · N. McDaid-Morgan
College of Education, University of Washington, Seattle, WA, USA
e-mail: mbang3@uw.edu; mbang3@u.washington.edu; nolanc3@uw.edu; nikkimcm@uw.edu

© Springer Nature Singapore Pte Ltd. 2018

E. A. McKinley, L. T. Smith (eds.), *Handbook of Indigenous Education*,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-1839-8_74-1

erasures. Much work has been done by Indigenous scholars and allies to challenge hegemonic and settler colonial agendas in education and to assert Indigenous families and communities as changemakers reshaping education toward thriving Indigenous futures. This chapter synthesizes across literature on Indigenous family engagement to argue for (1) the need for continued assertions of Indigenous families' and communities' ways of knowing and being; (2) engaging Indigenous families and communities as dreamers, nation-builders, and future elders; and (3) engaging promising strategies for reimagining and cultivating family-community-school relationships.

Keywords
Indigenous education · Indigenous families · Family engagement · School-community partnerships · Settler-colonialism · Indigenous resurgence

Introduction

Families are the heart of Indigenous nations and communities. For many Indigenous people and communities, families include all of our relations – reflecting multiple generations, extended family, other community members, more-than-humans, and the lands and waters of our homes. Indigenous familial relationships have a wide geography and reflect Indigenous knowledge systems as they unfold in everydayness (Corntassel and Scow 2017). Families are the archetype for Indigenous nations and often reflect a complex web of interdependence between all things. Families are the primary contexts in which Indigenous children learn who they are, Indigenous ways of knowing, and what is expected of them as they become adults and eventually become good elders. In this way, the strength and well-being of Indigenous families are fundamental to the strength and well-being of Indigenous nations. Given this perspective, we suggest the everydayness of Indigenous families' lives is perhaps the sites in which the most radical and hopeful possibilities for Indigenous resurgence and futures can and do unfold (Simpson 2011; Corntassel and Scow 2017).

While the centrality of Indigenous families to Indigenous nationhood may seem straightforward enough, it also is the reason that settler-colonial nation-states have routinely created and enacted policies across generations intended to dismantle, disrupt, or assimilate Indigenous peoples through forced changes in familial structures and relations (e.g., Muir and Bohr 2014; Sarche and Whitesell 2012). Although the well-known insidious strategies like forced attendance to boarding schools have subsided, policies intended to intervene in and reshape familial relationships continue to be widespread. Examples include compulsory attendance laws, high rates of foster care, legal guardianship instead of kinship, and age segregation in classrooms, among others. Additionally, forced removal from traditional homelands, policies that restrict access to land and water to engage in traditional harvesting and hunting practices, or legislation preventing Indigenous spiritual practices have intended to sever human relationships with land, waters, and more-than-humans – relations central to Indigenous families. These impacts on movement and activity are further

entrenched by the curricular aims of much of schooling. Mainstream curriculum and pedagogy contributes to and perpetuates settler-colonial narratives of Indigenous erasure, conquest, and dispossession (e.g., Calderon 2014; Grande 2004; Shear et al. 2015; Tuck and Gaztambide-Fernández 2013).

Evolving from this history, Indigenous family engagement and leadership in schools is again a focus in policy and practice wherein family engagement in schools is being mandated, measured, and resourced to reflect particular stances and goals. While this is true across the globe to a great extent, in this piece we will primarily focus on dynamics connected to the United States in which family engagement paradigms largely remain a one-size-fits-all assimilative demand modeled after White, middle-class forms of engagement and practices. However, there has been a swell of research on Indigenous family engagement from Indigenous peoples across the earth that can provide important resistance to and redirection of dominant family engagement strategies that perpetuate settler-colonial aims and histories. Our goal in this piece is to articulate a framework – rooted in a critical review of the literature – for Indigenous family leadership in systems of education that cultivate cultural and intellectual vibrancy and contribute to Indigenous collective well-being. As Indigenous and mixed-race mothers of children in US schools, former classroom educators in pre K-12 settings, and as scholars of education, we [authors] recognize that our histories and experiences shape our analysis of the literature and our hopes and dreams for our family and community well-being and the kinds of roles we might play in family leadership and educational transformation. A challenge for us is always to both dream and contribute to birthing resurgences and Indigenous futures – an elsewhere to the current settler-colonial forms and systems of education – as well as to account for the here-and-now enclosures. It is our hope that the stories, analyses, and recommendations here resonate with Indigenous families globally and contribute to heterogeneous and locally nuanced forms of family leadership and engagement that contribute to Indigenous well-being and educational justice.

We begin our review by situating mainstream family engagement as a research-policy-practice field within a broader settler-colonial agenda. Here we unpack mainstream constructions of family engagement and how it impacts Indigenous families today. Secondly, we explicate several dimensions of enclosure that Indigenous families face when attempting to transform schools and systems. This section is divided into three main findings: (1) racism, invisibility, and exclusion of Indigenous families in school, (2) tokenism and inclusion toward Whiteness in transactional family engagement paradigms, and (3) inauthentic decision-making processes based on onboarding to school agendas and fostering compliance. By explicitly naming these enclosures, we hope to highlight the difference between assimilative forms of family engagement and the promising forms of Indigenous resurgence enacted by families in the everyday. In the third section, we explicitly focus on promising practices and everyday resurgence in families and beyond. In this section we highlight four main facets of family engagement that contribute to Indigenous resurgence: (1) learning from and with our lands, waters, and more-than-humans is integral to Indigenous family engagement, (2) multigenerational and lifelong learning are integral to Indigenous education and therefore foundational for Indigenous family engagement, (3) relationships and collaboration with non-Indigenous

educators and systems need new forms of partnership that recognize and cultivate everyday Indigenous resurgence; and (4) equitable and transformative collaboration with families leads to rigorous academics and higher achievement for Indigenous students. Broadly, our findings call for the need for continued assertions of Indigenous families' and communities' ways of knowing and being to combat colonial enclosures. Beyond these forms of resistance, we also find the need to open imaginative and creative spaces in which Indigenous families and communities are engaged as dreamers, nation-builders, and future elders. Finally we suggest schools and other educational institutions need to develop new forms of family-community-school partnerships.

Historical Overview of Family Engagement Research

Since the 1960s, parent involvement and family engagement have been explicitly articulated as broad sweeping reform efforts to improve education (Ishimaru et al. 2016). Normative parent involvement literature suggests that increasing parent engagement increases the educational attainment of students (e.g., Epstein 1987; Epstein and Sheldon 2002; Henderson and Mapp 2002). Much of this research, however, focuses on particular practices that are normative to White, middle-class families. These include volunteerism, fundraising, and practicing "school" at home by reading or helping with homework, among others. Power, race, language, and gender are implicated in much of this work but are often silent. In the late 1990s and early 2000s, the rhetoric and policy impacts of parent involvement and family engagement began to address the particular "challenges" of engaging racially and ethnically distinct populations. For example, handbooks on parent involvement were published with chapters pertaining to different racial groups, including "Native" parents (e.g., Berger 2000; Butterfield and Pepper 1991; Redding et al. 2011).

Specific to Indigenous families, the Indian Nations at Risk Task Force (INART), a division of the Department of Education in Washington, D.C., published a landmark report in 1991 on the state of US parent involvement in education and appropriate strategies for ensuring American Indian and Alaska Native (AI/AN) parental participation in schools (Butterfield and Pepper 1991). This report reviewed 100 citations relevant to parent involvement and AI/AN education, including hearings and public testimonies. Like many reports of the time, it included a set of barriers to participation including unwelcoming school climates, differences between home and school cultures, and parental behaviors that may hinder participation such as alcohol abuse, dysfunction, and violence. Unlike many parent involvement handbooks of the time, the INART report critically examined the role schools played in harming Indigenous communities through boarding schools and removal of children from families and recognized how this history contributes both to the skepticism of AI/AN parents toward educational systems and to systemic health and economic disparities (Butterfield and Pepper 1991). Recommendations from this report tended to propose culturally responsive adaptations to normative

practices for AI/AN families but had not yet started to address differences in knowledge systems or to question purposes of family engagement in education.

Within the broader field of parent involvement and family engagement, critical race scholars were also calling attention to deficit constructions and assimilative demands, as well as their consequences, of parent involvement paradigms (e.g., Delgado and Stefancic 2000; Howard and Navarro 2016; Ladson-Billings and Tate 1995; Solorzano 1998). For example, in a persuasive handbook chapter, Baquedano-López et al. (2013) detail the deleterious ways that parents of color are forced to either assimilate to normative schooling *and child-rearing* practices or be labeled as deficient parents. The consequences of these choices on parents of color impact not only educational opportunities for children and youth but often impact familial and community abilities to organize themselves in culturally appropriate and sustaining ways. Furthermore, while critical race scholars have paid careful attention to the classed, gendered, and racialized rhetoric and practices that figure centrally in parent involvement and family engagement, they do not consider the ways that settler-colonialism and the dispossession of Indigenous peoples from their homelands also figures centrally into education and family engagement. Indigenous families and communities continue to be positioned into having to choose between either participating as compliance officers for schools enacting settler-colonial agendas or being positioned as deficient, deviant, or uncaring. Indeed this choice is reflective of a long-standing paradigm in which generations of Indigenous children were removed from their families and placed in foster care. While the Indian Child Welfare Act is designed to stop the removal of Native children from Native families, Native children remain significantly overrepresented in the foster care system reflecting the ongoing disruption to thriving Indigenous families (e.g., White 2017). The characterizations and perceptions of school systems with respect to child-rearing are a critical factor in this ongoing dynamic.

The Rise of Family Engagement Policy

Family engagement is becoming increasingly scaled and mandated through legislation in North America. For example, within the United States, the Every Student Succeeds Act [ESSA] requires Title 1 schools (those serving low-income students), including Bureau of Indian Education (BIE) schools, to have a *written* family engagement policy and to enact it (NCLB 2002; Henderson 2016). This includes funding for family engagement outreach and programs of at least 1% of Title 1 funds received by the district. Schools are required to seek family input on how those funds will be used to support family engagement and evaluate the efficacy of those programs and practices.

These policies arise amid a preponderance of “gap gazing” (Gutiérrez 2008) research that focuses on the disparities and barriers facing students and families of color, including Indigenous families. Couched in this ever-increasing demand for high-stakes accountability and measures to combat the “achievement gap” is a push for normalizing White and middle-class epistemologies as the standard upon which to measure Indigenous students (Gutiérrez 2008; Villegas 2009) and families.

These standards promote individuality, meritocracy, capitalism, and consumerism as desirable outcomes of education that perpetuate settler-colonial logics of land as a material resource and assimilation as progress (Villegas 2009). Federal policy and school adoption of family engagement has been shaped by settler notions of family, success, and education; however, because decisions about family engagement and funding are left to individual schools, we think there is potential to shape everyday implementation toward Indigenous futurity.

Through our analysis of the literature, we argue that Indigenous family leadership in schools requires attending to the political dimensions of how family engagement is framed, legislated, funded, and enacted as well as to the everyday resurgence of Indigenous families that contribute to the lived experiences and wellness of our families, communities, and nations. So far we have attended to the political enclosures and opportunities happening at national scales. In the next section, we highlight the enclosures faced by Indigenous families routinely in and by schools.

Refusing Settler-Colonial Enclosure

Equitable and transformative partnerships between schools, families, and communities require collaboration and shared decision-making practices. This means enacting reciprocal relationships between stakeholders where families and community members are seen as teachers with perspectives that matter (Murphy and Pushor 2004). Unfortunately, the literature we reviewed was rife with examples where settler paradigms slipped into and enclosed (Richardson 2011) even the most well-intentioned family engagement models (e.g., Lipka 1986). In this section we explicate some of the enclosures typical across the literature including racism, tokenism, and railroading.

Racism, Invisibility, and Exclusion

Racism and stereotypes about Indigenous families are common challenges found in the literature we reviewed that spanned across time and places (e.g., Butterfield and Pepper 1991; Coleman-Dimon 2000; Davis 1988; Herzog et al. 2016; Kaomea 2012). In interactions with non-Indigenous educators and school systems, Indigenous families and students face low expectations (Kaomea 2012), stereotypes about cultural practices and beliefs (Kaomea 2012; Lea et al. 2011; Robinson-Zañartu and Majel-Dixon 1996), and systemic barriers to participation in schools (Friedel 1999). In one of the very few large-scale quantitative studies with Indigenous families, 234 families representing 55 tribes were surveyed about their satisfaction with and perceived efficacy of public, BIE, and tribal schools in the United States. Resoundingly, families expressed their frustration with public and BIE schools, citing disrespect of Indigenous families and a deep concern over the lack of presence of Indigenous cultures in their children's formal educational experiences (Robinson-Zañartu and Majel-Dixon 1996). Tribal schools were viewed more favorably except in the area of special education. When this study was replicated 10 years later, results

had not changed (Herzog et al. 2016). Many of the participants made comments that the administrators or teachers did not, in fact, want Native parent involvement (Herzog et al. 2016; Robinson-Zañartu and Majel-Dixon 1996). This form of exclusion occurs regularly for Indigenous families, particularly when they do not participate in school-sanctioned ways (e.g., compliance). Friedel (1999) writes:

> Public schools, like residential schools, tend to remain closed to Native parents; they continue to exist as isolated 'islands' outside the community. Where residential schools might be viewed as cultural invasion, perhaps public schools can be seen as 'cultural occupation.' In both cases parents remain on the outside looking in. (p. 142)

In addition to overt racism and exclusion, Indigenous families and students face invisibility within schooling curricula and pedagogy (Hare 2012; Garcia 2014; Kaomea 2012). This invisibility perpetuates non-Indigenous educator perceptions of Indigenous parents as having deficient parenting skills and a lack of interest in children's education. However, there has been excellent research that examines and contrasts family and community-based practices with those of schools to demonstrate the problem is not about deficiency or interest but one of visibility. For example, Hare (2012) studied the family literacy practices in five Anishinaabe Head Start centers in Canada and compared them to school literacy practices. She notes that oral history, being on the land, and engaging in ceremony all contribute to the developing literacy practices of Indigenous children that shape how they see and make sense of the world. In particular, Hare argues that reading and renewing relationships with land are important literacy practices of Indigenous communities that are most often overlooked when schools assess the capabilities of Indigenous students and families. She writes:

> Young indigenous children learn to interpret their environment and understand the significance of place, territory and landscape through land-based pedagogies, which emphasize stories, specific teachings, observation and experiential learning. They are 'reading their world' and, in doing so, learning their histories, ideologies and identities. (p. 407)

In this compelling example, family practices and land-based education practices that support Indigenous children's learning and identity development are both missing and invisible in formal schooling practices. Further, we suggest that these practices and forms of learning are reflective of Indigenous knowledge systems. While educators may not explicitly subscribe to western supremacy and assimilation, dynamics of erasure and invisibility are nonetheless reflective of these historicized dynamics and create school contexts that enact forms of ontological and epistemological violence (e.g., Moreton-Robinson 2011; Marker 2006). However, it is also critical to note that these dynamics do not lead to practices and solutions defined by unexamined forms of multicultural inclusion.

Tokenism and Inclusion

Overwhelmingly, the literature demonstrated that non-Indigenous educators and administrators often lack an understanding of the history of schooling with respect to Indigenous communities or the ways in which schools continue to be shaped by and reflect settler-colonial agendas. Further, much of the literature demonstrated that educators are rarely adequately prepared to engage Indigenous learners in culturally responsive ways (e.g., Castagno and Brayboy 2008). This phenomena has been explored broadly but also with respect to Indigenous knowledge systems (e.g., Barnhardt and Kawagley 2005; Battiste 2002; Deloria and Wildcat 2001), Indigenous science (e.g., Cajete 2000), and literacy education (e.g., Archibald 2008; Freire 1970) among other specific foci. This is uniquely consequential in urban areas where not only are educators ill-prepared to support Indigenous students but Indigenous students may also find themselves socially isolated in dominant-majority classrooms and communities left to navigate racialized dynamics without a peer group (e.g., Johnston-Goodstar and VeLure Roholt 2017).

To remedy this, many schools are turning to community partners to aid in the cultural education of students by establishing cultural nights or bringing in speakers for school-wide assemblies or classroom activities. Sometimes families are brought in for focus groups or listening sessions where they are asked to share their experiences and opinions with administrators or educators (Friedel 1999). While these might be genuine efforts to include families in schools, cultural knowledge and practices are still positioned as extracurricular or peripheral to daily teaching and learning and have not had significant impact on increasing familial belonging nor do they reflect a foundational shift in paradigms which are in service of Indigenous thriving. Indeed Bequette (2009) and Friedel (1999) caution against asking elders, artisans, and other knowledge holders to volunteer their time and expertise, particularly if it is done so as a one-time participation without the intent of sustained or long-lasting partnership as this form of ad hoc, flat, representational inclusion can be deleterious to developing true collaboration. Further, these one-off inclusions tokenize Indigenous families and ways of knowing as non-Indigenous educators "position Indigenous knowledge holders (e.g., Elders, storytellers) as 'special guests' rather than foundational" and "non-Indigenous teachers are [then] tasked to rework the curriculum to make it more relevant to Indigenous students' cultures" (Madden et al. 2013 p. 219). These forms of inclusion are typically framed by unexamined multicultural perspectives that are largely shaped in response to Whiteness and often fail to move the ground from assumptions of western epistemic supremacy and tokenized representational discourses toward epistemic heterogeneity (Richardson and Villenas 2000). Such forms of inclusion often do not open spaces to create relevant and sustaining learning environments with Indigenous families and community members as leading and empowered decision-makers, thus as Indigenous scholars have long argued are ultimately counterproductive for Indigenous sovereignty and futurities (e.g., Deloria 1971; Vizenor 1989).

False Decision-Making: Railroading and Rubber Stamping

Unfortunately, many family engagement strategies reinforce power and decision-making with school officials and educators rather than engage in broader community deliberation and decision-making that transforms historically saturated power structures (López et al. 2016). Frequently schools will elevate and tokenize individual families to "rubber stamp" initiatives that schools deem important – initiatives that are frequently driven by the imperatives of Whiteness and settler-colonialism (Richardson and Villenas 2000). While there have been some increased efforts for schools to listen to the stories and experiences of Indigenous families, decisions about if and how to utilize those stories and knowledges remain with schools (Murphy and Pushor 2004; Coleman-Dimon 2000). Even when decision-making processes are in place, they are often politically charged spaces where power and privilege manifest and can contribute to within community tensions (e.g., Young 2011). Sharing her own experiences as a parent in a Native program in Alberta and as a researcher, Friedel (1999) describes how non-Aboriginal staff and administrators in the district continually undermined and prevented the decision-making and implementation of the Aboriginal parent advisory group that oversaw the Native program. She writes:

> Instead of being involved in planning and executing the educational program at Sprucewood School as was outlined in the recommendations that were approved by school board trustees, parents are kept busy trying to cope with everyday problems at the school. And they continue to deal with these alone instead of with the help of the Aboriginal community as was proposed in the recommendations. (p. 151)

Collaborating with Indigenous families in order to center and honor Indigenous knowledges and practices in schools is paramount to the educational success of students; however, doing so without first acknowledging the historical legacy of settler-colonial education on Indigenous communities allows for erasure of such history and enclosure of decolonial possibilities (Lipka 1986). Further, engaging Indigenous families in western forms of decision-making processes (e.g., hierarchical decision-making that reinforces the status quo) will not contribute to extensive transformations. Indigenous forms of deliberation, diplomacy, and decision-making as collective processes that attend to here-and-now urgency as well as being accountable to past and future possibilities and enclosures (e.g., Corntassel and Scow 2017; Whyte 2017) offer new pathways for family leadership and engagement.

Resurgence in the Everydayness of Families

Everyday enactments of Indigeneity and processes of decolonization and renewal matter for the wellness and strength of Indigenous nations, and they are pragmatic and empowering for families. In spite of the clear racism, tokenism, and assimilative imperatives inflicted on Indigenous families, there are also promising new practices and models for family engagement that *begin with* Indigenous families as the

foundation for healing and education. Importantly, as we reviewed literature, we noted that there was a marked shift in scholarship which focused on family well-being and cultural resurgence. This scholarship also tended to have a marked difference in the methodological approach and sensibilities – more specifically it utilized Indigenous methodologies (e.g., Smith 2013). Increasingly scholars seem to be recognizing historicity in approaches to Indigenous family engagement and working to engage Indigenous families as nation-builders and changemakers in educational reform. In short, they often articulated pathways of Indigenous resurgence that begins and continues with families. While protecting and evolving treaty rights and other legal expressions of Indigenous sovereignty will remain critical, an important emergent edge in this work is to focus, support, and understand resurgence in the everyday forms of practice in family life (Corntassel and Scow 2017). From this perspective, the vitality and growth of everyday resurgence in Indigenous families across our communities is what will continue to grow our sovereignty and nationhood.

Focusing on everydayness through analysis of family roles, relations, and responsibilities is a promising strategy. Corntassel and Scow (2017) did just this through an analysis of Indigenous fatherhood and articulated four dimensions of everydayness to attend to including relationality, convergences of time and place, politics of intimate settings, and gender relationships. Corntassel and Scow (2017) argue that much of the resurgence literature takes up the political and legislative stances of nationhood and sovereignty, and also importantly there is opportunity to explore the processes of resurgence in intimate settings. They argue that "the processes that Indigenous peoples assert for self-determination are just as important as the results of that struggle" (p. 56). Central to resurgence is living relationality which they define as the web of interconnected human and more-than-human relations and responsibilities that define us as Indigenous peoples. In connecting relationality to Indigenous resurgence, they write: "by examining lived relational aspects of being and becoming Indigenous, we effectively subvert universal generalizations and localize struggles for family resurgence and personal decolonization" (p. 58). For example, the authors turn to their own roles, relationships, and responsibilities as fathers and "other-fathers" to examine the intimate acts of fathering that contribute to the well-being and wholeness of children, families, and through this nations. Reflecting on these roles also demands attention to decolonizing gender constructions and gendered relationships. Corntassel and Scow's (2017) suggest many of the gendered roles and politics expected of families are based on colonial forms of gendered binaries that do not often reflect or respect traditional practices, particularly for two-spirit, queer, and trans identifying Indigenous peoples. As the authors put it, "After all, community 'traditions' are constantly changing and evolving. Even our community notions of complementarity in terms of gender roles need to be rethought and considered from queer or two-spirited perspectives" (p. 63). As mothers, daughters, aunties, cousins, and women, we are continually working through our desires and expectations of roles, relations, and responsibilities as well and those projected on to us. Further, we are always also working to renew our relations across roles which can and often do include resisting and refusing powered dynamics defined by colonialism.

Working from our own felt theories (Million 2009) – that is the things we know and feel that we may not always have the words for but sometimes the songs for – we are learning to move and act in our everyday lives with relentless critical awareness (e.g., Mignolo and Tlostanova 2006; Mignolo 2011) and decolonization on the one hand and on the other an unwavering reach for well-being, love, fierce grace, and strength that enflesh Indigenous ways of knowing and being in the here-and-now. Through focusing on the everyday, we can more intentionally refuse (e.g., Tuck and Yang 2014) the ways in which ongoing colonization and neoliberalism invade and try to restructure our daily lives but also refuse living in the negation or shadow of settler-colonialism. Many Indigenous scholars have long called for not only a focus on the content of our practices but perhaps even more importantly on enacting the processes by which our knowledges and ways of being have come to be. Deloria (2001) in discussing Indigenous learning states "we should be concerned with re-creating the conditions within which this learning occurred, not merely the content of the practice itself (pp. 58–59)." From this perspective, the everydayness of our families is critical site of re-creating the conditions for learning for children and families but also those that propel our resurgence.

Corntassel and Scow (2017) identify renewal and remembering as two key daily acts that are subtle yet powerful in their ability to transform relationships and potentially systems. Renewal refers to the daily interactions that strengthen our relationships and model how we are to be as Indigenous peoples: "They help us focus on the things that matter" (p. 62). Remembering refers to intentional acts of knowing the histories and relationalities of our peoples, lands, and waters in order to "enact our deepest love" (p. 63). One of the authors, Mick Scow, says that for him remembering includes returning with his family to their homelands and relations, but it also means building new relations with people and lands and waters where he now lives. These moments in everydayness and the ways they unfold can also be important convergences of time and place. They argue that attending to everydayness allows us to see and (re)act to the here-and-now as well as keep in view the past and present manifestations of possibility and enclosure. We suggest this longer-term and nonlinear view of time and place opens up new landscapes for decolonization and refusal of settler paradigms of child-rearing and separation from land.

Renewing and Remembering Roles, Relations, and Responsibilities with Lands, Waters, and More-than-Humans

Renewing and remembering includes our relations with lands and waters and is critically missing from family engagement policy and practice in the United States. Reading the land has always demanded complexity and attention to time scales beyond human scales and forms of deliberation that support complex ecological decision-making (e.g., Whyte 2018). However, learning to read the land is itself a complex and lifelong teaching and learning process that happens in Indigenous families' and communities' daily interactions (e.g., Marin and Bang accepted; Bang et al. 2014; Hare 2012). While a review of land-based education (e.g., Simpson 2014; Tuck et al. 2014), which is focused on Indigenous learning as emergent from

our relations and practices with lands, waters, and more-than-human relatives, is beyond the scope of this paper, we would be profoundly remiss to not acknowledge that this growing body of work has important implications for family engagement. In our review, we found very little literature explicitly articulating this nexus between land-based education and family engagement – at least with respect to schooling contexts. This absence is loud and in our view reflective of the dominant paradigm of centering schools and the west – not renewing and remembering our roles, relations, and responsibilities in the everyday. Increasing work that engages land-based perspectives and Indigenous family engagement could be an important area of development.

Renewing and Remembering Relationships Across the Life Span

Educational institutions have evolved to be predicated on age segregation. While this is in part because of the way neoliberalism constructs labor markets, it is also reflective of a particular view of learning and child development. These forces restructure roles, relationships, and how we enact our responsibilities to one another. These changes in interaction have had significant impacts not only at macroscales but also at micro-interactional levels that have shifted how children learn and participate in everyday activities (e.g., Rogoff 2014; Alcalá et al. 2014; Mejia-Arauz et al. 2018). An important aspect of everyday resurgence is working to remember and renew relationships across the life span and engagement in intergenerational learning. Such forms of learning carry significant implications for the ways in which institutions are structured. While we think there is room for significantly more work in this area, there are two areas of research that we highlight below.

Caregiving relationships in the early years are fundamental to raising and socializing Indigenous children into Indigenous ways of knowing and being. Many scholars contend that the early years of a child's life are foundational for the development of their identities as Indigenous peoples and prepare them to be leaders and members of their nations (e.g., Fleer 2006; Romero-Little 2010; Muir and Bohr 2014). As such, participation in cultural activities in the intimate and public spheres of their lives is essential. For example, Garcia (2014) begins his paper on reimagining school-community relationships with a story of the ceremonies that renew relationships between young people and the community in order to reimagine what formal K-12 school-community partnerships could look like. He writes:

> In [Hopi naming ceremonies] my daughters were shielded from Dawa (sun) for 20 days upon which they were properly introduced after my family — primarily members of the Hoaspoa (roadrunner) clan — came to wash their hair with their Tutsmingwu (white ear of corn representing her mother) and offered a Hopi name. This is one of many initial phases that reaffirms a sense of commitment and a formal acknowledgement of our collective roles and responsibilities as a clan and as an extended family to our children. Though we may perceive this ceremony as one in which we formally introduce our children to the world with many blessings, in many respects it speaks to a larger expectation— that requires each of us to live into the roles of supporting and nurturing our children throughout their lifetime. (p. 61)

Ultimately, Garcia (2014) calls for partnerships with schools that build upon the relationality central to Indigenous families and communities. This means expanding current conceptions of "family" to include the multitude of relationships that make up children's support systems, not just "parents." But it also means providing time and space for Indigenous and non-Indigenous families and educators to (1) recognize and unpack histories of oppression, resilience, and resurgence, (2) collectively identify barriers and opportunities for community-defined wellness, and (3) develop new practices that support cross-generational collaboration. Intentionally planning for time and place to be present in the healing and developing of new relations is necessary for Indigenous resurgence.

These early years also prepare children to enter into formal schooling as learners and thinkers (McWilliams et al. 2011; Romero-Little 2010; Lawrenchuck 1998). While there is a plethora of research that posits early childhood centers are assimilative and colonizing spaces for Indigenous children (e.g., Pérez and Saavedra 2017), there is also a demand for high quality and culturally sustaining care for children whose parents choose to work outside of the home. While, these centers need to prepare children to navigate mainstream educational systems as they enter K-12 schooling (Romero-Little 2010), a key need is for the development of learning environments in which this preparation is not detrimental to children learning their own ways. Positioning children to learn and develop expertise in Indigenous ways of knowing and being in opposition to academic success on western terms is a social construction shaped by historicized conquest narratives and claims to singular epistemic paradigms. Human beings have the capacity to speak multiple languages, make meaning in multiple ways, and navigate across multiple contexts. Developing learning environments that can accomplish such forms of life will require collaboration between Indigenous families and early childhood centers (both Indigenous and non-Indigenous) to collectively design and implement pedagogy and practices that support young children's development as whole and healthy Indigenous people. This is no small task, yet there are now multiple models for integrating Indigenous family leadership in the design and implementation of early childhood programming (e.g., Hubbs-Tait et al. 2005).

For example, Romero-Little (2010), in studying Cochiti Pueblo and Jemez Pueblo resurgence, contends that families are actively combating colonial pressures of assimilation through ownership of Head Start centers on the reservations. These communities are laying the grounds for both renewing and remembering traditional socialization practices and preparing young children for western forms of education by being a part of the planning and implementation of learning in the Head Start centers. This includes daily commitments to speaking the language in homes and creating language nests in early childhood learning centers where children spend most of their day.

Recognizing the need to address high rates of poverty and mental and physical health issues, many models of early childhood learning also integrate other social services to support families (Kaomea 2012; Lawrenchuck 1998; McWilliams et al. 2011). These often include training for families on effective and culturally appropriate child-rearing strategies. As Muir and Bohr (2014) put it, "Colonialism, residential schools, racism, and poverty have marked family relationships in

a multitude of destructive ways that are only beginning to be understood" (p. 68). A key challenge for many social programs, including early childcare, will be to reimagine programs so that they offer safe spaces for intergenerational healing and learning of traditional practices rather than enclosing family trainings that definitize and assimilate Indigenous families into Whiteness. Furthermore, there is a need for more explicit attention to gender norms, roles, and expectations within the current literature.

Multigenerational and community learnings are key aspects to Indigenous pedagogy and ways of knowing and being. Indigenous children learn from not only those in their family but also from elders and other adults and children in community. We also recognize that the burgeoning field of Indigenous studies affords us intellectual relationships with Indigenous knowledge holders globally through scholarship and research. In addition to caregiving as a multigenerational learning and teaching process, we also found two distinct ways of connecting youth and elders within communities reflected in the literature: through youth-driven community engagement and school-based collaboration with elders and artisans to develop and implement curriculum and pedagogy.

> Indigenous youth will be at the forefront in sustaining our Indigenous communities and they will no doubt be faced with the responsibility of navigating socio-cultural, environmental, political and economic issues while simultaneously preserving their Indigenous knowledge systems. (Shirley 2017, p. 164)

As expressed in the quote above, many scholars recognize the importance of Indigenous youth leadership in education and research (e.g., Shirley 2017; Tuck 2015). And many programs now exist that allow for youth-driven design and implementation of Indigenous-specific programming. Castagno and Brayboy (2008) provide a synthesis of key principles for culturally responsive schooling for Indigenous youth. One of these principles is that "schooling must be connected to student lives, engaging, and collaborative to be effective and culturally responsive for Indigenous youth" (p. 979). This requires explicit connections between learning opportunities and community wellness such that youth can visibly see the impact of their learning and leadership within their communities (Castagno and Brayboy 2008; Lee 2007). This also requires long-term collaborations between elders, artisans, and community members to collectively design and implement culturally responsive curricula and pedagogy (e.g., Bequette 2009; Lipka et al. 2005, Madden et al. 2013; Murphy and Pushor 2004; Zeegers 2011).

Community-based education models (CBEM) are one way Indigenous communities are addressing this need for holistic and meaningful learning for Indigenous students (e.g., May 1999). For example, Lee (2007) provides a case study of a New Mexican CBEM secondary school aiming to transform western educational systems to be more culturally relevant to their community by utilizing field-based, hands-on, and Indigenous pedagogies. As part of the program, math, science, and tribal governance lessons occurred in the afternoons in Pueblo communities. Lee (2007) describes:

> [S]tudents had immediate and in-depth interaction with community members and environmental issues that affected the communities over the course of an academic year. Thus the community sites became the learning environments through the involvement of community members as partners and mentors and resulted in lasting benefits for both students and communities. (p. 201)

Integral to the success of this program was the weaving together of multiple forms of pedagogy and knowledge. Teachers in the school worked intimately with Pueblo environmental administrators and leadership to generate important themes for curricular design. "The school developed the specifics of the curriculum organized around these thematic issues so that the field experiences and classroom learning supported and complemented one another" (Lee 2007, p. 202). Students also took leadership in their own learning to seek out knowledge holders about treaty rights impacting water and land relations in the community. This collaboration between teachers, Pueblo administrators, community members, and youth demonstrates that multiple forms of expertise, experience, and activity are necessary to develop rich and meaningful learning opportunities that engage real-world problems. Beyond programming *for* Indigenous youth, providing opportunities for youth to meaningfully engage in and make decisions about their own education is paramount to cultivating their leadership and analytic skills, both of which are critical for addressing twenty-first century demands.

Extending these findings, we argue that collaboration between schools, families, and community also builds resilience and adaptive capacity, thereby contributing to Indigenous collective continuance (Whyte 2018). Resilience and adaptive capacity here refer to the ability of a community to "maintain its members' cultural integrity, health, economic vitality, and political order into the future and avoid having its members experience preventable harms" (p. 355). We believe that explicit attention to onto-epistemic navigation practices that prepare youth for living in increasingly diverse and mobile communities also support collective continuance (e.g., Bang and Medin 2010; Shirley 2017). Onto-epistemic navigation is necessary to work through current local and global problems while maintaining Indigenous knowledges and ways of knowing. For Shirley (2017) this requires not only teaching students their histories from Indigenous perspectives but also helping them navigate the emotions that come up through the learning process. Teachers have to engage both the heart and the mind to help Indigenous youth heal as they examine the ongoing traumas Indigenous people experience through helping them make change in the present and future. In order to contribute to everyday resurgences, collaborations between schools and families will likely require a commitment to everyday forms of Indigenous learning, predicated on the relationality between multiple generations of community members.

Reimagining Relationships with Non-Indigenous Educators and Systems

Respectful and reciprocal relationships are foundational for cultivating the types of long-term collaborations necessary for Indigenous resurgence. There needs to be increased efforts at preparing Indigenous educators to work with Indigenous and non-Indigenous learners. However, currently most Indigenous children will encounter predominately White women in formal schooling. The views of these educators about Indigenous children, families, and communities shape not only their practice and interaction with students but also the success of any collaborative effort. When non-Indigenous educators lack historicity and hold deficit views, Indigenous families are more likely to refuse engagement (Lipka 1986), instead opting for protective and proactive strategies at home. However, we also see possibility in the construction of new forms of engagement that work toward Indigenous resurgence. Many authors recognize the need to build non-Indigenous educator capacity to work with Indigenous families as well as their ethical commitments to Indigenous communities' well-being. Building trusting and collaborative relationships requires critical reflection and ongoing renewal of relationships. For example, racism, exclusion, and railroading are still common barriers faced by Indigenous families in school contexts. Explicitly and intentionally addressing deficit assumptions about Indigenous families is required before partnerships can be formed (Kaomea 2012). This includes recognizing and honoring the history of colonialism and resurgence of Indigenous peoples globally as well as the particular histories of the families non-Indigenous educators are working with. Another way to address deficit assumptions is home-visiting, where educators engage families in their homes and in community events to learn more about the students and families they work with (Lowe and Bubb-Conner 2014; Murphy and Pushor 2004). This flips the family engagement paradigm so that it is non-Indigenous educators who go to community, rather than families going to school. Further, it disallows a view of Indigenous families as unengaged or uncaring.

Impacts of Indigenous Family Engagement on Academic Outcomes

Academic outcomes based in western knowledge systems do not need to be antithetical to Indigenous futurity. Indeed navigation of international diplomacy and resisting problematic policy means that our peoples will need forms of expertise in knowledge systems outside of our own. Within the family engagement literature we reviewed, there was a simultaneous denouncement of the rise of standardization and accountability to Whiteness and also the commitment to academically rigorous learning and achievement. It is clear from our review that educational attainment should be considered successful when Indigenous children and communities are healthy and thriving (Akee and Yazzie-Mintz 2011). As we saw in the above findings, this includes meaningful learning opportunities that also contribute to Indigenous community well-being and continuance of knowledge and language.

There is now robust research to demonstrate that young people who are deeply connected to their peoples, lands, and waters are also more likely to be resilient in formal education (LaFramboise et al. 2006; McMahon et al. 2013) and more likely to pursue and persist in higher education (Akee and Yazzie-Mintz 2011; Guillory and Wolverton 2008). In an examination of the disparity between US White and Indigenous attainment of higher education, Akee and Yazzie-Mintz (2011) surveyed the experiences of 62 college graduates, representing 44 tribal nations. Specifically, they asked graduates for the familial and cultural experiences that most hindered or contributed to the completion of their degree. Authors found that all respondents had some exposure to Indigenous history and culture in their schooling and most engaged routinely in Indigenous practices and ceremony. For example, authors found that 30% of respondents learned their Native language in school, and 75% spent time with elders. Akee and Yazzie-Mintz contend that these experiences contributed to the success of Indigenous scholars. They write:

> Our results… indicate that individuals who were more exposed to indigenous cultural activities were less likely to take a break between high school and college. Additionally, we found that the more exposure a student had to Native cultural activities as a child, the more likely they were to attend a large Research I university. (p. 136)

Creating opportunities for young people to engage regularly with Indigenous cultural practices and in their language supports academic achievement, rather than hinders it. When young people have regular opportunities to recognize their own histories, practices, and languages within school-based education, they are more likely to develop discipline-specific identities that contribute to their resilience and creativity in schools.

In conclusion, Indigenous family and community engagement practices should consider four principles highlighted throughout the chapter: (1) learning from and with our lands, waters, and more-than-humans is integral to Indigenous family engagement, (2) multigenerational and lifelong learning are integral to Indigenous education and therefore foundational for Indigenous family engagement, (3) relationships and collaboration with non-Indigenous educators and systems need new forms of partnership that recognize and cultivate everyday Indigenous resurgence, and (4) equitable and transformative collaboration with families leads to rigorous academics and higher achievement for Indigenous students. In practice, this requires that educators, administrators, and policy-makers collaborate with Indigenous families in ways that support the inclusion of Indigenous ways of knowing and being in curricula and resist settler-colonial enclosures toward Indigenous resurgence.

Implications and Conclusions

We have argued that attending to and intentionally engaging the everyday in Indigenous families contributes to Indigenous well-being, resurgence, and nationhood. Importantly according to Corntassel and Scow (2017), it is important to resist romanticization of traditional responsibilities and practices. The process of renewal

will take many forms, particularly across urban and intertribal contexts as Indigenous peoples envision and enact solidarities that work toward collective and individual determination and wellness. However there are several key sensibilities in Indigenous family engagement efforts that we rearticulate.

Critical historicity is a necessary foundation for collaboration and education with Indigenous families. Recognizing the global historical legacy of settler-colonialism as well as the local ways schools and Indigenous families have interacted is necessary research for all formal and informal educators working with Indigenous families. This could include talking with local elders and knowledge holders, visiting cultural centers, and online research. It is important to seek out not only the history of colonialism and oppression but to search for resistance and resurgence in your local communities.

Partnerships require reciprocity, respect, and the development of politicized trust. Trust, reciprocity, and respect are foundational aspects of long-term partnerships (e.g., Vakil et al. 2016). Generative partnerships with Indigenous families and communities require explicit recognition that multicultural forms of inclusion blind to Indigenous sovereignty perpetuate colonialism. Indigenous family and community engagement policies were not created to lead to any revolutionary change. In fact, some would posit that they merely shift the blame from structural inequities that governments and societies maintain to Indigenous parents and families. Educators, administrators, and policy-makers must critically consider whom family and community engagement policies and practices are meant to benefit and whether or not these actions are fulfilling their purpose and toward what ends. Indigenous family and community engagement should support Indigenous peoples' self-determination and nation-building. They should build adaptive capacities, visibilize Indigenous resilience, and bolster Indigenous resurgence. The opportunity is to contribute to Indigenous resurgence by contributing to multiple forms of activity and participation.

Non-Indigenous educators and administrators must self-reflect on stereotypical, racist, and privileged assumptions about Indigenous families and how these assumptions have and continue to impact their relationships and interactions with Indigenous students and families. While continuing to challenge assumptions and stereotypes, educators must begin the process of reaching out and serving Indigenous communities in order to build trust. This could take the form of attending cultural events, meeting families on and off campus, visiting homes if families are comfortable with it, and inviting family and community members into the classroom as teachers, collaborators, and decision-makers.

When working with Indigenous families, ensure that your engagement processes and practices reflect a commitment to long-term and sustained collaborations with multiple families and community members. Utilizing a single family or organization repeatedly contributes to tokenism of Indigenous families and perpetuates asymmetrical power relations. Collaboration should position Indigenous families and community members as meaningful decision-makers in order to create culturally resurgent learning experiences throughout the school year.

References

Akee RQ, Yazzie-Mintz T (2011) “Counting experience” among the least counted: the role of cultural and community engagement on educational outcomes for American Indian, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian students. Am Indian Cult Res J 35(3):119–150

Alcalá L, Rogoff B, Mejía-Arauz R, Coppens AD, Dexter AL (2014) Children’s initiative in contributions to family work in Indigenous-heritage and cosmopolitan communities in Mexico. Hum Dev 57(2–3):96–115

Archibald JA (2008) Indigenous storywork: educating the heart, mind, body, and spirit. UBC press, Vancouver

Bang M, Medin D (2010) Cultural processes in science education: supporting the navigation of multiple epistemologies. Sci Educ 94(6):1008–1026

Bang M, Curley L, Kessel A, Marin A, Suzukovich ES III, Strack G (2014) Muskrat theories, tobacco in the streets, and living Chicago as Indigenous land. Environ Educ Res 20(1):37–55

Baquedano-López P, Alexander RA, Hernandez SJ (2013) Equity issues in parental and community involvement in schools: what teacher educators need to know. Rev Res Educ 37(1):149–182

Barnhardt R, Kawagley A (2005) Indigenous knowledge system and Alaska Native ways of knowing. Anthropol Educ Q 36(1):8–23

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

Bequette JW (2009) Tapping a postcolonial community’s cultural capital: empowering Native artists to engage more fully with traditional culture and their children’s art education. Vis Arts Res 35(1):76–90

Berger E (2000) Parents as partners in education: families and schools working together, 5th edn. Merrill, Upper Saddle River

Butterfield R, Pepper F (1991) Improving parental participation in elementary and secondary education for American Indian and Alaska Native students. In Indian Nations at Risk Task Force commissioned papers. Department of Education, Washington, DC

Cajete G (2000) Native science: natural laws of interdependence. Clear Light, Santa Fe

Calderon D (2014) Speaking back to manifest destinies: a land education-based approach to critical curriculum inquiry. Environ Educ Res 20(1):24–36

Castagno AE, Brayboy BM (2008) Culturally responsive schooling for Indigenous youth: a review of the literature. Rev Educ Res 78(4):941–993

Colman-Dimon H (2000) Relationships with the school: listening to the voices of a remote Aboriginal community. Aust J Indigen Educ 28(1):34–47

Corntassel J, Scow M (2017) Everyday acts of resurgence: Indigenous approaches to everydayness in fatherhood. New Divers 19(2):55–68

Davis S (1988) Partners at school: a handbook on how to involve Indian and Metis parents in school activities. Retrieved from https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED382364

Delgado R, Stefancic J (2000) Critical race theory: the cutting edge, 2nd edn. Temple University Press, Philadelphia

Deloria V (1971) Of utmost good faith. Straight Arrow Books, San Francisco

Deloria V Jr. (2001) Traditional technology. In Deloria V Jr., Wildcat D. (eds). Power and Place: Indian Education in America. Fulcrum Resources, Golden.

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

Epstein JL (1987) Parent involvement: what research says to administrators. Educ Urban Soc 19(2):119–136

Epstein JL, Sheldon SB (2002) Present and accounted for: improving student attendance through family and community involvement. J Educ Res 95(5):308–318

Fleer M (2006) Troubling cultural fault lines: some Indigenous Australian families’ perspectives on the landscape of early childhood education. Mind Cult Act 13(3):191–204

Freire (1970) Pedagogy of the oppressed. Continuum, New York

Friedel TL (1999) The role of Aboriginal parents in public education: barriers to change in an urban setting. Can J Nativ Educ 23(2):139–158

Garcia J (2014) Re-examining Indigenous conceptualizations of family and community involvement. J Fam Divers Educ 1(1):58–74

Grande S (2004) Red pedagogy: Native American social and political thought. Oxford Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Lanham

Guillory RM, Wolverton M (2008) It's about family: Native American student persistence in higher education. J High Educ 79(1):58–87

Gutiérrez R (2008) A "gap-gazing" fetish in mathematics education? Problematizing research on the achievement gap. J Res Math Educ 39(4):357–364

Hare J (2012) "They tell a story and there's meaning behind that story": Indigenous knowledge and young Indigenous children's literacy learning. J Early Child Lit 12(4):389–414

Henderson A (2016) Quick brief on family engagement in Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) of 2015. National Education Association. https://ra.nea.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/FCE-in-ESSA-in-Brief.pdf. Accessed 08 Feb 2018

Henderson A, Mapp KL (2002) A new wave of evidence: the impact of school, family, and community connections on student achievement. Annual synthesis. National Center for Family & Community Connections with Schools, Austin

Herzog C, Smith P, McGinnis J (2016) Parent voices revisited: American Indian relationships with schools. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses

Howard TC, Navarro O (2016) Critical race theory 20 years later: where do we go from here? Urban Educ 51(3):253–273

Hubbs-Tait L, Tait DA, Hare C, Huey E (2005) Involvement of Native American families in early childhood education. In Saracho O, Spodek B (eds). Contemporary perspectives on families and communities in early childhood education, 225–246

Ishimaru AM, Torres KE, Salvador JE, Lott J, Williams DMC, Tran C (2016) Reinforcing deficit, journeying toward equity: cultural brokering in family engagement initiatives. Am Educ Res J 53(4):850–882

Johnston-Goodstar K, VeLure Roholt R (2017) "Our kids aren't dropping out: they're being pushed out": Native American students and racial microaggressions in schools. J Ethn Cult Divers Soc Work 26(1–2):30–47

Kaomea J (2012) Reconceptualizing Indigenous parent involvement in early educational settings: lessons from Native Hawaiian preschool families. Int Indigen Policy J 3(4):1–19

Ladson-Billings G, Tate WF IV (1995) Toward a critical race theory of education. Teach Coll Rec 97(1):47–68

LaFromboise TD, Hoyt DR, Oliver L, Whitbeck LB (2006) Family, community, and school influences on resilience among American Indian adolescents in the Upper Midwest. J Community Psychol 34(2):193–209

Lawrenchuk RE (1998) Parent participation in a Cree and Ojibway Head Start program: development of a conceptual framework. Masters thesis, University of Manitoba

Lea T, Thompson H, McRae-Williams E, Wegner A (2011) Policy fuzz and fuzzy logic: researching contemporary Indigenous education and parent-school engagement in North Australia. J Educ Policy 26(3):321–339

Lee T (2007) Connecting academics, Indigenous knowledge, and commitment to community: high school students' perceptions of a community-based education. Can J Nativ Educ 30(2):196–216

Lipka J (1986) School-community partnerships in rural Alaska. Rural Educ 7(3):11–14

Lipka J, Hogan MP, Webster JP, Yanez E, Adams B, Clark S, Lacy D (2005) Math in a cultural context: two case studies of a successful culturally based math project. Anthropol Educ Q 36(4):367–385

López G, Kuttner P, Yanagui A (2016) What does partnership taste like?: reimagining family-school partnerships through participatory design research. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Education Research Association (AERA), San Antonio, pp 1–29

Lowe K, Bub-Connor H (2014) Teaching at the cultural interface: establishing a responsive classroom through the authentic engagement of a teacher, Aboriginal students and parents. Paper presented at Joint AARE-NZARE 2014 conference, pp 1–13
Madden B, Higgins M, Korteweg DL (2013) "Role models can't just be on posters": re/membering barriers to Indigenous community engagement. Can J Education/Revue Canadienne de L'éducation 36(2):211–247
Marin A, Bang M (accepted) "Look this is how you know": forest walks and knowledge building about the natural world. Cognition & Instruction
Marker M (2006) After the Makah whale hunt: Indigenous knowledge and limits to multicultural discourse. Urban Educ 41(5):482–505
May S (ed) (1999) Indigenous community-based education. Multilingual Matters, Philadelphia
McMahon TR, Kenyon DB, Carter JS (2013) "My culture, my family, my school, me": identifying strengths and challenges in the lives and communities of American Indian youth. J Child Fam Stud 22(5):694–706
McWilliams MS, Maldonado-Mancebo T, Szczepaniak PS, Jones J (2011) Supporting Native Indian preschoolers and their families: family-school-community partnerships. Young Child 66(6):34–41
Mejía-Arauz R, Rogoff B, Dayton A, Henne-Ochoa R (2018) Collaboration or negotiation: two ways of interacting suggest how shared thinking develops. Curr Opin Psychol 23:117–123
Mignolo W (2011) The darker side of western modernity: global futures, decolonial options. Duke University Press, Durham
Mignolo W, Tlostanova MV (2006) Theorizing from the borders: shifting to geo-and body-politics of knowledge. Eur J Soc Theory 9(2):205–221
Million D (2009) Felt theory: an indigenous feminist approach to affect and history. Wicazo Sa Rev 24(2):53–76
Moreton-Robinson A (2011) Virtuous racial states: the possessive logic of patriarchal white sovereignty and the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous peoples. Griffith Law Rev 20(3):641–658
Muir NM, Bohr Y (2014) Contemporary practice of traditional Aboriginal child rearing: a review. First Peoples Child Fam Rev 9(1):66–79
Murphy B, Pushor D (2004) Parent marginalization, marginalized parents: creating a place for parents on the school landscape. Alberta J Educ Res 50(3):221–235
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (2002) P.L. 107-110, 20 U.S.C. § 1116
Pérez MS, Saavedra CM (2017) A call for onto-epistemological diversity in early childhood education and care: centering global south conceptualizations of childhood/s. Rev Res Educ 41(1):1–29
Redding S, Murphy M, Sheley P (2011) Handbook on family and community engagement. Information Age Publishing, Charlotte
Richardson T (2011) Navigating the problem of inclusion as enclosure in Native culture-based education: theorizing shadow curriculum. Curric Inq 41(3):332–349
Richardson T, Villenas S (2000) "Other" encounters: dances with whiteness in multicultural education. Edu Theory 50(2):255–273
Robinson-Zañartu C, Majel-Dixon J (1996) Parent voices: American Indian relationships with schools. J Am Indian Educ 36(1):33–54
Rogoff B (2014) Learning by observing and pitching in to family and community endeavors: an orientation. Hum Dev 57(2–3):69–81
Romero-Little ME (2010) How should young Indigenous children be prepared for learning? A vision of early childhood education for Indigenous children. J Am Indian Educ 49(1–2):7–27
Sarche M, Whitesell N (2012) Child development research in North American Native communities – looking back and moving forward: introduction. Child Dev Perspect 6(1):42–48
Shear SB, Knowles RT, Soden GJ, Castro AJ (2015) Manifesting destiny: re/presentations of indigenous peoples in K–12 US history standards. Theory Res Soc Educ 43(1):68–101

Shirley VJ (2017) Indigenous social justice pedagogy: teaching into the risks and cultivating the heart. Crit Quest Educ 8(2):163–177
Simpson LB (2011) Dancing on our turtle's back: stories of Nishnaabeg re-creation, resurgence, and a new emergence. Arbeiter Ring Press, Winnipeg
Simpson LB (2014) Land as pedagogy: Nishnaabeg intelligence and rebellious transformation. Decolon Indigen Educ Soc 3(3):1–25
Smith LT (2013) Decolonizing methodologies: research and indigenous peoples. Zed Books, London
Solorzano D (1998) Critical race theory, race and gender microaggressions, and the experience of Chicana and Chicano scholars. Int J Qual Stud Educ 11(1):121–136
Tuck E (2015) Research with Indigenous youth. Building capacitys and cultivating innovations research Brief 6. Retrieved from http://indigenouseducationtools.org/assets/primaryimages/IET06_ResearchwithIndigenousYouthIssue06.pdf
Tuck E, Gaztambide-Fernández RA (2013) Curriculum, replacement, and settler futurity. J Curric Theor (Online) 29(1):72–89
Tuck E, Yang KW (2014) R-words: refusing research. In: Paris D, Winn MT (eds) Humanizing research: decolonizing qualitative inquiry with youth and communities. SAGE, Thousand Oaks, pp 223–248
Tuck E, McKenzie M, McCoy K (2014) Land education: Indigenous, post-colonial, and decolonizing perspectives on place and environmental education research. Environ Educ Res 20(1):1–23
Vakil S, deRoyston MM, Nasir N, Kirshner B (2016) Rethinking race and power in design-based research: Reflection from the field. Cognition & Instruction 34(2):194–209
Villegas M (2009) This is how we "role": moving toward a cosmogonic paradigm in Alaska Native education. Can J Nativ Educ 32(1):38–56
Vizenor G (1989) Trickster discourse: comic holotropes and language games. In: Narrative chance: postmodern discourse on Native American Indian literatures. University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, pp 187–211
White V (2017) Disproportionality of American Indian children in foster care. Master of Social Work Clinical Research Papers
Whyte K (2017) What do Indigenous knowledges do for Indigenous peoples? In: Nelson MK, Shilling D (eds) Keepers of the green world: traditional ecological knowledge and sustainability. Cambridge University Press
Whyte K (2018) Food sovereignty, justice and indigenous peoples: an essay on settler colonialism and collective continuance. In: Barnhill A, Doggett T, Egan A (eds) Oxford handbook on food ethics. Oxford University Press, Oxford
Young IM (2011) Justice and politics of difference. Princeton University Press, Princeton
Zeegers M (2011) Positioning the school in the landscape: exploring black history with a regional Australian primary school. Discourse Stud Cult Polit Educ 32(3):343–356