Preparing Students for Informed Public Discourse through Native American History

Laurie Arnold (Sinixt Band, Colville Confederated Tribes), Gonzaga University

ARTICLE

Introduction to Native American History is a survey course, currently designed as a lower-division one-semester big-picture overview spanning pre-contact to the present. The course presents an opportunity to engage students from across majors and schools, and, while it is a lower division class, more than half of the enrolled students in spring semester 2018 were juniors or seniors. It is an elective course for the Native American studies minor, it fulfills a university core requirement for history, social justice, or global studies. It could also be the only Native American topic course students take in college, so the stakes are high for providing content knowledge as well as interpretative practices that will enhance the ways students discuss Native American histories and lives beyond the classroom and the university. I must do more than simply practice my discipline of history with students—I must help them learn for understanding. Learning for understanding “is to act more like a professional historian, and [develop] the motivation and confidence that flow from this to stimulate further learning.” This approach combines content knowledge with skills development to transform students into historical thinkers. I hope that this course lays the foundation for students to think critically about history throughout their lives.

As a Native American, the responsibility to bring substance and meaning to the survey weighs heavily. We focus on learning Native histories from the inside out, rather than relying only on narratives written from external perspectives. If students had previous Native American content, say in their K-12 educations, those histories focused on the nineteenth century and typically used sources written by non-Indians. These practices reinforce a conclusion that Native Americans are peoples of the past. They cast Native American histories as brief and unrelated to American history, rather than illustrating the diversity and dynamism of Native peoples or acknowledging that Native peoples were integral to the formation of the United States. This course specifically seeks to counter the absence of Native American histories created by U.S. history textbooks, and to reveal to students that Native American history pervades North American histories. The stakes are high in this course because Native Americans make up and reside in vibrant contemporary communities. Discussions of treaty rights and nation-to-nation governmental relationships are not abstract concepts but reflect the real lives and practices of 573 federally recognized tribes in the United States as of 2018.

This article will focus on my approach to building this course—the methodology I employed in designing the syllabus in order to meet history learning outcomes as well as my own—and will discuss in detail one...
new assignment that I created to foster student learning and skills development. The public engagement interview called upon students to apply their content knowledge in a mock public setting where they served as experts discussing Native histories with friends and strangers. I strategically employed this assignment so students could practice for conversations where they might repair and augment previously learned narratives.

I have been teaching at a Gonzaga University, a Jesuit institution, for five years. Most of our students enroll directly from high school. They are generally diligent and are usually proficient with various kinds of writing assignments. However, I have observed that they often struggle to articulate their ideas orally, whether in a formal presentation or in class discussions. Students meet course learning outcomes when writing, but are less competent and confident when recounting their narratives using different methods such as digital projects or oral presentations. In other words, when not dwelling in the familiar realm of tests and papers, students have difficulty moving beyond memory to illustrate meaning.²

Introduction to Native American History is a new course in my portfolio; I taught it for the first time in spring 2018. When I began to design it in fall 2016, I planned to adapt assignments from the Harvard University’s John F. Kennedy School of Government Belfer Center’s Applied History Project, which defines applied history as “the explicit attempt to illuminate current challenges and choices by analyzing historical precedents and analogues.” In practicing applied history, historians use events in the past to suggest interventions in the present, with an aim of informing policy decisions and more.³ Native American history is a perfect setting to apply lessons of the past to contemporary actions related to tribes and the U.S. relationship with them because those relationships are ongoing. The U.S. continuously engages in policy discussions with tribes. Throughout the university curriculum approval process this approach to history assignments received enthusiastic feedback.

As much as I liked the applied history ethos, I began to move away from written assignments in the final syllabus design. By fall 2017, I decided to experiment with an assignment that would foster oral competency: a public engagement interview.⁴ My rationale for this approach is that all students (and alumni) will have many more opportunities to speak about history and Native American lives than they will to write about either. Even students who pursue advanced academic degrees will speak about historical narratives and methods (whether formally or informally) more than they will write about them. In this era of “fake news,” I assert that it’s crucial for students to develop confidence in their content knowledge about history, in the sources they have used to learn history, and in their abilities to engage publicly about history. To learn for understanding. I believed this assignment would help students comprehend some of the reasons the stakes are high in getting Native histories right. As Veronica Boix-Mansilla noted in her case study about Rwanda, “[understanding] can only emerge when students have the opportunity to tackle authentic problems [and] to use their skills appropriately in plausible settings.”⁵

---

³ Applied History Project, [https://www.belfercenter.org/project/applied-history-project#!about](https://www.belfercenter.org/project/applied-history-project#!about) accessed April 1, 2018
⁴ The assignment is not a standard interview format, with one person asking questions of another, but instead is a recorded prompt to which students reply. Naming the assignment an interview seemed the most succinct way to communicate to students that they would be responding to questions via a recorded response.
The idea came to me after I watched students in my fall 2017 Introduction to Native American Studies class present digital projects they had spent the month of October researching. Despite their one-month immersion in primary and secondary source research, both during class time and outside class, many of them had trouble speaking about the historical significance of the topic so instead focused on biographical details of the individuals they had encountered. Historian Peter Stearns discussed a conundrum he encountered when teaching comparative world history: students “could not consistently move from descriptive, memorized presentations of data to selectivity and analysis.” My experience with students was similar. At the same time, their written work in their digital portfolios demonstrated they did comprehend the bigger picture, so why couldn’t they translate that knowledge?

Some answers to this question arrived in spring 2018, in student reflection essays about the public engagement interview. I posed several questions for their consideration, including “how is talking about history different than writing about history?” All students in a class of 32 noted that talking about history was more difficult because it required deeper content knowledge. More than one-third of students observed that they couldn’t bluff their way through the interviews as they might have when cherry-picking content to use in papers. Ellis observed, “I feel that talking about history required more planning than writing [does]. When writing a paper, I’d find what information I can use to respond to the prompt, write the essay and turn it in.” He aimed to work efficiently and generally did not revisit those types of assignments after submission. John noted, “When I write a paper or study for an exam, I tend to focus on studying and mainly memorizing a couple days before the date it is due or the exam occurs. However, once the exam or paper is completed, I drop and essentially lose almost all of the information...When speaking about something, one has to have learned and know what he/she is talking about. So all in all, because I learned the content and spoke about it, it is retained at a much higher percentage compared to that of a paper or test.” Many students described similar approaches to memorizing for assignments and noted that these methods did not support longer-term content retention. Short-term cramming creates the opposite of an ideal outcome: memorization, not meaning. This approach to history also does not help students go beyond “thinking the nation” in U.S. history classes, to challenge established narratives and recognize other perspectives.

As I reconsidered my approach to assignments, I recalled the *Washington Post’s* “Made by History” blog, introduced in June 2017. The blog calls upon historians to enter the fray and explore history behind the headlines, to bring additional and/or nuanced perspectives to the news of the day. The urgency behind this project makes complete sense to me: we need more informed people entering discussions more often if we want to balance imbalanced narratives. Since its debut, the blog has averaged more than one post per day. This kind of public historical scholarly engagement provides a welcome counter to accusations that scholars speak only to each other, and it has been a useful model for me as I have worked to connect the aims of this assignment to the students’ products.

---


7 Only quotes for which students gave their informed consent and explicit permission were used in this article.

8 I have changed all student names to preserve their anonymity. Ellis, reflection paper, May 4, 2018.

9 John, extra credit assignment, May 2, 2018.


The learning outcomes used by our history department will feel familiar to historians at other institutions. This list includes the history learning outcomes as well as examples of how the Introduction to Native American History course met those outcomes. The social justice and global studies learning outcomes, including specific examples related to the course, are included in the appendix.

- Identify possible causes and consequences of significant historical events.
  - For example, students will be able to discuss how European and British immigration to the Americas caused irreversible changes to Indigenous spaces and lifeways in North America.

- Explain processes of change over time as well as historical continuity within a chronological and geographical framework.
  - For example, students will comprehend that while Native American communities throughout the United States experienced colonial processes of change, there is no single ‘Native American’ historical experience or perspective. European and American migration across North America disrupted Native American lifeways, but Native American cultures and communities persisted and persist.

- Understand and formulate historical arguments, evaluate historical evidence, and assess historical interpretations
  - This course is built from Native American perspectives of their own histories. We will study these histories in comparison with narratives written from European and American perspectives about Native peoples. Through this process of evaluation, we will discover areas of contradiction and areas of alignment in respective historical interpretations.

As I completed the spring 2018 syllabus, I made an intentional decision: in a departure from other courses in the history department, students would complete no historical writing assignments in the class. Instead, they accomplished their learning outcomes orally, through the public engagement interviews and through class discussion. This adjustment reflects what Alan Booth describes as a pedagogic shift representing the ability of faculty “to respond flexibly and creatively to classroom situations.” The interview assignment had guidelines and a narrative rubric (see appendix); students asynchronously video-recorded themselves responding to six content questions over the course of the fifteen-week semester, staggered roughly two weeks apart. At the end of the course, students completed a written reflection essay, reviewing each of their six videos and discussing whether and how their competency and comfort with this format improved.

As I designed the project, I contacted the university’s career services office, which shared several interview resources with me. Most important among those was the university’s access to subscription-based interview software. All students and faculty have access to this software and I elected to have students use it to record their interviews. I viewed this as a more stable tool than asking them to store the files on their own devices, particularly because those interviews will live on that server indefinitely. Students can access the interviews any time and could extract them for other purposes if desired. The asynchronous nature of the assignment and unlimited access to the software meant students could complete this assignment at their convenience. Students could access the questions in Blackboard and through the

---

12 Booth, 11.
13 The career services office requested that I not name the software here but several platforms of this type are available in the market.
interview software for two weeks prior to the due dates, allowing students ample time to research and prepare their responses.

I designed the questions to start broad, then narrow, and then expand again. These are the questions, in order. I indicated which history course learning outcomes (CLO) and which social justice (SJ) and global studies (GS) learning outcomes effective responses would achieve.

1. Native American history *is* U.S. history. If you were discussing history with a friend or colleague, what events, examples, or themes would you draw upon to help them connect with this idea? (CLO 1, GS 1)

2. Native peoples and Native nations developed varying approaches for dealing with colonial powers, from forms of resistance to forms of cooperation. Discuss one example of either resistance or cooperation, or discuss a situation that seemed to encompass both. (CLO 1, GS 1, 2, SJ 1)

3. Choose one Native American community/group and discuss both how that group experienced change over time as well as an example(s) of historical continuity. (CLO 2)

4. The U.S. Army was successful in the Plateau wars because of many different variables. Identify at least one factor which, if absent or different, could have changed the outcome of a battle or the war (Note: this question is built from an applied history question and concept). (CLO 1, 3)

5. The decades at the turn of the twentieth century (1880s-1920s) brought change to Native American spaces, lives, autonomy, and cultures. Discuss one or two examples of change. Your discussion can include anything from policy, society, assimilation, identity, etc., so long as it offers context of the era and Native American lives at that time. (CLO 1, 2, 3)

6. Discuss Native American activism in context of 1950s and 1960s of Native youth activism. You should draw upon both text and film. Why is it important that we understand this activism; why did it matter? Conclude with a discussion of any previous knowledge you held about Native American activism and how/whether your perspectives were changed by this content. (CLO 1, 3; SJ 1, 2, 3, 4)

In the interviews, students were required to make an argument, use evidence in support of that argument, and draw a conclusion, just as they would in a paper. I varied the length of the interviews, experimenting to find the optimum parameters for effective, cogent, and organized responses. The first response had to be at least five minutes and no more than seven. This was not effective for the first assignment. Students made several good points but then they rambled to fill up the time. It is also unrealistic that anyone with whom they were speaking face-to-face would allow a seven-minute monologue. For question two I required at least three minutes but no more than five minutes, and for question three, I gave them a three-to-four minute window. This seemed to be the most effective amount of time. Responses were organized, contained strong support, and responded to the broad question with details. Some students requested the option to speak for five minutes in question four. I acquiesced and discovered that students who utilized that extra minute again began to ramble. I standardized four-minute responses for the last two interviews of the course.

Students could draw upon any course resources to complete their responses and they could also include content from additional research. We used Colin Calloway’s *First Peoples: A Documentary Survey of American Indian History* (Bedford/St. Martins, Fifth Edition, 2016) as our main text. Although Calloway is a non-Native author, the book includes primary source documents and art created by Native peoples. We also used Native-authored materials including tribal websites, scholarly articles, chapters from scholarly monographs and edited collections, online resources, excerpts from popular movies, documentary film, and drew upon expertise of guest speakers.
To encourage deeper engagement with course resources, I tried an assignment that history colleagues have used effectively: note-taking on assigned readings. I provided note-taking guidelines and resources to support students in this assignment, including approaches such as outlining and mapping, as well as web links to the Cornell System and Crash Course tools. I required students to submit their reading notes weekly before class. They could upload their Word or PDF documents if they took notes in that format or they could take photos of their handwritten notes and submit those image files. The notes assignment proved useful and this process significantly increased student comprehension and content retention.

In their reflections about the interview assignment, many students observed that their detailed notes supported their preparation for the interviews. Several students shared Mickey’s experience:

I do not usually take notes when I read, but in this class, I came to understand the importance of note taking when reading because I do not believe I would have understood the material as well had I not done so. The detailed notes that we took for every reading helped me streamline the information I wanted to communicate in these videos. The notes allowed me to pick and choose information that I wanted to use while also providing me with the right amount of background info needed to talk about the subject.

Don observed, “My organization skills are best described as ‘organized chaos.’ [The] weekly deadlines and note requirements enhanced the neatness of my work. Being able to reference page numbers and take away key concepts or have a placemark to reread the text was huge time saver... I have already implemented [taking notes on readings] in my other classes.”

Students consistently noted that the interviews were more difficult than they thought they would be and more challenging than other kinds of assignments. We can view these observations in context of John B. Biggs and K. Collis’s five-level Structure of Observed Learning Outcomes (SOLO), an approachable interpretive taxonomy. Students confessed to using surface details and facts to complete other kinds of assignments, which indicates they operated at the pre-structural level (one), drawing upon superficial observations or using tautology to mask lack of understanding. Even in early interviews, students moved beyond levels one and two (single dimensional or narrow comprehension) to start this assignment at level three, a multistructural recognition of varying perspectives, and many students quickly moved beyond this to level four, relational context, then easily demonstrated the extended abstract qualities of level five (hypothesize, theorize, reflect, formulate). Booth’s discussion of SOLO notes that in level five, “The student additionally connects subject to self and the wider world in a way that indicates some original thinking...the student sees the wider issues raised by the question and integrates these so that self-reflection becomes an integral part of critical reflection on the discipline.”

For example, in question four, which I consider least interesting because it was so specific, students correctly identified U.S. possession of superior weapons as a primary reason for Plateau Tribes defeat in 1858. However, they contextualized their responses within the framework of the impact of defeat on ancestral practices and local knowledge, as well as within a U.S. military leader’s lack of humanity in employing these weapons. Students recognized the weapons as the tool but hypothesized the cultural disconnections as the most significant factor in understanding the Plateau Wars.

---

Students consistently indicated that they preferred the interviews to the tests or papers they completed in other courses because they could exert more agency in this assignment. Don observed, “I prefer to be able to demonstrate the knowledge I learned, instead of being tested on the totality of the content.”\textsuperscript{18} John noted, “The questions were broad enough as to where I could use a variety of texts and sources to help support my position. When writing, topics tend to be more specific and not as open ended...Because of [broad questions], I felt that I gained a greater understanding of history.”\textsuperscript{19} Student feedback like this reminded me of Sam Wineburg’s advice: remember the difference between students not knowing what we want them to know and concluding that they don’t know anything at all.\textsuperscript{20}

As a Native historian, connecting students to ancestral Indigenous practices of the oral tradition was part of my initial motivation in creating this assignment. I wanted students to get a sense of the imperative of listening and speaking in this context. However, during the course I realized that while their content knowledge would improve, it would not develop enough in a single semester to replicate the oral tradition, which is built upon repetition of narratives until listeners master the content and meaning so deeply that they are prepared share it. As we discussed this practice throughout the semester, though, I was delighted to see students recognize themselves as part of the larger tradition of knowledge holders and to consequently embrace the responsibilities of sharing knowledge. Belinda noted, “I feel that once I was able to articulate them in an interview, the facts and stories I learned became part of my development as a [N]ative individual; they will stick with me as I formulate perspectives about concepts, while further advancing my awareness and appreciation for cultural identity.”\textsuperscript{21}

In context of learning for understanding and of SOLO, and in context of my own hopes for creating new history peers, the public engagement interview was a success. Students consistently achieved course learning outcomes and they developed interpretive skills and communication skills many noted would serve them well in other classes and in their post-grad lives. Mickey concluded,

> I believe our doing these public engagement videos has provided the scaffolding for us to go into the world and begin having discussions that are both thoughtful and intelligent with others who know little about Native American history...While writing history of course has its merits, in most practical settings having a four to five minute conversation about the Allotment Act is much more beneficial to a person with little knowledge on the subject than reading a 1000 word essay.\textsuperscript{22}

In terms of skills development, many students reported feeling self-conscious speaking to the camera, and at first students disliked the assignment for that reason. By the end of the course, several students confessed to still feeling self-conscious, even those who had completed the assignment effectively. Jenny observed, “I would practice as many times as it took off camera, so I only had to record myself once...I am still uncomfortable listening to myself speak but I think that [the interviews] serve a very important purpose especially in a class that is taught from the point of view of a group that is not often heard from.”\textsuperscript{23}

While, inevitably, some students did better with this assignment than others—one student was a broadcast journalism major—all students made strides in their content knowledge and in communicating

\textsuperscript{18} Don, reflection paper, May 4, 2018.  
\textsuperscript{19} John, reflection paper, May 4, 2018.  
\textsuperscript{21} Belinda, reflection paper, May 4, 2018.  
\textsuperscript{22} Mickey, reflection paper, May 4, 2018.  
\textsuperscript{23} Jenny, reflection, May 4, 2018.
more effectively and succinctly by the end of the term. These interviews also allowed me to get to know the students in ways I wouldn’t be able to otherwise. They spoke directly to me through the camera, generally from their dorm room or apartment, sharing their personal space with me as well as their responses. Students who were quiet in class shone in these interviews, including students with speech disfluencies that made them less comfortable speaking in class.

A discussion of the many successes of this assignment must be followed by a confession about one unanticipated adverse outcome that is so obvious to me in retrospect I can’t believe I did not consider it during assignment design: these assignments took a long time to grade. The rhythm of grading papers does not translate to grading interviews. Each student speaks differently, organizes their key points differently, and each has a different narrative style. Consequently, I had to listen to the interviews all the way through, sometimes more than once, and then share written feedback. That first assignment, when students could use seven minutes, took an entire weekend to grade. Lesson learned, and a small price to pay for this experiment with public engagement preparation.

By the end of the semester, I also concluded this assignment would have been just as effective with five interviews instead of six, and I will adjust my syllabus accordingly next time I teach the course. I think this assignment could adapt to larger classes, perhaps through dividing students into sections with each section answering a different question at different times in the semester. With smaller class sizes, I can see it being even more effective and I can imagine students doing an occasional interview as a pair. Paired interviews could work well in upper-division courses where students have more content expertise, or in section break-outs of larger courses.

Learning for understanding is an important pedagogical practice for me. I could not have articulated that idea as thoughtfully before I started reading history pedagogy literature. Now I understand that this approach to teaching and learning is what drives me to create assignments that call upon students be imaginative, creative, and confident in demonstrating historical thinking. Calling upon our students to share their knowledge in public helps them realize the value and significance of public engagement and public discourse. This assignment prepared thirty-two students to have reasoned and informed discussions with people in the world around them. It’s a start.
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APPENDIX

HISTORY AS PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT INTERVIEWS: In a digital world filled with instant access to information, it is critically important to learn how to study content, to determine its veracity, its accuracy, and its meaning. Historians begin with an event or era and attempt to provide an account of what happened and why. These interpretations move beyond ‘facts’ and toward meaning, context, and legacies of choices or events.

Native American peoples relied on their oral traditions for millennia. The oral tradition passed down knowledge, histories, culture, language, values, morals, survival skills, and so on. While some Indigenous communities used a written language, many communities still relied only on oral tradition into the 19th century. This assignment asks you to connect yourself to the oral tradition, to consider how much you can teach people about Native American history through discussing it, and the assignment prepares you to do articulately and cogently. Skillful communication is especially important for this topic, one which so few people choose to learn about but which is fundamental to understanding U.S. history. You will have many more opportunities to discuss history than you will to write about it—this assignment will allow you to demonstrate your knowledge, your reasoning, and your conclusions about Native American history.

HISTORY AS PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT INTERVIEW RUBRIC

Native American peoples relied on their oral traditions for millennia. The oral tradition passed down knowledge, histories, culture, language, values, morals, survival skills, and so on. While some Indigenous communities used a written language, many communities still relied only on oral tradition into the 19th century. This assignment asks you to connect yourself to the oral tradition,
to consider how much you can teach people about Native American history through discussing it, and the assignment prepares you to do articulately and cogently. Skillful communication is especially important for this topic, one which so few people choose to learn about but which is fundamental to understanding U.S. history. You will have many more opportunities to discuss history than you will to write about it—this assignment will allow you to demonstrate your knowledge, your reasoning, and your conclusions about Native American history.

Students may use all course materials in preparation for responding to questions and may do additional research as preferred.

In each interview, students must be organized, succinct, and articulate.

- Use evidence to support your answers. For example, “Historian Juliana Barr noted [evidence]. In context of [this question] we can interpret argument, argument, argument.”
- Just like a paper, the interview response must include an introduction, body, conclusion [although please do not say ‘in conclusion.’ Remember, these are designed to help students learn to speak informally about Native American history.].
- Responses must fully answer the prompt, and do so in the time allotted.
- Speak clearly and at a natural pace—don’t hurry to get all your points in, don’t speak slowly to take up time. Your pace should be conversational in order to be easily understood.
- Word choice is important. Imagine your audience as curious, informed non-specialists. If you use a term that you think might need to be defined (such as sovereignty), define it. Meet them where you think they are.
- Eye contact is also important. Be sure you are looking into the camera most of the time, referencing your notes as needed but not reading from your notes. Again, this is meant as practice for engaging informally with people around you.

**Rubric**

A GRADE: follows all guidelines presented in bullet list above. Response is clear, confident, informed, and engaging.

B GRADE: follows most of the guidelines and is clear, confident, informed, engaging.

C GRADE: follows some of the guidelines and is in some ways clear and engaging, but does not seem fully informed or confident in arguments/assertions/evidence.

D GRADE: only achieves partial success in following guidelines and responding to question, uncomfortable on camera, little eye contact, lack of organization in response.

**Global Studies and Social Justice Learning Outcomes**

This course fulfills a global studies core requirement. It does so because while Native Americans are American citizens and tribal lands are located within the boundaries of the United States, tribes are distinct governments that participate in a government-to-government relationship with the U.S. The federal government recognizes tribal political sovereignty, and it supports tribal cultural sovereignty through the protection of Native American arts and crafts and through protection of Native American religions.

**Global Studies Learning Outcomes**

By the end of this course, students will demonstrate:

- Knowledge of social practices and cultural systems as constructed by members of one or more societies, past or present (in this course, Native Americans, acknowledging that there are 567
federally recognized tribes in the United States and that consequently, there is no monolithic Native American social practice or cultural system.  

- Skills necessary to engage people in those societies (in this course, Native Americans, whether you encounter them on reservations or in urban or cultural or professional settings).
- Curiosity, openness to difference, and critical reflection when encountering values and belief systems different from those you may already know (in this course, a willingness to interpret Native history, Native experiences, Native beliefs, and Native lives from the inside out, rather than maintaining a spectator’s perspective).

This course also fulfills a social justice requirement. Throughout this course, we will discover how Native American pursuit of sovereignty—both political and cultural—reflects Native American beliefs in dignity and social justice. Social justice is a belief in human interconnectedness that obligates us to care for one another and the common good. This ideal reflects Native community ideals that caring for their members and for others in their midst signifies commitment beyond the self.

**SOCIAL JUSTICE LEARNING OUTCOMES**

By the end of this course, students will be able to:

- Describe how social systems and structures contribute to human suffering or human flourishing, in particular how the dignity of persons is enhanced, threatened, or diminished by social systems and structures, and identify pathways to create more equitable access to systems (in this course, how colonialism disrupted and changed Native American lives and lifeways, ‘systems’ include federal agencies in this course).
- Understand and articulate how attitudes, perspectives, and behaviors—our own and others’—are shaped by specific contexts/structures within which one lives (in this course, how lack of inclusion of Native American histories and cultures in K-12 education prevents comprehension of Native American peoples and lives).
- Articulate moral, ethical, and social reasons for working toward the common good, especially for—and with—vulnerable populations (in this course, one example might be learning tribal histories from tribes, or collaborating with tribes on historical interpretation).
- Demonstrate enhanced empathy with vulnerable populations, and exhibit a commitment to the need for social transformation toward a more just world (in this course, ‘a more just world’ can mean broad comprehension of distinctions among tribal communities).

---

24 The number of recognized tribes was current when I proposed the course in 2017; that number changed in 2018.