CULTURALLY SUSTAINING AND REVITALIZING PEDAGOGIES: LANGUAGE, CULTURE, AND POWER

ADVANCES IN RESEARCH ON TEACHING

Series Editor: Volumes 1−11: Jere Brophy
Volumes 12−28: Stefinee Pinnegar

Recent Volumes:

CULTURALLY SUSTAINING AND REVITALIZING PEDAGOGIES: LANGUAGE, CULTURE, AND POWER

EDITED BY

CATHY COULTER

University of Alaska Anchorage, Anchorage, AK, USA

MARGARITA JIMENEZ-SILVA

Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ, USA

ISOQAR certified
Management System,
awarded to Emerald
for adherence to
Environmental
standard
ISO 14001:2004.

ISOQAR
REGISTERED
Certificate Number 1985
ISO 14001

INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

CONTENTS

PART II: CULTURE

PART III: LANGUAGE

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

Apalaq (James) Ayuluk	Chevak Schools, Chevak, AK, USA
Cathy Coulter	Department of Graduate Studies in Education and Leadership, College of Education, University of Alaska Anchorage, Anchorage, USA
Tracey T. Flores	College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, Arizona State University, USA
Laura Gomez	Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College, Arizona State University, Tempe, USA
Timothy E. Jester	Department of Graduate Studies in Education and Leadership, College of Education, University of Alaska Anchorage, Anchorage, USA
Margarita Jimenez-Silva	Division of Teacher Preparation, Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College, Arizona State University, Tempe, USA
Panigkaq Agatha John-Shields	Educational Leadership, College of Education, University of Alaska Anchorage, Anchorage, USA
Jameson D. Lopez	Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College, Arizona State University, Tempe, USA
Ruth Luevanos	Los Angeles Unified School District, Los Angeles, CA, USA
Neva Mathias	Chevak School, Chevak, AK, USA
Cueponcaxochitl D. Moreno Sandoval	Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College, Arizona State University, USA

Kathryn Ohle   Early Childhood Education, Department
                          of Teaching and Learning, University of
                          Alaska Anchorage, USA

Cikigaq-Irasema   Department of Teaching and Learning,
   Ortega   College of Education, University of
                          Alaska, Anchorage, USA

Pablo Ramirez   Division of Teacher Preparation, Mary
                          Lou Fulton Teachers College, Arizona
                          State University, Glendale, USA

Karen Roth   College of Education, University of Alaska
                          Anchorage, Anchorage, USA

Anthony J. Trifiro   College of Liberal Arts and Sciences,
                          Arizona State University, Tempe, USA

Lisa Unin   Chevak Schools, Chevak, AK, USA

Amy Vinlove   School of Education, University of Alaska
                          Fairbanks, USA

INTRODUCTION

Cathy Coulter and Margarita Jimenez-Silva

In 2012, Paris Django published a call to move the field of education forward in its consideration and use of "resource pedagogies" (also called "asset pedagogies") (p. 94), including, among others, culturally relevant pedagogy (Ladson-Billings, 1995), funds of knowledge (Moll & Gonzalez, 1994), the pedagogical third space (Gutiérrez, Baquedano-López, & Tejeda, 1999), and culturally responsive pedagogy (Cazden & Leggett, 1976). Each of these pedagogical frameworks regards students' cultural and linguistic identities, knowledge, and communities to be paramount in providing access to dominant cultural practices and language (Dominant American English, or DAE). Paris asks us to think beyond using the culture and language that children bring to the classroom as a bridge to schooling success, but rather, to think in terms of using schooling to sustain the (fluid and evolving) cultural and linguistic identities and communities of our students. Paris wrote, "The term *culturally sustaining* requires that our pedagogies be more than responsive of or relevant to the cultural experiences and practices of young people — it requires that they support young people in sustaining the cultural and linguistic competences of their communities while simultaneously offering access to dominant cultural competence" (p. 95). Paris draws our attention to an aspect of resource pedagogies that

is too often neglected in practice. It is a shift in thinking, but with deep implications − the goal, in other words, is not simply access to DAE and dominant cultural competence, but access *while sustaining those native language and cultural practices that make our students who they are*. Paris is careful to point out that cultural identity is not static, but is "dynamic, shifting, and ever-changing." As we see in the examples in this volume, this distinction is very important in practice.

As a follow-up to Paris's, 2012 article, a 2014 issue of *Harvard Educational Review* (HER) featured a Symposium in which several authors (including Ladson-Billings, 2014; McCarty & Lee, 2014; Paris & Alim, 2014) take up the ideas originally set out by Paris. In the issue, authors Paris and Alim seek to illuminate and (lovingly) "critique forward" what it means to be culturally sustaining and ask: What is the purpose and what are the outcomes of Culturally Sustaining Pedagogy (CSP)? Here they articulate that CSP means not just working to sustain "… heritage practices of communities of color" but to also "tak(e) into account … contemporary/evolving practices" while also "contending with … problematic elements expressed in some youth cultural practices" (pp. 85−85). The purpose, in other words, is to sustain heritage and evolving practices, provide access to the dominant language and practices, and to prepare students for a pluralistic, multicultural, multilingual society.

Ladson-Billings lauds the work of Paris and Alim, discussing CSP as a version 2.0 − a "remix" of culturally relevant pedagogy (Ladson-Billings, 1995) with the added features of both sustaining the evolving cultures of students as well as creating a sort of "hybridity, fluidity, and complexity" that fosters a multilingual, multicultural classroom. Wrote Ladson-Billings, "Given the relationship between the two frameworks, I enter this conversation not as a critic of what these two scholars present but as an interlocutor. I hope to help those who subscribe to earlier versions of culturally relevant pedagogy make the transition to the remix: culturally sustaining pedagogy." It is important to continue to grow the theories we live, teach, and study by. A "remix" will allow us to reframe culturally relevant pedagogy, and to reinsert an active, living pedagogy into classroom practices that, in some instances, have reinstated symbolic acts of "cultural relevance" that serve instead to bolster the monolingual, monocultural mainstream (e.g., learning about holidays and traditions as a "static" form of knowledge, comparing the "other" to the White, middle class "norm"). More, the critical, political aspects of education become more visible: In order to sustain cultures and languages, mainstream classroom practices have to move over, adapt, or be collapsed into more pluralistic forms.

McCarty and Lee (2014) reframe CSP for Indigenous students who are historically and constitutionally entitled to educational sovereignty as a part of tribal sovereignty. In the context of Indigenous education, CSP becomes Culturally Sustaining/Revitalizing Pedagogy (CSRP) in that it seeks to revitalize and maintain languages and cultures that have suffered tremendously (and continue to suffer) under settler colonialism. Indigenous peoples' desire for tribal sovereignty has been "interlaced with ongoing legacies of colonization, ethnicide, and linguicide. Western schooling has been the crucible in which these contested desires have been molded, impacting Native peoples in ways that have separated their identities from their languages, lands, and worldviews" (p. 103). McCarty and Lee delineate three components of Culturally Sustaining/Revitalizing Pedagogy:

1. CSRP attends directly to asymmetrical power relations and the goal of transforming legacies of colonization.
2. CSRP recognizes the need to reclaim and revitalize what has been disrupted and displaced by colonization (focusing on language education policy and practice).
3. Indigenous CSRP recognizes the need for community-based accountability.

Though Culturally Sustaining/Revitalizing Pedagogies are articulated toward the unique situation of Indigenous students, we find that the premise and components of CSRP, with a more overtly critical frame, are reflected in the examples included in this volume that pertain to non-Indigenous English learners, as well.

In the introduction to the 2014 HER issue on CSP, the editors wrote, "We encourage scholars and practitioners to take this work into their studies and classrooms and to use the concept of culturally sustaining pedagogy in ways that will test, hone, and clarify the theory" (pp. 72−73). This volume sets out to do exactly that. When we first began to talk about this volume, we wanted to seek out examples from around the globe to see what CSP might look like in various settings. However, the more we talked the more we realized that what we sought was happening in our own backyards. We decided to highlight the little-known local endeavors − simple snap shots of projects that are centered in CSP/CSRP that are pursued as sites of resistance, whether practical, pedagogical, or policy-driven. These are educators: Indigenous, non-Indigenous, linguistically and culturally diverse, and allies who are working for change, for what Paris calls the "democratic project of schooling" (p. 93).

In her essay, "Pedagogies of Resistance and Survivance: Learning as Marronage" (2016), Leigh Patel wrote "Learning is, at its core, a fugitive

act" (p. 397). The chapters in this book provide examples of such fugitivity — writing bilingually in the shadow of restrictive language policies in Arizona (Flores' chapter); or teaching Kenkakun/Through Love and Ellangeq/ Becoming Aware using Yup'ik epistemologies in higher education in a large public university in Alaska (John-Shields' chapter); exploring the systemic oppression that keeps Native American students from enrolling in higher education (Lopez's chapter); or the interest convergence of Dual Language Programs (DLPs) as an elitist mechanism that effectively bars access to English Language Learners (ELLs) (Gomez's chapter); preparing teachers for culturally sustaining work in Alaska Native villages through an induction program that supports teaching through local knowledge systems (Roth's chapter) or teaching through Indigenous and local place-based knowledge in preservice teaching classrooms (Vinlove's chapter); promoting culturally sustaining/revitalizing pedagogy through reflective field experiences in Alaska Native villages (Jester's chapter) or guiding preservice and inservice teachers in transforming practices toward CSP (the respective chapters by Trifiro and Ramirez); advocating for broader participation in computer science education for the good of Mother Earth (Moreno Sendoval's chapter); or reflecting on professional identities in an inward gaze (Paris & Alim, 2014) in order to decolonize the self (the respective chapters by Ohle and Ortega), or to examine what CSP practices look from a teacher's perspective (Jimenez-Silva & Luevanos' chapter). Each example has resistance and survivance at its core: articulations of defiance against educational policies that demand that children leave behind their cultural identity in order to succeed.

This volume is separated into three sections: Language, Culture, and Power. We realize that, not unlike western education, we are imposing constructs — silos that do not exist in isolation. Of course, language, culture, and power are always inextricably linked and it is not our intent to maintain otherwise. In fact, any one of these chapters could have been organized within any one of these topics. Nevertheless, structuring in this way allows us to think through these three aspects of CSRP filtered through the individual chapters. At the beginning of each section is an essay by an Indigenous teacher or paraprofessional from Chevak, Alaska (the respective chapters by Ayuluk, Mathias, and Unin), addressing the ways in which their Cup'ik culture, language, and epistemologies intersect with western education. Their narratives highlight the dissonances in navigating western influences while working to sustain culture and language: the importance of listening to the Elders and maintaining Native language (Ayuluk's chapter); the joy of passing on skills learned by a mother's side in the interest of revitalizing culture (Unin's chapter); the hard work and joy in retaining Cup'ik

values through subsistence (Mathias's chapter). Each narrative embodies Cup'ik epistemologies and a "loving critique forward" (Paris & Alim, 2014). Their words illuminate our path.

In our university undergraduate and graduate classes, we find preservice and inservice teachers who are willing and able to work in culturally sustaining/revitalizing ways with their students, but who often feel their hands are tied within very scripted, one-size-fits-all curricula and the need to prepare students for high-stakes tests (standards-based and in English). It is clear at the outset that culturally sustaining/revitalizing pedagogies will be either in resistance to or in spite of the current schooling environment. We therefore begin the volume with a discussion of power. In "Section I: Power," we begin with our "Voices from the Community" section, in which Mathias takes us on a journey as she shows ways she has learned to navigate two worlds: her Cup'ik way of life, and that of the western world. Then, in the chapter "Critical Ancestral Computing for the Protection of Mother Earth," Moreno Sendoval calls for diverse voices in computer science and technology courses, which will lead to more diverse representation in technology fields − in the interest of a more sustainable technological world for the "protection of Mother Earth." In the chapter "American Indian Access to Higher Education: Where Are All the NDNs?," Lopez explores reasons why there are fewer Native American and Alaska Native students in higher education, addressing issues of access and colonization. In Gomez chapter ("Dual Language Programs: Language and Access"), we move on to Arizona, where a resurgence of DLPs for the benefit of White and higher Social Economic Status (SES) students is happening as English learners are barred access to the programs by various restrictive language policies, in spite of ample evidence that DLPs and bilingualism are beneficial to all students. In the final chapter of this section ("Culturally Sustaining Pedagogy in Action: Views from Inside a Secondary Social Studies Teacher's Classroom" by Jimenez-Silva and Luevanos), we explore what CSP looks like inside of secondary U.S. and World History classrooms and how one experienced teacher uses CSP to connect with culturally and linguistically diverse students, some who are pregnant or parenting teens.

Unin begins our section, "Part II: Culture" by weaving her childhood story of learning to sew by the side of her mother and within her Cup'ik ways of knowing with her ability to live within her Cup'ik traditions and values today, coming full circle by teaching school children Cup'ik language, culture, and values through sewing. Part II includes chapters that more explicitly describe ways in which culture is addressed within CSP/CSRP projects. In

the chapter "Yupiunrirngaitua/The Skirt I Refuse to Wear," John-Shields takes us on a journey as she transforms her teaching practice to integrate her cultural identity and Indigenous epistemologies within her higher education classroom. In the chapter "Preparing Culturally Sustaining/Revitalizing Educators: Lessons from Field Experiences in Alaska Native Village Schools," Jester describes ways in which his preservice teachers came to understandings of the crisis, struggle, and hope within language and culture revitalization in rural Alaska Native schools. In the chapter "Teach What You Know: Cultivating Culturally Sustaining Practices in Pre-Service Alaska Native Teachers," Vinlove explores ways in which Indigenous and non-Indigenous preservice teachers can learn to incorporate Indigenous and local knowledge (ILK) in order to make their classrooms more culturally sustaining and revitalizing. In the chapter "The Induction Seminar: Nurturing Culturally Sustaining Teaching and Learning in Rural Alaska Native Communities," Roth describes a teacher induction program used to prepare non-Indigenous teachers from outside of Alaska for classrooms in rural, Alaska Native villages. Finally, in the chapter "Reflections from the Tundra: Language, Culture, and Pedagogy through Community Engagement," Cikigaq-Irasema Ortega describes the journey that she went on in exploring her own Indigenous roots as a part of her experiences working alongside Cup'ik colleagues toward language and culture revitalization.

In "Part III: Language," our chapters address more directly aspects of language in CSP/CSRP. Ayuluk begins with an essay on the role the Cup'ik language fills in supporting a Cup'ik way of life. In the chapter "Writing the Threads of Our Lives: Stories from a Bilingual Family Writing Project," Flores discusses a family writing project that she engages in after school with the families of her bilingual students who are deprived of CSP/CSRP in their classroom instruction. In the chapter "Five Words: Lessons Learned in Rural Alaska," Ohle uses a series of "Five Words" to describe her experience teaching a class for preservice teachers in rural Alaska. Through her narrative, we see way in which instructors must decolonize their practice in order to engage in CSP/CSRP. In the chapter "Preparing Pre-Service Secondary Teachers in Arizona: Using Culturally Sustaining Approaches to Learn from Diverse Secondary English Learners," Pablo Ramirez examines the experiences of six preservice teachers who are navigating their high school student teaching experiences while trying to engage in CSP within a highly culturally and linguistically diverse school within a state that is known for its restrictive language policies. He sheds light on the critical work of preparing the next generation of teachers to enact CSP. Finally, Anthony Trifiro in the chapter "Transforming Teachers' Practice through Professional Development:

Culturally Sustaining Pedagogical Changes in Support of English Language Learners" shares examples of how professional development can support inservice teachers to think about how their own backgrounds can impact and inform their teaching practices when working with English learners in secondary classrooms across various content areas. Through coursework, course assignments, and coaching, the teachers shifted their understanding of their roles from that of only focusing on content to roles that extend beyond teaching content to one of sustaining students' cultural and linguistic assets.

OVERVIEW OF EACH CHAPTER

In this section, we provide a more detailed overview of each chapter highlighted in this volume, after which we discuss ways in which each project informs CSP/CSRP.

Mathias offers an inside view of what it is like to be a Cup'ik woman who is forced to go to a western-based boarding school outside her village. She shows how she has held on to her Cup'ik values and customs while navigating the western and Cup'ik worlds. Through her descriptions of fish camp and life as a Cup'ik woman, she illuminates the joy, beauty, and fulfillment of sharing a subsistence life with her family.

Moreno Sendoval discusses the need for a diversity of worldviews and thoughts within computing classrooms (and professions). The field is currently dominated by White males, which contributes to "hubris" in regards to the environmental impact of always going for the "newest and latest devices." She argues that by promoting critical consciousness through culturally sustaining and revitalizing pedagogies we can begin to unwind the oppression that keeps us disconnected from mother earth, keeps us stratified and (some of us) oppressed. She goes on to discuss a possible remedy in a "multi-course ancestral computing for sustainability pipeline" which will foster critical consciousness and connection toward a more sustainable technological world.

Moreno Sendoval explores the factors that contribute to the significant difference in numbers of Native American students enrolling in institutions of higher education. While there are obvious factors in the opportunity gap within schools in terms of quality and preparation, Lopez contends that it is the lack of culturally sustaining and revitalizing pedagogy that makes a difference. The push toward individualism and westernized educational

thinking causes a decline in children learning Indigenous language and culture. The Eurocentric, epistemological monopoly in Western schooling erodes Indigenous epistemologies centered in self-improvement for the collective good. Lopez informs us that culturally sustaining and revitalizing pedagogy promotes access into higher education, and that loss of language and culture happens as a result of the push toward individualism and economic expansion, which actually contributes to a loss of access and reduced chances of success.

Gomez presents an extensive review of the literature on the benefits of DLPs as a backdrop for the Interest Convergence Theory (Bell, 1980), enacted by education policies that exclude language minority students from those benefits by denying them access to DLPs. A plethora of empirical evidence is offered, providing evidence that there are multiple benefits to DLPs, including "cogitative learning, high academic achievement, and the opportunity to be competitive in a global economy" (p. 1). However, through restrictive language policies, English learners are excluded from DLPs. Access to DLPs and CSP/CSRP would benefit all students. Writes Gomez, "The education policies excluding language minority students have been created by politics and laws that are driven by nativist sentiments … and hidden by Interest Convergence ideals of shared interest when only the interests of the dominant culture are pushed forward" (p. 20).

Jimenez-Silva and Luevanos take informal conversations between a researcher and a classroom teacher to a formal study examining the specific strategies and lessons that move from culturally relevant teaching to a CSP. Working with pregnant and parenting teens in an alternative high school, Mrs. L uses a number of strategies that help her connect with students, develop the skills they need to access the school curriculum, and empower them to sustain their cultural and linguistic assets. By drawing on the community's cultural wealth, the authors provide examples of how to teach the social studies' standards of primary and secondary sources in meaningful ways. They call on us to support teachers in the classroom trenches who are engaged in this ground-level work to empower the next generation of social justice advocates.

Unin tells the story of learning to sew by her mother's side. Describing her Cup'ik epistemologies she then shows how she grew to use that knowledge − of how to sew, of how to survive off the land − to connect to her Cup'ik identity. The teaching of her Ancestors comes full circle as she shares her knowledge with the children she teaches in school.

John-Shields works from a Yup'ik epistemology of love and awareness and honoring the words of the Elders to describe how she came to

indigenize her identity as a teacher. As a result, she has come to use Yup'ik values and epistemologies in her teaching practice in her higher education classes. Through reflection and sharing, her students become aware of their own cultural identities and how they share commonalities with one another (through the sharing of values). John-Shields shows how CSP/CSRP can be used in college classrooms to help foster the ability to teach through CSP/CSRP in K-12 classrooms.

Jester presents the findings from a study in which he examined the reflections of 60 preservice teachers placed in cross cultural experiences based in rural Alaska Native villages. He found that students were able to perceive the crisis of endangered Alaska Native languages and cultures and the struggle against the continued coloniality of schools in rural Alaska through their observations of classroom instruction. Students who witnessed culturally sustaining and revitalizing practices as Elders visited schools and taught children about subsistence and cultural values noticed that Elders taught with patience and love. Jester elicited reflections from his students that allowed them to perceive practices of oppression (what he calls "Contexts of Crisis, and Contexts of Struggle") and culturally sustaining and revitalizing practices that engendered hope in his students (and his readers). Such experiences provide possibilities for transformative learning for preservice teachers.

Vinlove explores the possibilities in instructing pre-service teachers to use ILK in order to provide CSP/CSRP in their instruction. She shows that in order to engender the ability to use ILK, pre-service teachers "must first recognize the value and significance of locally relevant curriculum; second, understand how to respectfully gather and document current 'living' local knowledge; and third, become empowered with the skills and knowledge to purposefully integrate local knowledge into the curriculum." Through her study, Vinlove shows how she was able to help both Alaska Native and non-native students get in touch with and use ILK to foster CSP/CSRP in their current and future classrooms.

Roth describes a year-long teacher Induction Seminar that provides support for non-Indigenous teachers who were hired from outside Alaska to teach in Alaska Native villages. The course was carefully designed for the following outcomes: "(1) To provide mentoring support, resources and strategies for teachers who seek to implement CSP; (2) To examine assumptions around effective schooling in rural Alaska Native communities; and (3) To explore the cultures and current issues of the Indigenous peoples of Alaska and how these affect student learning." These goals help to mitigate the negative experiences that Alaska Native children have with

new-to-the-field teachers who are not well-prepared for life in a rural village, some of whom end up leaving before the end of the school year.

Ortega chronicles her experiences working alongside Alaska Native community members to sustain culture and language through collaborative curriculum writing for a Cup'ik immersion wing. During her many visits to the village, she finds that she is personally and professionally transformed as she explores her own Indigenous identity through experiences that "help chronicle a transformation that is deeply tried to how place and the activities that take place in the company of community members and mentors generate new insights related to the incommensurable western and Alaska Native paradigms of pedagogy, research and educational policy in contexts where the language, culture and place are at stake."

Ayuluk describes the dissonances he feels navigating the western world with all of its conveniences and trying to sustain cultural identity through Cup'ik practices. There is paradox in the choices: to be practical, one might choose the non-Cup'ik ways, and yet to choose the non-Cup'ik ways is to lose them. Ayuluk finds answers in learning the language, and particularly in listening to the Elders. He writes, "Everything about the Cup'ik way of life is in the words of the Elders" (p. 2).

Flores writes about a bilingual family writing project that she has started at her school in response to restrictive language policies that deprive her students' access to enriching content and language instruction. In order to create a CSP that allows bilingual families to write about their shared dreams, she has created a space where "all voices, languages, and cultures are equally valuable and important" (p. 2). Because of the restrictive language policies of the state, which "silenced (students) cultural and linguistic identities, but mandated a very different path than their English speaking peers" (p. 6) the writing project had to happen outside the school day. But there in her classroom, family members feel safe and valued and there they write together about their hopes and dreams — bilingually — in a setting that should be available to all students during the school day.

Ohle uses the lesson she learned as a freshly minted teacher in a job interview to frame an approach to her work from a place of self-knowledge and awareness as she discusses her experience teaching a pre-service teaching class in rural Alaska. Her work exemplifies the kinds of ongoing self-reflection — the gaze inward (Paris & Alim, 2014) that is necessary for non-Indigenous instructors to engage in as they learn to decolonize their practice. Through a series of "five words" Ohle discusses the role of identity and institution in teaching and learning with pre-service teachers in rural Alaska.

Ramirez directs us to the important work of preparing preservice teachers to working with culturally and linguistically diverse students. Using a multiple case study approach, he guides us through the experiences of six preservice teaching working in a highly diverse urban high school. By building meaningful relationship with students, the preservice teachers began to shift their perspectives from deficit-oriented to asset-oriented. One teacher reported that she now saw that "all 15 students were extremely talented in their first language. Many of the students knew so much that they were bored with what I was teaching" (p. 256). Another teacher pointed out when discussing a community event in which students were translating complex text for their parents, "I love the fact that my students have so much linguistic talent. I don't see this side of their language skills in class. This is powerful" (p. 260). Ramirez emphasizes that this shift does not happen without skillful guidance by those of us working with preservice teachers.

Trifiro moves us from preservice teachers working with culturally and linguistically diverse students to those teachers already in the classroom. His work points to the need to engage teachers in professional development that allows them opportunities to examine their own beliefs about how to best support English learners in secondary content classrooms. Through coaching, meaningful discussions about how to sustain the assets that students bring through our classroom doors can shape teachers' practices. By understanding how to improve the craft and science of teaching when working with English learners, teachers reported a "renewed and re-ignited passion for teaching."

HOW THIS VOLUME INFORMS CSP/CSRP

Each of these authors presents projects that inform CSP/CSRP. In this section, we reflect on some key issues that emerge from the volume as a whole. First, these chapters tell us that this work is happening — that there are practitioners who are working within different capacities to bring about Culturally Sustaining and Revitalizing Pedagogies. They show us what it can look like — that it can be done with awareness, with purpose, with love (John-Shields' chapter; Paris & Alim, 2014). Culturally sustaining and revitalizing practices are happening in classrooms and communities across the nation, and these are just a few examples. We hope that by focusing on and theorizing around CSP/CSRP we

will make progress in moving the field forward toward a multilingual, multicultural, pluralistic school system.

Second, we understand that there are some key issues that need to be addressed in our quest toward CSP/CSRP, and these include: overt obstructions to CSP/CSRP such as restrictive education and language policies; endemic and institutional racism/colonization; and the need to claim and decolonize all aspects of the education system: policies, educators, curricula, and students in order to foster a multilingual, multicultural classroom environment in which CSP/CSRP practices are possible. These chapters further highlight the need for a critical stance, a "community driven" approach (McCarty & Lee, 2014), and the importance of the inward gaze (Paris & Alim, 2014) in decolonizing our own practices. All of these themes are laid out in the 2012 and 2014 publications regarding CSP/CSRP. What is relevant here is the way in which these issues present themselves. By looking closely at CSP/CSRP in practice, even within our approximations, we can get a sense of what more needs to be done. In this way, our endeavors can begin to reach out to one another, tying us together into a collective with a common purpose.

RESTRICTIVE EDUCATION AND LANGUAGE POLICIES

While some states such as Arizona have overtly restrictive language (e.g., Arizona's Proposition 203) and curricular policies (e.g., Arizona HB 2281 banning ethnic studies), other states, such as Alaska, restrict use of language and culture in classrooms through the mandates of scripted curricula, high-stakes standardized testing, and narrow, standards-based instruction. The results of such mandates include teachers who feel their hands are tied when it comes to curricular choices. We have worked with teachers who try to utilize multicultural children's literature or a little free writing, for example, into very scripted programs with limited success. It is difficult to establish equitable classroom practices when teachers have little to no autonomy in classroom choices.

There are other forms of restrictive education policies, such as the requirement of standardized exams for teaching certification – exams which are biased against candidates of color, Indigenous candidates, and English learners (e.g., the Praxis I and II). These policies tend to "white wash" teacher education. Furthermore, many of our teachers who are former English

learners have not had access to quality bilingual education. Therefore, their own proficiency in their native language is stunted. Because they were not supported by CSP, many of them were not encouraged nor provided the opportunity to sustain their linguistic assets. A number of them enroll in the bilingual/English as a second language elementary education program yet cannot pass the language proficiency tests to be endorsed as bilingual teachers. Due to restrictive language policies, most of the students becoming bilingual today are native English speakers learning a second language in DLPs many of which are situated in wealthier neighborhoods. Such policies tend to normalize racism and trickle down into instruction, as seen in the respective chapters by Ramirez, Jester, Flores, Gomez, and Lopez.

Restrictive education and language policies obstruct CSP/CSRP and must be addressed. We simply can't pretend that teachers have the kind of autonomy that is required to engage in authentic CSP/CSRP. We have to actively advocate for change, through our democratic processes (informing and pressuring lawmakers at the state and federal levels, local levels, and district levels and resisting inequitable mandates) and activism (demonstrating, boycotting, and so forth). In this way, what our chapters here show us is that the critical aspect of CSP/CSRP is crucial. We have to create the spaces in which these approaches can happen.

INSTITUTIONAL COLONIALISM

Institutional colonialism is a means by which institutions, inadvertently or not, tend to oppress Indigenous and English learners through processes that are difficult to navigate. They generally include formal forms with signatures, fees, layers of approval, and a tacit knowledge. For Alaska Native students in rural villages, for example, institutional policies in higher education can seem very disconnected from the students they purport to serve. For example, in Coulter's work with Alaska Native students, it has happened multiple times that a student decides to drop a class and doesn't realize that she has to formally drop it through the university system. The student simply stops attending class. If the student misses the drop deadline, the system requires that she still must pay for the class in full. Often times the student doesn't realize that she has a balance due on her student account and has been accruing late fees. When the student decides to resume her studies, she is unable to because she has to pay the past due amount before she can reenroll. Institutional systems are difficult to

navigate for urban students who have attended large schools. For rural students with no experience with the walls put up by "that's how we do things" it can become a serious gatekeeping process.

Examples of institutional colonization are present at all levels of higher education: from developing curricula or scheduling courses around subsistence activities, we have found time and again that institutional processes thwart attempts to be responsive to the needs of our Indigenous and English learner students. In order to fully embrace the possibilities within CSP/CSRP, institutional processes must be decolonized in ways that ensure the health of the unit by expanding its capacity to serve *all* students, which requires it to be flexible and fluid in meeting their needs.

Institutions of higher education are not unique in this way. Schools and districts are wrought with policies that reinforce a mainstream approach. These policies and practices are often so ingrained that they are not questioned. When they are, critique is met with righteous indignation − as an affront to all that is right and good. Under such circumstances, it is difficult to imagine new and just possibilities.

CLAIMING AND DECOLONIZING EDUCATION

While we work toward breaking down the overtly restrictive education and language policies (from outside our schools) and the inherently racist and colonial aspects of schools (from inside our schools), there are some overarching aspects to CSP/CSRP which will allow us to directly re/claim and decolonize education. First, we must take a critical stance (the respective chapters by Moreno Sandoval, Lopez, Gomez, Ramirez, Jimenez-Silva, and Luevanos). Classroom instruction is inherently political − CSP/CSRP that happen within schools will by definition begin to break down the White, middle class mainstream norm. Paris and Alim (2014) note that this will be an uphill battle − there will be push back from those who want a monolingual, monocultural society and also those who feel that fostering multilingualism/multiculturalism will be detrimental to students' success in Dominant American English (DAE) and, as a result to a prosperous life. Second, as McCarty and Lee (2014) discuss, such work must be community-driven − local cultural communities must be the driving force in articulating the ways in which ways of knowing, epistemologies, languages, and traditions will manifest in the classroom. Culture-bearers, native speakers of mother languages, and Elders are integral to the work in this volume, whether it be teacher induction or the availability of cultural and linguistic

knowledge for K-12 students (the respective chapters by John-Shields, Vinlove, Jester, Roth, Flores). But for CSP/CSRP to blossom into a pluralistic, equitable future, it must be community-driven. Community members have a huge stake in classrooms — their children! — and therefore must be the center of decision-making at all levels. Finally, we must actively utilize the "gaze inward" (Paris & Alim, 2014) working to decolonize ourselves and the students with whom we work (the respective chapters by Ohle, Ortega, Trifiro). It is hopeful that the work highlighted in this volume is happening in the current, restrictive educational environment. Much of this work centers around the "gaze inward" as teachers, teacher educators, Indigenous students and English learners alike understand the importance of indigenizing/decolonizing/identifying themselves within culturally sustaining and revitalizing processes.

Indigenous authors in this volume write about the importance of observation, of awareness, of paying attention. Paris and Alim propose a "loving" move forward, and John-Shields shares with us the Yup'ik value of *kenka*/love. When we reach out and connect to one another — across tundra and desert, across institutions and policy-driven barriers, when we reach out and move forward with love we can create change. CSP/CSRP practices are happening around the nation and world. This remix (Ladson-Billings, 2014) provides us with new opportunities to rethink schooling from the ground up. The hopeful imperative is this: We *can* do this. But we need to do this now, and we need to work together. CSP/CSRP practices are not just pedagogies. They constitute a movement, and it must be conducted at all levels of education. The future of our multilingual, multicultural society depends on it.

REFERENCES

Bell, D. A. (1980). Brown v. board of education and the interest-convergence dilemma. *Harvard Law Review*, *93*(3), 518–533.

Cazden, C. B., & Leggett, E. L. (1976). *Culturally responsive education: A discussion of LAU Remedies II*. Prepared for the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. National Institute of Education, Washington, DC.

Gutiérrez, K. D., Baquedano-López, P., & Tejeda, C. (1999). Rethinking diversity: Hybridity and hybrid language practices in the third space. *Mind, Culture, and Activity*, *6*(4), 286–303.

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

Ladson-Billings, G. (2014). Culturally relevant pedagogy 2.0: aka the remix. *Harvard Educational Review*, *84*(1), 74−84.

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

Moll, L. C., & Gonzalez, N. (1994). Lessons from research with language-minority children. *Journal of Reading Behavior*, *26*(4), 23−41.

Paris, D. (2012). Culturally sustaining pedagogy: A needed change in stance, terminology, and practice. *Educational Researcher*, *41*(3), 93−97.

Paris, D., & Alim, H. S. (2014). What are we seeking to sustain through culturally sustaining pedagogy? A loving critique forward. *Harvard Educational Review*, *84*(1), 85−100.

Patel, L. (2016). Pedagogies of resistance and survivance: Learning as marronage. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, *49*(4), 397−401.