

### Native American Studies DTF (1986-88)

The Native American Studies DTF has established and maintained a dialogue of respect around issues of personal, cultural, and pedagogical integrity. The process of working together on difficult cultural issues has been the product of our work. Our "report" to the rest of the campus consists of three parts:

Part I was the seminar, presentation and discussion offered at the Faculty Retreat on April 30th and May first, 1987, with a follow-up discussion and repeat of the presentation offered in an open session on campus on May 27, 1987.

Part II was our "End-of-the-Year Report" to Patrick Hill, submitted on June 11, 1987. It contains our Recommendations (1 - 5). It is included in this document.

Part III, distributed for the first time in this document, highlights some of the results of our research, which we presented in Part I, in response to some of the specific questions raised in the charge to the DTF. It contains our Recommendations (6 - 8).

We acknowledge that we did not have the time or the resources to conduct all of the research and pursue discussion of all of the issues in the long and detailed Charge to the DTF. However, we have fulfilled two of the primary purposes of our work: to study the Native American Studies academic program in light of concerns raised by the Academic Deans, and to increase the level of trust, understanding and respect for the philosophical and pedagogical differences among us as faculty, staff and students. We have been less successful in a third element of our charge: to clarify the limits (if any) of philosophical and pedagogical differences that we collectively want to embrace as part of our identity as The Evergreen State College.

We hope that the constructive and respectful atmosphere and tone of dialogue we have worked hard to establish will permeate the on-going discussion of the challenging cultural issues of epistemology, pedagogy and community-building we all need to keep exploring. Our recommendations (1), (2), (5) and (6) address how to pursue further work on these issues.

#### Members of the DTF were:

Faculty -- Thad Curtz, Russ Fox (Chair), Lucia Harrison, Dave Hitchens, Yvonne Peterson, Rita Pougiales, Sandra Simon, Pete Taylor, Gail Tremblay, David Whitener, York Wong;

Staff -- Barbara Cooley, Mary Huston;

Students/Alumni -- Kimberly Craven, Bob Harris, Nancy Koppelman, Michael Lane, Janine Thome;

Interested Community Members -- Lloyd Colfax, Katherine Hopkins, Chris Smith, Ben Tansey

2

**Native American Studies Report: Part II**  
**"End-of-the-Year Report" to Provost Patrick Hill**  
**June 1987**

Accomplishments:

(1) We, as a collection of people with different experiences, values and opinions regarding the issues before us, have learned how to discuss these differences in open, respectful dialogue. We have worked collaboratively.

(2) Through our two presentations at the faculty retreat, follow-up discussions and an additional presentation on campus, we have begun to create faculty and campus-wide dialogue with the same qualities of openness and respect that we have built into our internal work.

(3) We have gathered an impressive amount of data about the history, philosophy, structure and curricular role of the NAS program over the past ten years. These data include founding documents, student enrollment patterns, interviews with all faculty who have taught in the program, a statistical sample of faculty and student evaluations, historical documents on the controversies that have engulfed the program, and more. There is no comparable data for any other program or specialty area in the history of the college.

(4) We have begun compilation and analysis of these data and have started to identify patterns and correlations that may eventually be useful in addressing some of the more specific questions in our charge.

(5) We have designed four survey instruments that will enable us, as an institution, to initiate a comprehensive needs assessment and planning process if we want to seriously address the educational needs of Native American communities and students in our region or state. We have implemented one of these surveys.

(6) We have reached agreement on a few recommendations, including a proposal for how the work on the charge to the DTF should be carried on over the next few years.

Recommendations:

The recommendations we unanimously agreed upon during our last DTF meeting of the year on June 3, 1987, were:

Recommendation (1): That Provost Patrick Hill authorize the implementation of the two Indian Education Needs Assessment surveys that are beyond the resources of the DTF to complete during this or any other school year. Implicit in this action is an institutional commitment to a planning process that will use these data to develop a model and proposal for how TESC could and should respond to the needs of Native American students and communities. Our proposal for a planning process includes the following elements and campus and community resources:

(a) Implementation of the survey of Tribal Education Officers in Washington State. The research instrument is prepared. We propose that David Whitener and Yvonne Peterson be employed for two weeks each, during July, 1987, to conduct these interviews. The cost would be about \$3250 + travel, printing and phone. David and Yvonne are available and interested.

(b) Implementation of the survey of current and former Native American students enrolled at TESC. The research instrument is prepared. We propose that a student or students be employed for 400 hours to conduct these telephone interviews. Costs would be about \$1700 + phone.

(c) Implementation of the survey of all Native American TESC faculty. The research instrument is prepared. DTF members David Whitener, Yvonne Peterson and Barbara Cooley) will conduct these as part of their DTF volunteer work.

(d) Formation of an Indian Education Planning Group to oversee the development of a model and proposal for how TESC could and should respond to the needs identified. This group should have a majority Native American membership and include representatives from the NASDTF, other Native American TESC faculty, students and alumni, Student and Enrollment Services, Native American tribes in our region, the Academic Deans, the Development Office, and others.

(e) Use of TESC students in several academic programs and/or Independent Learning Contracts as a "cluster project" to tabulate and analyze the needs assessment data, research other Indian Education models, and assist the Planning Group in developing its proposal. Students in the 1987-88 NAS program could possibly be joined by students in computer studies and/or teacher certification in forming this cluster project.

(f) Establishment of open communication with all of the constituencies and units represented on the Indian Education Planning Group, plus the President and Provost, during the entire planning process.

4

Recommendation (2): That Provost Patrick Hill communicate to the Academic Deans, the Faculty Agenda Committee, and the Council of Convenors the seriousness of the DTF request that in addition to hiring a Native American fill Lloyd Colfax's position on the faculty, higher priority must be given to identifying and hiring Native American faculty to teach in the Native American Studies specialty area of our curriculum. Obviously, a larger pool of faculty will enable the current faculty in the area to rotate into other areas more frequently.

Recommendation (3): That Provost Patrick Hill request that the Dean of Student and Enrollment Services assure that opportunities for late-summer/early fall admission of Native American students be kept open. Successful recruitment of a culturally diverse student body requires flexibility to accommodate culturally different decision-making patterns.

Recommendation (4): That Provost Patrick Hill designate a Native American faculty member to be a part of the Student Learning Assessment Planning group charged with developing a strategy for TESC's assessment planning over the next few years.

Recommendation (5): That the "work" of this year's NASDTF continue, but with more people working on three separate-but-coordinated tasks. Most, if not all, of the current DTF members who will be here next year are willing to continue working on the issues in our charge. We would continue to be a coordinating group, with our membership distributed among three new and expanded groups:

(a) The Indian Education Planning Group identified above.

(b) A group, composed of some DTF members, all faculty affiliated with the Native American Studies specialty area, and others (a Dean?) that will continue to analyze the NAS program data collected this year, with the objectives of using that analysis to strengthen the program and preparing for the HEC Board specialty area review in 1988-89.

(c) A group charged with the responsibility to continue the faculty and campus dialogue on issues such as orality and literacy, different educational pedagogies, faculty-student roles and responsibilities, criteria for creditable work, and the distribution of Native American faculty in the curriculum--issues that our work this year have highlighted as central in the controversies of the past and central in building new understanding through dialogue.

5

Native American Studies DTF Report: Part III  
April 1988

The issues we address in this part of our report are:

- 1) What has happened to Native American Studies for Indian students at TESC over the past fifteen years?
- 2) How has the Native American Studies coordinated studies program changed or evolved over the past decade?
- 3) What is the current philosophy and structure of the Native American Studies program and how is it similar or different from other TESC offerings?
- 4) How have students used the Native American Studies program as part of their studies at TESC?
- 5) How do we respond to the specific concerns regarding the Native American Studies program posed by the Academic Deans?
- 6) How do we, as a DTF studying and discussing these issues for a year, respond to the pedagogical compatibility question raised by the Faculty Agenda Committee?

1) What has happened to Native American Studies for Indian students at TESC over the past fifteen years?

Research Highlights:

- 1973 Indian Curriculum Workshop: Hitchens' analysis
- a) Native American Studies conceived as an experiment to bridge the gap between oral and written traditions;
  - b) Four original objectives:
    1. Hospitality
    2. Give and Take
    3. Symbolization
    4. Transfer of Learning
- (See Hitchens DTF report for more details)

- Origin of NAS program: Hillaire's community-based model
- a) Hospitality = absolute trust in students' learning goals, motivations, and abilities;
  - b) Learning Triad = student, student's community, and institution/program/faculty;
  - c) a + b = student chooses how to best utilize self, community, and college resources to pursue learning goals;

Indian student enrollment data (NAS program + college-wide)

<u>Year</u>	<u>NAS Program</u>	<u>TESC Total</u>
1974	?	?
1977	32	67
1980	13	37
1983	5	56
1986	5	59

6

Factors: Fewer resources (Indian staff) for recruiting and counseling;  
Fewer resources (travel money) for community visits by faculty;  
Bureaucratic difficulty in obtaining BIA financial aid;  
Hillaire's death (10/82);  
Interest in NAS program by non-Native American students

Discussion:

While our official commitment to providing unique and culturally appropriate educational opportunities for Indian students has never been modified since affirmed in 1973 and subsequently built into our curriculum as a Specialty Area, the number of Indian students taking advantage of these opportunities has diminished over the years. Our primary strategy or curricular "model" to meet Indian education needs has been our annual Native American Studies program. It was originally designed to be a fairly autonomous academic program staffed primarily by Native American faculty available to work individually with Indians within their communities and in studies appropriate to their desires to either validate traditional knowledge or gain knowledge necessary to survive in two cultures. The program remains an important academic "home" for some of the Indian students who attend Evergreen. However, as Evergreen's recruiting and counseling support for Indian students decreased, as prospective Indian students were faced with increasingly complex bureaucratic channels to receive financial aid, as Mary Hillaire's death left us without her network of community contacts, as budget cuts reduced the opportunity for faculty to travel regularly to community settings, as more-and-more non-Native American students sought out our Indian faculty, and as our curriculum restricted other opportunities for students to pursue individualized study, the Native American Studies program has changed (see Issue 2).

It seems obvious to those of us on the NASDTF that we need to re-affirm our commitment to meeting the needs of Indian students and communities in our region. We need to re-establish strong and collaborative educational liasions with the Indian nations in our region. And, probably, we need to create a more multi-faceted curricular strategy or "model" that doesn't put all expectations or responsibility on one academic program. Our Native American Studies program provides one important educational resource for Indians--especially those who want to concentrate on learning and validating traditional knowledge. It may still be the most appropriate campus "home" for community-based learning, but an increased level of faculty and service support will be needed. And, new and equally creative additional strategies to enable our campus resources to be significantly meaningful to Indian students and communities are needed.

The NASDTF believes that two of the three essential first steps in building new and appropriate educational relationships with our Native American neighbors are to establish collaborative

dialogue with them and to obtain a comprehensive set of base data about their educational resources, needs, aspirations and previous experiences. The third step, of course, is to heighten our interest and ability to collaborate with the Indian nations of our region in educational model-building.

Conclusions and Recommendations:

This issue surfaced as the most important of the many we were asked to address in the charge to our DTF. One of our sub-committees worked for four months to design a strategy to initiate the process of building new educational relationships with Indian nations in our region. Recommendations (1), (2), (3) and (5) in Part II of our report specifically address this issue. Subsequent meetings with Patrick Hill have revealed his preference for a different approach to that we proposed in Recommendation (1). While appreciating his initiatives, the DTF feels they are insufficient or incomplete. The DTF remains firm in its belief in the wisdom of its recommendations, in spite of the loss of opportunity by not initiating the work this past summer. We continue to endorse Recommendation (1) from Part II of our report.

2) How has the Native American Studies coordinated studies program changed or evolved over the past decade?

Research Highlights:

Curtz' analysis, from faculty interviews:

- a. From primarily Native American students to primarily white students;
- b. From primarily community-based to primarily campus-based;
- c. From older students to younger students;
- d. From an experiment to a tradition;
- e. From primarily female to primarily male faculty.

Student profile data: Ethnic background of NAS students

Year	Native American	Other People of Color	White
1978	37%	40%	23%
1980	18%	18%	64%
1985	8%	14%	78%

- Factors:
- Fewer resources (Indian staff) for recruiting and counseling;
  - Fewer resources (travel money) for community visits by faculty;
  - Bureaucratic difficulty in obtaining BIA financial aid;
  - Hillaire's death (10/82)
  - Creation of Specialty Areas
  - Fewer faculty in Individual Contract pool

## Discussion:

In addition to the factors contributing to a reduction of Native American students enrolled at Evergreen, discussed in the commentary on Issue 1 above, the creation and development of Specialty Areas has resulted in a higher percentage of faculty assigned to programs and fewer faculty available to sponsor Individual Contracts. So, while Native American student enrollment in the Native American Studies program was diminishing, and especially once the establishment of the Tacoma campus gave Tacoma-based non-white students another "home," campus-based students from many (all?) areas of our curriculum discovered the Native American Studies program as an alternative format for individualized study. The program's pedagogical philosophy (highlighted in Issue 3 to follow)--one of giving a very high degree of trust, responsibility and authority for learning to students--made this a logical alternative. In addition, the opportunity to learn about and experience Native American culture and values from Native American faculty has attracted many of our students.

There seem to be five general categories (with many sub-categories, of course) of students who enroll in the Native American Studies program. They are:

- a. Native American students, whether campus or community-based, who pursue either traditional or transitional studies with the program as a "home;"
- b. Other non-white students who are attracted to the culturally-sensitive learning environment and faculty of the program;
- c. White students interested in Native American or other ethnic studies and who are seeking the cultural content of the program;
- d. Advanced or non-campus-based students who see the program as an alternative registration option for individualized study and who may or may not take full advantage of the cultural richness of the program classes and faculty.
- e. Students who feel a need for a temporary break from more structured programs in order to pursue an individual project and who may or may not take advantage of the cultural richness of the program classes and faculty.

The data show that between 1978 and 1985, the Native American student enrollment in the program dropped from 37% to 8%, the other people of color enrollment dropped from 40% to 14%, and the white student enrollment rose from 23% to 78% of the students in the program. While it is difficult to distinguish students in categories (c) and (d) or (e) above, an analysis of student self-evaluations from 1977 to 1986 showed that 34% of the students mentioned the Monday class as a significant learning activity and 41% mentioned the value of cultural learning gained by having been in the program.



Conclusions and Recommendations:

It seems apparent to the DTF that in addition to re-affirming our commitment to Indian education, as discussed in Issue 1, we need to re-affirm our commitment to and support for the opportunity for students to engage in individualized learning. Such opportunities are embedded in our pedagogical rhetoric and tradition, are highlighted in our articulation of the educational opportunities at Evergreen, are sought by our students at various times in their educational careers, yet are often frustrating or impossible for students to arrange with faculty who are teaching full time in another program.

Recommendation (6): Whether as part of our on-going curricular review and evolution or as a specific charge to a DTF, serious consideration should be given to increasing faculty support for individualized study as part of our curriculum. There are many approaches this could take, and a comprehensive multi-faceted strategy would be desirable over any one individually. Possibilities include:

(a) Recognize the valuable role the Native American Studies program plays in meeting this curricular need and increase the faculty staffing of the program. This could include assigning faculty from different specialty areas to be part-time or supporting members of the team. They could help cover student interests in a wide range of content areas and free up the Native American faculty to concentrate on the students in categories (a), (b) and (c) as identified above.

(b) Encourage other Specialty Areas to create similar models of umbrella or "home" programs for students pursuing individualized study in their areas. This maintains the advantages of a Native American Studies program model-- multiple faculty available to students, opportunity for some interest-group seminars or classes, opportunity to connect students' work to larger, unifying issues of the Specialty Area--and alleviates the frequent problems of isolation and lack of peer-contact characteristic of many Individual Contracts.

(c) Increase the number of faculty assigned to the Individual Contract "pool." The DTF believes that this is the least desirable alternative if only one is chosen.

3) What is the current philosophy and structure of the Native American Studies program and how is it similar or different from other TESC offerings?

Research Highlights:

- Curtz' analysis of program philosophy, from faculty interviews:
- a. Sense of personal authority prerequisite for genuine interest and long term retention of subject matter;
  - b. Personal authority requires clarity of personal, family and community identity;
  - c. College needs to trust and validate this process of developing personal authority over one's educational needs;
  - d. Community elders and experts ideally provide standards for valid aims of education and for whether genuine learning has resulted;
  - e. There are no mistakes or uneducational experiences;
  - f. Education is growth, not prescriptive transmission;
  - g. Carl Rodgers' theories are similar in various ways, with less sense of community's role.

Concept of hospitality (see (2) above)

Structure: Diagnostic interviews (Four questions)  
 Monday class on Native American issues  
 Other classes offered by program faculty  
 Student projects and presentations  
 Interest groups and work with sub-contractors  
 Courses and internships  
 Campus forums and community field trips  
 Evaluation interviews (Four questions)

Discussion:

The Native American Studies program seems to have a coherent pedagogical philosophy that is understood and supported by the fifteen faculty who have taught in the program for at least a year. The program trusts students and recognizes their authority to set educational goals, maintain motivation, locate appropriate learning resources, and find appropriate means to demonstrate what they have learned. It allows full expression to some of Evergreen's most fundamental pedagogical principles. It supports students in their taking full responsibility for the quality and quantity of their learning.

Structurally, the program is one version of the combination of large group, small group and individual learning that characterizes many or all of our academic programs. Students are invited but not required to attend the various class activities that relate to their learning goals.

11

Conclusions and Recommendations:

There is nothing un-Evergreen about the philosophy or structure of the Native American Studies program. It is a pedagogical experiment, just as many of our other program models are. Fifteen of our faculty, from a wider range of academic disciplines and ethnic backgrounds than characterize the teaching in many of our other Specialty Areas, have contributed to the development of the program and, in general, strongly support its philosophy and basic structure. Like all other Specialty Areas, this one will continue to mature and develop if new faculty are hired with the expectation of contributing to the area and if more existing faculty are encouraged to rotate into the program for a year or more.

The Native American Studies program should be appreciated, if not celebrated, for its contributions to the TESC curriculum. In meeting the needs of three of its five categories of student "clienteles" (as identified in Issue 2), it is contributing significantly to the college's intercultural education and literacy goals. Many of the faculty who have taught in the program consider the experience an important contribution to their own faculty development in intercultural education. Direct, on-going experience and dialogue with people with different world views, values and life-styles is perhaps the most effective means of discovering, affirming and modifying our own cultural values vis-a-vis others.

Recommendation (7): The Provost and Academic Deans should take leadership in expressing appreciation and support for the contributions of the Native American Studies program to our curriculum. Both new and current faculty should be encouraged to rotate into the program for a year or more.

4) How have students used the Native American Studies program as part of their studies at TESC?

Research Highlights:

Student profile data: Age (1980-1986 cumulative):

<u>Age</u>	<u>NAS Program</u>	<u>TESC Total</u>
<21	9%	28%
21-30	60%	41%
31-50	25%	28%
>50	6%	3%

Enrollment patterns data (1980-86 cumulative):

- 80% enrolled in TESC program prior to NAS;
- 40% enrolled in core program prior to NAS;
- Equal distribution of 1st, 2nd, 3rd and 4th year students at time of first NAS enrollment;
- Wide variety of enrollment patterns re: when and for how long in NAS;

Freshmen often spring quarter only;  
 Juniors and seniors often two or three quarters;  
 15% enroll in NAS two or more different times;  
 7% of students enrolled receive NCR;

Credits earned in NAS programs (TESC graduates: 1980-86):  
 43% = 16 credits or less  
 35% = 17 - 48 credits (78% = year or less)  
 17% = 49 - 96 credits (95% = two years or less)  
 5% = more than two years credit

Faculty and student transcript evaluations (1977-86):  
 39% did not include student self-evaluation;  
 Some "generic" faculty evaluations, but none since 1982  
 Types of learning identified by faculty or student:  
 Cognitive - 65%  
 Affective - 55%  
 Cultural - 41%

Fox/Simon/Taylor/Hopkins' analysis of self-evaluations:  
 Distribution of amount and quality of student work  
 seemed similar to other programs (from DTF  
 faculty experience);  
 Many strong statements of appreciation of learning  
 opportunity and value;  
 Many expressions of self-confidence and new  
 enthusiasm for learning;  
 Some unclear writing;  
 Many without personal learning goals stated;  
 No criticism of program in sample read (10%).

Graduate information data (1981-85):  
 Slight variations, but no significant differences  
 from TESC totals re: grad school & employed;  
 Wide range of career interests, jobs, graduate  
 programs (cross-section of TESC);

Discussion:

Without the time or resources to interview former NAS students or employers of students who had been in the NAS program, the only "outcomes" we were able to analyze were transcript evaluations and Career Development Office placement data. Neither source revealed any significant variation from the patterns of work and accomplishment that seem to characterize a college-wide cross section of students. Faculty on the DTF discovered that some of their favorite or best students had been in the program. We also found some who (by our standards or expectations) hadn't done much or well. But the distribution did not seem to vary from our experiences in other programs or Specialty Areas.

The enrollment history data need more analysis, but some valuable insight regarding when and for how long students enroll in the Native American Studies program has begun to emerge. Close to

one-fourth of the students who enroll in the program are in each of the four years of college work.

Freshmen tend to enroll for spring quarter only, then return to other areas of study the following year. In addition to the more obvious reasons students often seek spring quarter alternatives (desire to pursue new interests in depth, fear of projects, etc.), Stella Jordan observed that some students seek the flexibility of the NAS program as a means to work with the Learning Resources Center for credit.

Juniors and seniors tend to enroll in the program for two or three quarters to pursue some type of advanced or individualized project work. We were surprised at how many students (more than 15%) had enrolled in the program at two or more different non-contiguous times during their undergraduate career. Students seem to use the program for a variety of reasons at different times. Still, only 22% of the 623 students who had been in the program and subsequently graduated earned more than one year's credit in Native American Studies--and only 5% earned more than two years worth.

#### Conclusions and Recommendations:

The Native American Studies program is perennially the most heavily enrolled coordinated studies program at Evergreen. It is obviously filling a perceived curricular need for a large number of our students--1332 different students were enrolled in a NAS program from 1975-1986.

Review of student evaluations revealed consistently strong expressions of appreciation of the value of the learning opportunity offered by the program. Students from freshmen to seniors regularly mentioned new levels of self-confidence and enthusiasm for learning. In addition, 65% of the student self-evaluations contained reference to specific cognitive learning.

We found the quality of faculty evaluations of students to vary, as they do among any group of faculty in any Specialty Area. The only evaluations of any concern--the so-called "generic" evaluations that mainly described the program's philosophy and structure--were all pre-1982.

In our review of self-evaluations, only one characteristic raised some level of concern: that only 61% of the students receiving credit program filed student self-evaluations as part of their transcripts. In a program where the student has such a significant degree of responsibility to define and undertake his or her learning, it seems particularly important that the student's voice be present in the final evaluation record. The four diagnostic and evaluation questions used as a framework for the students' work offer an ideal vehicle for self-evaluation statements.

Recommendation (8): The faculty team in the Native American Studies program should expect students to thoroughly document their work and learning, including submission of final transcript-ready self-evaluations. Just as the faculty assumes the responsibility to declare a student ready for the program (by signing the registration form), the student should declare her or himself ready for credit by thoroughly documenting their work and submitting a final self-evaluation. Special self-evaluation writing workshops designed for students with different types of learning projects could be organized and presented with assistance from the Hillaire Advising Center or other faculty with experience with different formats of self-evaluation.

5) How do we respond to the specific concerns regarding the Native American Studies program posed by the Academic Deans?

We think that most of the issues raised by the Academic Deans in Barbara Smith's presentation to the DTF on January 14th, 1987, have already been addressed. But, to assure that sufficient attention is given them, we offer the following summary:

a) Concerns about student record-keeping. If this was a problem in the past, it seems to have been addressed by the faculty teams of the past few years. Last year's NAS program dean and DTF member Rita Pougiales reported that she was satisfied with the faculty's current system of student records. Our review of faculty evaluations of student work did reveal some evaluations that seemed "generic" rather than individualized, but in our sample there were none since 1982.

b) Concerns about the quantity, quality and supervision of student work. Part of our response to these issues falls within the discussion of acceptance of divergent world views and pedagogical philosophies. Faculty colleagues--colleagues we trust and want to learn more from--have accepted the quantity and quality of the work of 93% of their students as worthy of credit. Our review of faculty and student evaluations did not result in any significant concern about these decisions. While individual cases of question about the appropriateness of work for academic credit arose, we also recognized our lack of context regarding the student's educational needs, and we found no reason not to trust the judgements of our colleagues. The amount and quality of work was equivalent to that done by students in the other programs and contracts we have participated in. In reading a sample of 10% of all evaluations filed from 1977-86, we did not find one student evaluation that expressed a criticism or dissatisfaction with the program or what they had learned.

We did share some of the concern for a need for a broader range of faculty expertise available to students in the program. The strategy of adjunct faculty hired to assist in areas where there are known "clusters" of student interest, initiated last year,

has been embraced by both Rita Pougiales and the faculty team. Our Recommendation (2) calls for further support in this area.

c) Concern about serving intended clientele. We agree that Evergreen must do much more in order to effectively serve the educational needs of Indian students and communities. We have given this issue top priority in our recommendations--see our Recommendation (1).

d) Concern about inconsistency of model. The program does not emphasize building community, but integrating one's learning into one's community life. The student's community is part of the learning triad, along with the student and the college. It's true that the community component of this triad is less strong for younger, non-local students, but the program has always attracted older, community-bound students who found full time attendance in three or four day-a-week classes difficult to manage given their other community and family obligations. The student age profile data supports this assessment.

We agree with the need for more faculty support and resources for individualized study. Our Recommendation (2) offers some suggestions for addressing this issue.

e) Concern about student abuse of the program. The data on the number of credits earned by students who enroll in the program deflates this myth. 43% of the students who have been in the program and graduated earned 16 credits or less; only 5% earned more than 96 credits in Native American Studies. We have no comparable data for any other Specialty Area, but these data do not indicate abuse to us.

f) Concern about faculty isolation. Fifteen faculty, representing all divisions of academic study, have taught in the program since 1977. Only two faculty have not also taught in other Specialty Areas. Again, we do not have comparable data from other Specialty Areas. If the program were better understood and more appreciated for the contributions it is making to the curriculum, more faculty would be interested in joining the team. Our Recommendations (2) and (5) in Part II of our report address this issue.

6) How do we, as a DTF studying and discussing these issues for a year, respond to the pedagogical compatibility question raised by the Faculty Agenda Committee?

We received the following question from the 1986-87 Faculty Agenda Committee:

- "Premises: 1) Any educational institution, including Evergreen, exists within a culture;
- 2) Any educational institution, and especially Evergreen, has its own culture (sub-culture);

- 16
- 3) Any culture, including the two referred to above, has its own integrity and structural wholeness.

Question: In the light of the three premises above, to what degree can Evergreen make room for educational pedagogies, approaches, and values that derive from other cultures without violating the integrity of its own culture?"

Evergreen prides itself on challenging many of the premises of traditional higher education. We are trying to forge new models of thinking and learning and acting. These efforts include trying to figure out what "cultural literacy" means, not only in the classroom, but in our lives as citizens of the world. In doing so, we are not only challenging the dominant models of higher education, but the dominant cultural systems that try to ignore or suppress the pluralistic reality of what America and American culture are. American culture includes Native Americans and their perceptions of reality. At least since 1971, Evergreen's educational culture has included Native Americans and their world-views and pedagogies. We are all limited by our own world views--perhaps that's the source of the racism that occasionally or frequently surfaces in all of us, whether individuals or institutions. The DTF rejects, therefore, the premise that there is a single culture at Evergreen.

We do, however, share values and aspirations about ourselves as an educational institution. The Values and Aspirations Committee for Strategic Planning articulated these for us in their May 1986 final report. While many of the values identified in that report support the reality and desirability of our cultural and pedagogical diversity, the following discussion of "Diversity" as one of these central values is particularly relevant here:

"Diversity. We should renew our efforts to incorporate as much variety as possible in race and ethnicity, socio-economic class, lifestyle, cultural values and so on into the faculty, staff and students of TESC. We should make diverse peoples and cultures, modes of teaching/learning, ways of seeing and being, mind-sets and points of view part of the fabric of this institution." (P.5)

This was one of seven values that "represent the center of the spectrum of opinion about what this college is and does. As a result, we believe that they should continue to form the central core of what we seek to achieve in the future." In giving direction to the Strategic Plan regarding "Evergreen as a Teaching/Learning Enterprise," the report states that "we should encourage the integration of different cultures' ways of learning into the life of the college." (P.5)

Of course, aspiring to these values is much easier than achieving them. Our general commitment to cultural diversity is not



enough. These statements do not include the structural mechanisms we need to create to make us examine and change our individual attitudes and behaviors. They don't make us act in accordance with our rhetoric. They don't help us realize and articulate possible limits to the diversity we are willing to embrace as part of our community. Our DTF does not have "quick-fix" recommendations to reconcile these issues. As we discovered, work on these questions requires a willingness to commit oneself to dialogue and to the possibility of new or modified self-identities as teachers and colleagues. This takes time--lots of it. It means taking risks--sometimes big ones.

Regardless of how much more we want to challenge ourselves to live up to our rhetoric concerning multi-cultural education, our DTF believes that we have an obligation to honor our long-standing acceptance of Native American cultural values as part of our community and our curriculum. We have hired faculty and staff to help us learn and use these values. We should respect the efforts of individual faculty, programs, and Specialty Areas to express different pedagogies and learning strategies within the curriculum. And, we should use this as an opportunity to learn how to collectively recognize, celebrate, learn from and institutionalize the diversity that is already a part of the cultural reality of Evergreen, Washington State, America and the world. This needs to happen at all levels and in all arenas of life and decision-making on campus--not just within one or two isolated corners of the curriculum.

#### A Final Comment

We have all grown up in a racist society and world that finds subtle ways to teach us that white people and institutions are superior, and so we must all be continually defending ourselves against those ideas in order to appreciate people of color and their institutions as equal.

When one observes the history of the relationship between the Native American Studies program, its faculty, and the rest of the college, we can see some manifestations of institutional racism at Evergreen. We insist that the NAS program be more than equal to other programs. There has been a longtime suspicion that it is not equal. That doesn't mean there is no room for improvement; every program on campus could and should improve. But it does mean that support for improvement--in this case support to recruit more Native American students and support to make more effective liaisons with the community--needs to come from the institution. Native American faculty should not be expected to recruit as well as teach, or do outreach as well as teach. They are members of our faculty, and they need to be given the rights and respect awarded all faculty. They need to be given support to do their best work at Evergreen, and the college needs to learn to listen better to the needs of Native people on our campus.