

CALEDON



INSTITUTE OF  
SOCIAL POLICY

# **Constructing Knowledge and Training Curricula**

**About Early Childhood Care and Development  
in Canadian Aboriginal Communities**

*by*

**Jessica Ball and Alan Pence**

**December 2001**

**First Nations Partnership Programs, School of Child and Youth Care  
University of Victoria, Canada**

*Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association,  
Division 1 (Education in the Professions), Seattle, April 12, 2001.*

Information about the Generative Curriculum Model and the First Nations  
Partnership Programs is available at [www.fnpp.org](http://www.fnpp.org).

## **Overview**

The effectiveness of an innovative 'Generative Curriculum Model' was demonstrated in seven partnership programs involving rural Aboriginal communities and a team based at the University of Victoria. A constructivist model of curriculum design and teaching by Elders ensured cultural relevance of the training curricula in child and youth care and subsequent transfer of training to development of community services by program graduates. Seventy-eight percent of the First Nations enrollees completed the two-year diploma program. Implications of the program evaluation findings for advancing the decolonization of postsecondary education and the utility of education as a tool for Aboriginal community development are discussed.

## **Introduction**

Curricula embody and reproduce cultural goals and methods for fostering student development and subsequent transfer of training to vocational pursuits. Postsecondary education intended to provide professional training reflects and engenders the culturally conditioned values and practices of those who design and deliver the curricula. Many Aboriginal students and community representatives in North America and elsewhere have expressed concern about the lack of representation of their values and methods in both the process and the outcomes of learning at all levels of education.

Their concerns are essentially twofold: (1) mainstream, Euro-Western educational approaches often do not fit the learning styles, interests or needs of Aboriginal students, resulting in high drop-out, high costs, decreasing self-esteem and low capacity for self-sufficiency in Aboriginal communities; (2) the predominantly

Euro-Western derivation of most of what is taught in mainstream educational institutions perpetuates the colonial, assimilationist effects of education upon marginalized populations including Aboriginal students. These concerns have been elaborated by many Aboriginal educators [Archibald 1995; Armstrong, Kennedy and Oberle 1990; Barber 1986; Battiste 1997; Kirkness 1986; Kirkness and Barnhardt 1991; Leavitt 1995; Lockhart 1982; Mackay and Myles 1995; Royal Commission on Aboriginal People 1996]. They will be briefly explored below, since they provide an important part of the rationale for the education innovation which was the focus of the present program evaluation research.

A key principle guiding the innovation described in this report, and confirmed by the evaluation, is that the decolonialization of education towards practices that are inclusive of disenfranchised or marginalized cultural populations begins with acceptance of a desire on the part of these groups to participate meaningfully and centrally in the design, implementation and evaluation of curricula [Evans, McDonald and Nyce 1999; Haig-Brown 1995]. The need for a participatory approach will be explored as a preamble to discussion of the program innovation, and we will return to this key principle in considering implications for future program initiatives.

## ***Aboriginal history of disappointments with education and training***

All of the Aboriginal groups that participated in the innovative education program evaluated in the current study had made many previous attempts to build professional capacity among community members through education and training. Like the experiences of many Aboriginal people, they had found neither cultural relevance in training curricula nor cultural safety

on mainstream campuses. It is widely recognized among educators in Canada and the United States that Aboriginal students who attend mainstream postsecondary education most often encounter exceptional barriers to success. Barriers range from overt racism to latent forms of discrediting, insensitivity or disregarding the forms and substance of knowledge residing within Aboriginal historical and contemporary cultural institutions. Low academic completion rates signal the need for enhanced efforts to design and deliver programs that effectively overcome these barriers.

In Canada, although the number of Aboriginal students enrolled in postsecondary programs has increased since the 1960s when the participation rate was negligible [Archibald and Bowman 1995], Aboriginal peoples remain significantly under-represented at Canadian universities and colleges [Report of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples 1996]. Aboriginal people in Canada are seven times less likely to graduate from university as are members of the general population [Armstrong, Kennedy and Oberle 1990]. In spite of efforts to improve Aboriginal participation, Canadian universities for the most part do not yet provide the social climate, curricula, geographic accessibility and entrance criteria needed to attract, retain and support the success of Aboriginal students [Barber 1986; Kirkness and Barnhardt 1991; Archibald and Bowman 1995].

Some mainstream programs have tried to become 'culturally sensitive' or 'culturally inclusive' by introducing pan-Aboriginal curriculum content including, for example, boxed text or selected readings about Haida, Lakhota, Navajo or Ojibway beliefs, lifestyles or conditions. These efforts are regarded by many Aboriginal people in Canada as conceptually flawed, in part because they fail to recognize the heterogeneity of more than 600 separate First Nations, Inuit, Aleut and Métis cultural groups, each with

their own traditional language and culture, service needs and development goals.

A growing number of postsecondary institutions in Canada and the United States have initiated satellite and extension programs delivered off-campus in Aboriginal communities. In Canada, the Assembly of First Nations has strongly encouraged this trend [Charleston 1988]. Community-based programs have been seen to have several advantages, including keeping students close to their natural social support networks and reducing the strain on the student's family, thus promoting student retention [Friesen 1986]. When a program is visible to the community and the community has some responsibility for overseeing the practicalities of student participation in a program delivered locally, there is greater likelihood of support for students [Knowles 1980]. Community-based training programs can be effective in addressing important social issues as well as meeting educational needs [Calliou 1995; Kirkness 1986].

Unfortunately, most community-based programs do not actively seek to address the community's self-identified development goals, and do not actively involve the community in key roles with regard to curriculum content and delivery. They therefore fail to respond significantly to the concerns among Aboriginal people. These programs typically offer the same programs of training offered at on-campus centres, consisting overwhelmingly of content representing a Euro-Western-based canon and teaching methods that have been found to be effective with predominantly white, middle-class student populations. Making a program geographically accessible does nothing, in itself, to increase the resonance and applicability of professional training to the culture, rural circumstances, socioeconomic conditions, unique goals and resources of Aboriginal communities, unless the program is reconceptualized to respond

to these needs and conditions [Ball and Pence 2000].

There is increasing recognition that for many Aboriginal students, there is neither intrinsic nor extrinsic motivation to learn the content or to engage in the types of learning activities found in mainstream postsecondary programs [Wilson 1994]. The Assembly of First Nations in Canada has called for postsecondary curricula and pedagogy that are relevant to First Nations people, particularly in areas where there are cultural considerations, such as communication and learning styles, and culture-specific content [Charleston 1988]. Many educators similarly have argued that curricula need to incorporate traditional First Nations philosophies and practices [Brokenleg 1990; Brant 1990; Gillis 1992; Hesch 1995] and should incorporate Aboriginal languages [Calliou 1993; Armstrong 1987; Leavitt 1995].

Lockhart has drawn attention to the connections between culturally-grounded curricula, community involvement and the purpose of education to further community development goals. In his words: "It is critically important that process models are developed that ensure equity between 'insider' and 'outsider' knowledge frames; that these processes involve the whole community in acquiring a sense of 'ownership' ... and local community-based criteria are utilized in 'social impact' and 'economic feasibility' assessment" [Lockhart 1982: 160].

Some educators have reported experiences of community-based postsecondary programs that have effectively served Aboriginal students by actively collaborating with members of the community where the program is delivered [Ignace 1996; Evans, McDonald and Nyce 1999; Lockhart 1982; Wright 1991]. Delivery of programs in communities where students originate has the potential of enabling contributions from community members on curricu-

lum content decisions and the logistics of program delivery [Friesen 1986; Knowles 1980]. Going beyond community participation, some First Nations scholars have identified community control over decisions about program content and delivery as a crucial factor in making education and training a means to social and cultural reconstruction [Calliou 1995; Kirkness 1986].

As part of this approach, the role of Aboriginal Elders in facilitating education and training has been recognized in some programs. In 1995, Grant and Sterling reported that Elders can support postsecondary programs by sharing indigenous knowledge, reinforcing indigenous ways of teaching and learning, and mentoring students. Kirkness has emphasized the need to elevate the role of Elders beyond the telling of stories or prayers to places of central importance in the teaching and learning process [Kirkness 1987].

### ***Introduction of an innovative approach: First Nations Partnership Programs***

A proactive response to the paucity of culturally responsive postsecondary education was initiated in Canada in 1989 by the Meadow Lake Tribal Council (MLTC) in Saskatchewan, Canada. Identifying as a top priority the training of community members in early childhood care and development, they proposed a partnership with the second author, based at the University of Victoria, aimed at co-constructing a bicultural training curriculum. They sought training which would "enable our community members to walk in both worlds" [MLTC Administrator] – to work both on and off reserve and in native and non-native settings [Pence and Ball 1999]. Thus, they aimed for a curriculum that would place both Euro-Western knowledge and cultural knowledge residing in their constituent Cree and Dene com-

munities at the core of the curriculum and the teaching and learning process.

Pointing out the heterogeneity of cultures and traditional languages among more than 500 Aboriginal tribal communities in Canada, the Meadow Lake Tribal Council sought post-secondary curricula that incorporated their particular culture, rather than a melting pot of Aboriginal lore that would result from construction of a pan-Aboriginal curriculum. Because of this emphasis on the cultural particularities of each partnering community and the desire for community involvement in each program iteration, no two programs and no two resulting curricula were identical, although the principles of the process were consistent across programs.

The innovative partnership approach that evolved through the community-university partnership started with the assumption that culturally valued and useful knowledge about childhood and child care was embedded within the community and that this knowledge needed to be afforded a central place in the development of training curricula. At the same time, the community partners assumed that there was value in considering the perspectives and knowledge yielded by Euro-Western research, theory and professional experience. This biculturally respectful stance laid the foundation for a 'community of learners' to become engaged in co-constructing culturally grounded training curricula that combined, in the words of one MLTC representative, "the best of both worlds." This innovative approach became known as the Generative Curriculum Model [Ball and Pence 2000].

By 1999, seven groups of Aboriginal communities in rural areas of Canada, comprising a total of 47 separate bands or First Nations villages, had partnered with the authors at the University of Victoria to co-construct and deliver a two-year postsecondary training cur-

riculum on early childhood care and development. The common goal of the Aboriginal communities when they each separately initiated the partnership program was to strengthen capacity among community members to create and operate early childhood education programs in their communities. Programs would be congruent with their culturally-based goals and strategies for supporting children's development and would be appropriate to their geographic, economic and social conditions.

Community representatives reported that previous experiences with mainstream post-secondary curricula based on Euro-Western constructions of childhood and 'developmentally appropriate' child care had failed to represent the realities and goals of families in their communities. Mainstream training programs also had yielded low rates of retention and completion among students in all of these communities, reflecting a general trend in native education in North America [Ball, Pence, Pierre and Kuehne, forthcoming].

The partnership programs were delivered entirely within each of the seven Aboriginal communities on federal reserve lands. Community-based delivery enabled community members to play active roles, not only as students but also as discussion group members, supporters and 'adjunct instructors' involved in transmission and reconstruction of cultural knowledge throughout program planning, delivery and evaluation stages. As noted earlier [Freisen 1986; Knowles 1980], delivery in the community also provided students with uninterrupted access to social supports during their two years of course work and practica [Ball and Nicholson 1999]. A steering committee was formed in each community to raise program funding, recruit instructors, students, participating Elders and practica supervisors from within or near the community, and to provide facilities and supports for teaching and learning.

### ***Co-constructing curriculum with cultural communities***

The pivotal process that generated curriculum could be termed 'dialogical constructivism.' The precise content of each training program was purposefully indeterminate to allow for co-construction of curriculum that had cultural relevance and resonance for the particular partners. Partnerships did not start with a blank slate, but instructors and students were also not encouraged to adopt wholesale the scripted materials and resources provided by the university-based team. Students and community members engaged in ongoing dialogue and debate about mainstream, provided theoretical conceptualizations, research and early childhood education program models offered by a university-based curriculum team. They were encouraged both to consider the provided curriculum and to go beyond it. Students, Elders and instructors critiqued the curriculum, contributed to it and reconceptualized it from their own cultural vantage points.

This university-based curriculum content was considered alongside community-generated, often culturally-specific perspectives on the topics studied in each of 20 undergraduate university courses. No texts existed that could provide community-specific information, and few texts or materials provided culturally-specific information, so the initial design of the Generative Curriculum Model was seen as necessary, not radical.

Among participants in the program, tribal Elders played key roles in conveying and helping to re-create culturally grounded concepts and approaches to child development, care and education. Elders also introduced and modelled traditional modes of teaching and learning. Rapport and cooperative teaching and learning

among Elders, instructors and students were facilitated by an intergenerational facilitator in each of the partnership programs. In the partnership programs, community members developed practical knowledge, skills and models for early childhood education through debate and dialogical construction of useful, culturally 'fitting' concepts and practices.

### ***Education career ladder***

Career laddering in the First Nations Partnership Programs enables students to 'step off' the program of study after one year, with a certificate in Early Childhood Education, or after two years, with a diploma in Child and Youth Care. In Canada, these credentials enable them to pursue employment in a range of human service fields including: child care, learning assistance, supportive care for special needs, respite, recreation and health services coordination. If they choose, students can 'step on' the career ladder again, continuing third- and fourth-year studies, either through distance education or on-campus courses, leading to a degree in Child and Youth Care.

The diploma program in Child and Youth Care that was created for the partnership programs involves five terms of full-time study spanning approximately two years. The program consists of 20 courses, including five practica courses, one university accredited English course and child safe First Aid. Courses address four themes:

- Early Childhood Care and Education/ Child and Youth Care (ECCE/CYC)
- Communications
- Child and Youth Development
- Practica

**Table 1**  
**Generative curriculum in early childhood care and development**

Child and Youth Development Strand	ECCE/CYC Strand	Communications Strand	Practicum Strand
Human Behaviour	Introduction to Play	Interpersonal Communications	Practicum 1
Child Development I and II	Foundations of Curriculum Planning	Communication with Children and Guiding Children's Behaviour	Practicum 2
Introduction to School Age Care (elective)	The Caring & Learning Implementation	Introduction to Planned Change	Practicum 3
Introduction to Programs for Adolescents (elective)	Introduction to Professional Child & Youth Care Practice (elective)	Communication Skills for Professional Helpers	Practicum 4
Special Topics in Child & Youth Care			Practicum 5
Children & Youth with Special Needs			

***Program evaluation method***

The focus of the remainder of this report will be on the method, findings and implications of a comprehensive program of research, conducted by the authors and representatives of the partner communities from 1998 to 2000, in which the process and outcomes of this unique training program model across the seven communities were evaluated.

Over a two-year period from 1998-2000, data were gathered and analyzed to capture the experiences of representative groups of people involved in each of the partnership programs between 1989 and 1999. A multimethod, social participatory research design was used, including both a longitudinal perspective and cross-sectional comparisons across seven partnering communities. Each partner community contri-

buted questions that would yield feedback of interest to their agenda. Collaborators were recruited from each community to participate in aspects of data collection, analysis, community feedback sessions and reporting. Extensive commentary was invited from a broad spectrum of community members who had been involved in and/or affected by the program.

This evaluation also included comparisons between the First Nations Partnership Programs and human service programs at other postsecondary institutions where First Nations students were enrolled. These cross-program comparison procedures and findings will be reported elsewhere.

Table 2 shows the groups of participants in the program evaluation.



**Table 2**  
**Program evaluation participants**

103	graduates
4	early program leavers
19	instructors
38	Elders
4	intergenerational coordinators
3	student spouses
23	partnering community administrators
11	partnering postsecondary institution administrators
12	practicum supervisors
7	funding agency representatives
19	comparison program instructors and administrators
4	comparison program First Nations students

### *Procedures*

The impacts of the training program across groups of program participants were assessed using an ecologically comprehensive research methodology that combined qualitative and quantitative data collection and analysis strategies, including semi-structured individual and group interviews; structured questionnaires; focus groups of program administrators; participant observations in partnering communities and postsecondary institutions; community forums; two forums bringing together professionals involved in training Early Childhood Education in rural First Nations; and review of records of seven partnership programs.

### *Analysis of interview and questionnaire data*

#### *i. qualitative data analysis*

A six-member research team employed a content analysis procedure pioneered by Glaser and Strauss [1970]. The 'constant comparative method' was used to reconstruct basic social

processes described by respondents to account for their experiences of the program and its impacts. The recurrence of descriptive statements across participants' transcribed interviews led to the identification of key themes about program processes and program outcomes. After several interpretive iterations, a reliable coding scheme was derived for enumerating these themes. In the interviews, participants offered explanations as to why the program had various effects.

Commonalities across participants' interviews in the explanations they offered led to the formulation of hypothetical causal linkages between certain 'enabling conditions' and program outcomes. These causal linkages were inventoried by the research team and subsequently were elaborated in the form of 'theoretical memos' (i.e., key interrelationships among core constructs embedded in the respondents' accounts). Interpretations of qualitative data were carried back to partnering communities for feedback, revision and elaboration. Table 3 shows the iterative process of data collection and analysis following a grounded theory building method.

**Table 3**  
**Iterative data collection and analysis strategies**

<b>Phase 1</b> <b>Data Collection</b> Individual participant interviews.	<b>Phase 1</b> <b>Data Analysis</b> Derivation of tentative hypotheses about causal links between pre-conditions, processes and outcomes.
<b>Phase 2</b> <b>Data Collection</b> Confirmatory interviews and group forums. Record review. Discussion of tentative findings and eliciting community input.	<b>Phase 2</b> <b>Data Analysis</b> Statistical analysis of quantitative data. Formulation of conceptual framework grounded in analysis of accounts and quantitative data.



This report focusses on key findings of analysis of transcribed participants' interviews evaluating their program experiences. The findings reported here are those for which there was high agreement among five data analysts who coded key themes and identified causal linkages in participants' accounts about the program (reliabilities ranged from .78 to .97 using Cronbach's alpha).

*ii. quantitative data analysis*

Frequency analysis of educational, vocational and community outcomes yielded descriptive information about program impacts. Because nearly all participants gave overwhelmingly high ratings across questionnaire dimensions, statistical analysis of questionnaire data yielded few insights about the correlation of specific program elements to specific program outcomes.

The evaluation yielded descriptive findings about partnering and program delivery in each community. These findings are presented first, including participants' recommendations about aspects of the First Nations Partnership Programs that could be improved. The evaluation also yielded descriptive and quantitative findings about outcomes for individuals and for the partnering communities and institutions overall. Finally, the evaluation yielded a conceptual framework, suggested in participants' accounts of why the program worked to generate enhanced capacity. Their understandings pointed to the importance of certain enabling conditions that created a socially inclusive, culturally safe 'ecology' in which the program and the student cohort could become nested, and in which the co-construction of a bicultural curriculum could flourish. The framework of enabling conditions is presented last in this section.

This report provides a brief overview of key findings. More detailed reports on various aspects of the partnership programs, the evaluation research framework and evaluation findings will be reported subsequently.


**Program Processes**

*i. program descriptive information*

*students*

A total of 118 community members enrolled in the partnership programs across seven communities; 102 of these students were involved for one or more years of study. Table 4 provides a profile of community members who enrolled in the programs across seven partnerships.

**Table 4**  
**Student characteristics**



A special, 'mature student' admissions procedure was arranged with each partnering postsecondary institution in which flexible prior learning criteria were used and students were admitted as a cohort. Across partnership programs, the cohorts ranged from 10 to 22 students. Students were between 21 and 50 years of age. The average time since they had been in full-time studies, typically at the secondary school level, was 11 years. A few had been out of school for as long as 25 years, while two had graduated from high school just three years before enrolling in the program.

The First Nations communities conducted their own screening and preparatory programs for students, based on locally established criteria and assessment procedures. Common student selection criteria included: a level of academic preparedness that suggested high probability of program completion; fluency in written and spoken English; personal health and stability; positive relationships with children through work and/or family; and strong interest in Early Childhood Care and Development as a career.

Student candidates were reviewed and admitted by the university as a cohort. Forty percent had completed secondary school. The remainder were admitted on a mature student status, based on being assessed as having a high probability of success in the two-year program given their prior education, work experience, personal characteristics and pre-program preparatory work.

### *instructors*

A total of 20 instructors were involved across the seven partnership programs. Qualified instructors were recruited and contracted by each partnering First Nations community. Instructors were then approved by the academic

institution. Four of the seven partnerships had at least one First Nations course instructor; Mount Currie First Nation was the only group able to recruit instructors exclusively from their own community. While some communities would have preferred to have more First Nations instructors, there is a shortage of available, qualified First Nations educators in all professional training areas in Western Canada. Some instructors were recruited from within the vicinity of the community, while others were recruited from further away (e.g., one instructor was recruited from Quebec to BC through a nation-wide First Nations newspaper). Relocation costs were an additional expense borne by communities. In each partnership program at least one instructor was a certified specialist in Early Childhood Education.

The program required the equivalent of two full-time instructors over five terms. Three or more people often taught different course strands or subject areas. Retention of instructors who relocated to the partner community was a serious challenge in the two most remote partnerships. Instructors emphasized several important supports: program of orientation to community conditions and cultural forms of interaction; formal introductions to key community members, especially Elders, Band Chiefs and council members, and other educators involved in the community (e.g., staff of independent schools on reserve, tutors involved in Open University course delivery); financial incentives including relocation and transportation allowances; and ongoing communication and supports from the university as well as the community for both academic purposes and morale.

### *Elders*

Elders were recruited from communities represented by members of the student

cohort. Most community partners recruited an 'Intergenerational Facilitator' who asked Elders to participate in the program. Elders joined in the teaching process either in the classroom setting or by allowing students to visit them in their homes to discuss topics that were part of each course. Across the seven programs, the number of Elders who participated ranged from three to 40. Each community had a slightly different way of identifying who was an Elder. Generally, Elders were older adults who had demonstrated to community members that they had knowledge and a wise perspective on the cultural identity and history of the community.

#### *community-based administrators*

On average, a core group of approximately five community members emerged early in each partnership to move into place the elements that were needed to enable program delivery. This steering committee typically responded to input and feedback from a larger group within the community, such as an education society, day care society, employment and training board, or Band chief and councillors. Each community had one or two individuals who were the primary liaisons with a university-based liaison. Throughout all partnership phases, the relationship between primary liaisons was crucial. In the evaluation, these individuals emphasized the need for mutual respect, patience, tolerance of shortcomings and constructive responsiveness to both positive and negative feedback.

#### *practicum supervisors*

The community identified suitable, accessible practicum sites for students to develop applied competencies. Practicum supervisors at

these sites were recruited by First Nations community administrators. The supervisors were important not only because successful practica were required by government in order to qualify for certification in Early Childhood Education, but also because the students depended upon them to provide a nondiscriminatory, safe atmosphere for developing new skills. Practicum supervisors varied in their receptivity to the distinctive cultural viewpoints and approaches that the First Nations students often brought to the practicum setting. More than half of the students depicted their own experiences as young children in formal education settings as very destructive to their concept of themselves as worthy and capable learners. They recalled many incidents involving racism. In the evaluation, program graduates often described the role of the practicum supervisors as pivotal in their ability to cope emotionally and function effectively as trainees.

#### *institution-based team members*

The University of Victoria team generally consisted of three part-time staff members. Most were involved in curriculum writing, revision, updating and resource gathering. One specific role was liaison with the community. One team member undertook administrative requirements such as student registrations, submission of grades, requests for academic concessions and communications required to maintain operations. Table 5 shows the roles and responsibilities of the university and community partners.

#### *ii. program implementation*

The program implementation phase ranged from 19 to 42 months. Variability depended upon the expressed needs of the com-

**Table 5**  
**Partnership roles and responsibilities**

University of Victoria	First Nations Communities
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ensure academic accreditation (course work and education career ladder)</li> <li>- Liaison with program administrators ('point of entry' for third partner)</li> <li>- Appoint instructors</li> <li>- Register student cohort</li> <li>- Provide curriculum resource using Generative Curriculum Model</li> <li>- Co-construct bicultural ECCD curriculum</li> <li>- Design and conduct program evaluation</li> <li>- Prepare and disseminate information on partnership programs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Initiate partnership based on needs and objectives of community members</li> <li>- Secure program funding</li> <li>- Administer preparatory programs and full training program</li> <li>- Recruit student cohort and instructors</li> <li>- Employ instructors and intergenerational facilitator</li> <li>- Co-construct bicultural ECCD curriculum</li> <li>- Deliver program (classroom/practica)</li> <li>- Provide ongoing supports for students</li> <li>- Participate in documentation/evaluation</li> </ul>

munity partner. In the shortest program, with Treaty 8 Tribal Association, students were in class longer each day and took fewer, shorter breaks between terms. This approach to program implementation was motivated by the uncertainty of continued funding, and the fact that students had moved away from their villages, and in some cases, their families, into a nearby town. They were eager to return home.

The longest program implementation occurred with Tl'azt'en Nation, where students began the program gradually, combining a reduced courseload with ongoing preparatory work in basic academic and study skills and personal life skills. In addition, when students were at last ready to assume a full courseload, a series of tragic events necessitated several temporary

cessations of the program; every student experienced the death of one or more relative while in the program. The pace of the partnership program at Tl'azt'en Nation was also affected by frequent instructor turnovers and the difficulty of recruiting replacements to work in this isolated and challenging setting.

Another factor that sometimes affected the pace of program activities was the difficulty that students' husbands had with their wives being fully occupied outside the home and with the prospect of their becoming more confident, independent and employed. Finally, because many families depended upon seasonal hunting, fishing and berry-picking, the program accommodated time off for students to pursue these important sustenance activities.

### *iii. post-program follow-up phase*

No partnership ended on the day delivery of all the courses was completed. In order to support students to complete successfully all the program requirements for the diploma, the partnership continued actively throughout a post-program phase which ranged from six to 12 months. Across the partnerships, an average of 70 percent had leftover work to complete; this typically involved a final round of supervised practicum training or final assignments for one or two courses.

The most prevalent challenge to completion of the full diploma program was the required university-level English course which communities accessed through local colleges or through Open University distance education. A majority of community-based program administrators affirmed the value of students becoming more proficient in writing, reading and speaking. However, students reported low confidence in their own ability to succeed in a university English course and they further reported a mismatch between their perceived needs as practitioners and the content and teaching model of the English courses that were available to them. Participants recommended the development of a new English course that would be: (a) taught on site, (b) sensitive to First Nations needs and encompassing positive First Nations literature, and (c) tailored to the communication task demands of practitioners in early childhood and youth services.

### *iv. costs*

Average costs per student ranged from \$4,000 to \$5,000 per term, which was slightly higher than the full cost per student in other postsecondary programs providing training in


Early Childhood Education. The program was more cost-effective when there were more students in the cohort. However, costs varied considerably across programs due to other factors such as transportation requirements and availability of community resource people to serve in instructor roles. The two programs that were the most remote reported the highest costs.

In each partnership, at least 80 percent of the expenditures for the program remained within the community. The communities delivered the program in their own facilities, provided their own administrative and support services, and contracted with instructors who were either community members or were recruited to the community for the duration of the program. Approximately 20 percent of the costs were for institutional liaison and support; provision of the university-based curriculum materials that were combined with community-generated course content; registration and recording of students' progress in the program as required for credentialing; and pre-program and post-program liaison costs. Table 6 shows the distribution of funds across partners and program components.

### *v. funding challenges*

The partner communities raised all of the funding both for community-based program implementation and for institution-based program support. While this fundraising contributed to the community's sense of agency and control in the partnership and their pride in successful implementation, it also placed an inordinate financial burden on them and accounted for the relatively high overall cost per student each term. The most serious challenge for the partnerships was the absence of a base of operational funds, independent of funds raised by the community, to support the involvement of the university-

**Table 6**  
**Funding allocation**



based team. The institution-based team required funding for the development of new course materials, updating existing curriculum, travel to communities, liaison and participation in community-initiated fund raising activities.

A challenge for both the institution-based team and the partner communities was a lack of funding to support involvement during the critical pre-program period and during post-program follow-up. In Canada, funding for education and training typically is tied specifically to the period when courses are being delivered. And this funding often is based on a narrow conception of what is involved in education and training. Thus, several of the community partners had particular difficulty obtaining sufficient external funds to support Elder involvement, the Intergenerational Facilitator's role, and students' travel to and from practica and community events to elicit broad social participation in the program. For the institutional partners, inadequate funding seriously curtailed the capacity to reach out to prospective community partners, travel to communities, build relationships in communities, support community efforts to mobilize resources and help create conditions that would enable program delivery.

*vi. cost-benefit perspective*

Evaluation participants underscored the benefits of the partnership program to the community as a whole. Most participants contrasted this investment in education and training with other training and employment programs that have benefited students themselves but have had little or no impact on other community members. Distinctive features of the First Nations Partnership Programs that they pointed to were: (a) the unprecedented high rates of student retention and completion, (b) the application of relevant train-

ing to community service development, and (c) the far-reaching ripple effects of the partnership programs.

All the community-based administrators described how they had considered both social and economic goals of the community when making the decision to search for funding to implement the training program. These administrators reported high levels of satisfaction with the extent to which the program had furthered those goals.

Two partner communities offered financial data as a way of comparing the benefits of the First Nations Partnership Programs. Both communities reported providing \$17,000 per single student per year when community members moved away to attend university or college. These communities pointed out that costs often run higher than this amount when students move their children and partners with them. They reported that roughly 30 percent of community members who have left their communities for educational opportunities have completed the training. This number is in accord with national rates of First Nations student retention in postsecondary programs.

Many students who have completed their training have not returned to the community, though the postsecondary administrator in one community noted that there recently appears to be a gradual trend towards more graduates returning home. Thus, the return on investment of postsecondary funds in the First Nations Partnership Programs in terms of capacity built to achieve community development goals was nearly 100 percent superior compared to the conventional practice of supporting First Nations students who leave home to access postsecondary training.

#### *vii. cross-program comparisons*

Several unanticipated difficulties prevented detailed comparisons of First Nations Partnership Programs with other postsecondary programs. First, postsecondary institutions in Canada cannot require students to identify their race or ethnicity, making it impossible to obtain a reliable count of the number of First Nations students enrolled. Second, criteria for the identification of individuals as 'First Nations' is itself problematic and controversial, contributing to difficulties in obtaining reliable comparison information. Third, there was no uniformity in how postsecondary programs broke down their budgets – which costs they included as part of program delivery, which were supplementary (outside the budget but nonetheless essential). Fourth, there was reluctance among administrators of other programs to reveal cost information for purposes of program comparison. Finally, we were able to identify and contact very few First Nations students enrolled in Early Childhood Education programs away from their home communities. With the exception of the students in one program, most had not been successful in their studies and they were not eager to discuss their experiences.

Thus, the evaluation yielded largely anecdotal evidence of how the First Nations Partnership Programs compared to other postsecondary training programs in Early Childhood Education in terms of costs and benefits. Participants' accounts and available information about other programs enabled a few comparisons, as listed below.

- The First Nations Partnership Programs were slightly more costly and lengthy than other programs.



- The First Nations Partnership Programs were unique in enabling students to achieve university credit for courses culminating in a two-year diploma that laddered into a degree program.
- The First Nations Partnership Programs were unique in Canada with respect to the extent of community involvement in program delivery.
- No other programs provided opportunities to develop locally relevant capacity through a generated curriculum in which cultural knowledge, community conditions and locally articulated goals for children's development figured centrally in what students learned and how they were prepared to take on professional roles as leaders in their own communities.
- First Nations Partnership Programs outcomes ran against the tide, often described as 'brain drain,' which has been abetted by other program delivery approaches. In other programs, students often are required to leave their communities or to study in isolation from their communities while enrolled in a local program. When communities pay for their students to study in programs that are geographically or socially removed from their communities, graduates rarely return to work in their communities. By contrast, 95 percent of students who completed one or two years in the First Nations Partnership Programs remained in their communities after the program and most assumed roles in community-based child and family serving program initiatives.
- Overall, the lack of visible First Nations people practising in the field of Early Childhood Education and in other human services areas in Canada suggests that

mainstream postsecondary training programs have been either inaccessible or ineffective in supporting the growth of capacity in First Nations.

The picture that vividly emerged from the evaluation of First Nations Partnership Programs was of a tapestry of interwoven program elements and processes embedded in and actively supported by a community-driven agenda. These mutually enhancing program characteristics and the embeddedness of the program in communities were the most distinguishing features of the First Nations Partnership Programs, compared to other programs of professional training. The impacts of the partnership programs, beginning with individuals and rippling out to the First Nations communities, are the focus of the next section of this report.

### *Program outcomes*

The program evaluation showed that in all seven partnership programs to date, the Generative Curriculum Model of providing university-accredited training in students' own communities led to unprecedented educational and vocational outcomes as well as to personal and community transformations reaching far beyond the classroom.

#### *i. individual outcomes*

##### *education*

The findings revealed unprecedented high rates of student retention and completion. Among 118 students across seven programs, 86.4 percent completed one year of full-time, university-accredited study and 77.3 percent completed two years of full-time study and achieved

**Table 7**  
**Students' perceptions of change, pre- and post-program involvement**

Scale	Mean Rating*
Self-concept as a competent learning	8.81 4.83
Self-concept as an effective leader	6.93 4.01
Self-concept as an effective parent	8.65 5.71
Self-concept as an effective child care provider	8.88 5.79
Helping other parents	7.02 4.48
Clarity of career goals	8.76 4.28
Job prospects within the community	7.31 3.94
Job prospects outside the community	7.08 3.71
Pride in cultural identity	8.42 6.44
Role in promoting children's cultural identity	7.06 4.69
Involvement in cultural activities	6.31 4.71
*Mean rating on a 9-point scale before after	

a university diploma. These numbers compare favourably against completion rates among Aboriginal students in two-year postsecondary programs nation-wide of less than 40 percent.

Sixteen community members who were originally enrolled in the program terminated

their studies before completing one year of coursework. Fourteen of these left in the first few weeks of the program. Among the 16 early leavers, four students withdrew due to lack of family support for their involvement in full-time studies; eight students withdrew due to academic challenges; two students withdrew due to pregnancy; and two withdrew due to critical events which precipitated their departure from the community.

A recurrent theme emerging in the program evaluation was the congruence that program graduates experienced in a training program which focussed on their cultural and geographic community – its goals for the well-being of children and families, socioeconomic circumstances, readiness and strategies for responding to the needs of children and youth. Many students contrasted this congruence with previous experiences in mainstream educational institutions, which they described variously as 'totally white,' 'impractical,' 'culturally contradictory,' 'spiritually bankrupt' and 'foreign.' Because the Generative Curriculum Model adopts a 'both/and' approach that presents Euro-Western theories and research alongside traditions, values and practices of the students' own culture, the curriculum resonated with the realities of their daily lives.

#### *student transformations*

Positive psychosocial development among students, including those who did not complete the whole two-year program, was one way that participants gauged program effectiveness. Table 7 shows students' ratings of themselves along 11 provided dimensions before and after the two-year training program, indicating positive changes in psychosocial self-concept, cultural involvement and vocational preparedness.

### *parenting effectiveness*

More than 80 percent of program graduates reported that their parenting and grandparenting had improved significantly. Eleven reported sharing new knowledge and skills about child development and their own culture with their adult children, who were now raising their own children. This program impact has particular importance for the partnering First Nations. The communities involved in the four most recent partnerships had a combined population of 5,100. A total of 53 students were parents or grandparents to 186 children. Enhanced transmission of knowledge, skills and enthusiasm about child development and parenting represents a substantial impact on the future of the community as a whole.

### *a healing journey*

Significant psychosocial healing was reported by 92 percent of the students across the seven programs. Evaluation interviews revealed the extent to which many students had previously internalized negative stereotypes of themselves and their cultural heritage, as well as the extent to which they experienced the First Nations Partnership Programs as a healing journey for themselves and their communities. Many students described feeling more positive about their potential to take control of their own lives and to make valued contributions in their families and communities.

Working through trauma experienced through residential schools was a recurrent theme in the interviews with members of all seven community partners. Many graduates talked about having missed the foundational experiences of being parented effectively. Some had been forced to attend residential schools off-reserve as children; others were raised by par-

ents who had attended residential schools. Many program graduates recounted the re-emergence of painful memories in reflections and group discussions about their own experiences of childhood and of parenting, and in hearing the stories of the Elders. Participants linked the availability of social support within the student cohort, within a 'culturally safe' classroom environment created by the instructors and Elders, and within their own community as an important factor enabling them to make constructive use of recalling childhood traumas in their program of professional development.

### *ii. community outcomes*

#### *graduate retention*

Certificates and diplomas were not the only or the ultimate criteria that First Nations evaluation participants used to measure program effectiveness. Across all seven programs, they expanded valued program outcomes to include a range of personal and community transformations.

Seventy-eight percent of students became employed within one year after the program in human service related fields, predominantly in child and family services; another 11 percent continued on the education career ladder towards an undergraduate degree. Most important was the fact that 95 percent of program graduates remained in their communities in contrast to the widely reported 'brain drain' in rural Aboriginal communities when community members complete professional training. Retention of program graduates in communities strengthened community capacity to provide culturally appropriate services for children and families. As many evaluation participants noted, there are few benefits to the community when students either go away to attend university and do not return,

or when they come back, as one Elder expressed it, "as strangers with alien ideas."

### *expanded services for children*

The evaluation showed that First Nations Partnership Programs supported community-identified goals for expanded service delivery. As a group, community-based administrators across the seven First Nations Partnership Programs had prioritized three service objectives when they decided to initiate delivery of the child care training program: (a) to provide safe, developmentally supportive care for children, (b) to enable parents to pursue education and employment and (c) to ensure the reproduction and reconstruction of culture through programs for children and families. The community profiles below outline how these objectives were achieved.

#### *Tl'azt'en Nation*

Midway through the Tl'azt'en Nation partnership, students became involved in planning the Nation's first child care centre. They were involved in negotiating contracts with a carpentry training program on reserve to create furniture and toys for the facility. They worked together to develop operational policies and procedures. They created curriculum activities to teach young children their traditional Carrier language and to promote positive identity as Tl'azt'enne people. They named the centre 'Sumyaz' (meaning 'Little Star'). Students completed their final practicum at this new centre in their community. All of the program graduates became staff at the centre and also at the Aboriginal Head Start program in an additional facility that they had helped to initiate and implement.

#### *Mount Currie First Nation*

The training program ended just one day before the official opening of a multiplex that houses two new programs: the 'Tsipalin' ('Baby Basket') program for infants and toddlers, and the 'Sqwalx' ('Young Eagle') preschool program. These services are staffed almost entirely by program graduates who have created opportunities for young children to learn the traditional Lil'wat language, songs, games, dances, drumming and ways of telling and listening to the stories of their people and their natural environment.

#### *Meadow Lake Tribal Council*

In the five Cree and four Dene communities represented by the Tribal Council, graduates started day cares and other child and family services at their home reserves in remote parts of northern Saskatchewan. Some took up leadership roles in Health and Social Development planning within the offices of the Meadow Lake Tribal Council. One joined the staff of a safe home for women where she introduced programming for children.

#### *Cowichan Tribes*

This partnership occurred in a semi-urban environment and was the only program in which classes were held on a college campus on reserve land. Graduates applied their training in a variety of locations, including child care and parent support programs, probation services and college student services. Eight of the original 22 students laddered on to third and fourth years of university study towards a degree, usually in education.

### ***Onion Lake First Nation***

Half of the 17 program graduates in this community of 1,700 people were hired as staff at child care programs in their villages or as assistants at the community school. One graduate started a new day care in the main community on reserve at Onion Lake. Ten program graduates continued with First Nations Partnership Programs in a pilot project enabling them to take third and fourth year courses in Child and Youth Care while remaining in their community. Six of these students are expected to attain a Bachelor of Arts degree within months of the present report. Combining distance learning and face-to-face meetings in classrooms on reserve using the Generative Curriculum Model, these students blazed a new trail for students in other partner communities who may wish to 'ladder' on to the next rung in their career development.

### ***Nzen'man' Child and Family Services***

Program graduates are involved in a variety of centre-based and in-home child care programs, and after-school care. In addition, in this sparsely populated rural area, graduates are serving First Nations children and families through mobile outreach programs.

### ***Treaty 8 Tribal Association***

A range of new day care and other child- and family-centred programs were started and staffed by graduates from the six villages that comprised the partnership. Included among them is the 'Cree-ative Daycare' at Salteau reserve which emphasizes Cree language and cultural learning in the early years. Continuing

the bicultural values underlying the training program, some graduates are involved in English literacy programs to help parents prepare their children for school.

### ***From training to practice***

A question of central interest in the evaluation was how the strong cultural component of the training experience influenced the programs that graduates have created. Observations in centre-based care programs in the communities provided many examples. These include: children's books created in the training program about families in their community, and in their traditional language ("If you lived in Onion Lake, you would know..."); the colours and teachings of the Medicine Wheel; masks and legends; labels in traditional language and in English; child-sized drums and group drumming songs; traditional crafts such as the making of button blankets, miniature teepees, moccasins, basketry and bead work, including the use of traditional tools and materials; 'clan houses' decorated with symbolic animals in the playground; an emphasis on nature; an infusion of native spirituality – in stories, art and ways of describing people and events; cradle boards for infants; traditional foods, such as bannock, smoked fish and dried meat; organization of children into traditional 'clans' for small group activities; creation and use of the traditional talking stick for structuring talking circle time; the use of 'healing circle talk' to provide for support in response to distressing events; the use of 'time in' (rather than 'time out') in response to children's challenging behaviours; preparing for traditional community events such as powwows; learning traditional sustenance activities such as gathering berries, reeds for baskets, and mushrooms; and preparing fish, fruits, meats and leather, following the seasons and rhythms of the community.

Practicum supervisors and the evaluation team frequently noted the distinctive characteristics in the ways in which program graduates approached caregiving. These included flexibility in programming (e.g., in response to the needs of individual parents, children or care givers, seasonal variations, unanticipated opportunities); acceptance of a wide range of individual differences among both children and their parents, including a reluctance to label children (e.g., as having 'special needs' or disabilities); non-authoritarian, child-centred approaches to directing children's behaviour in program activities and involvement of Elders and parents meaningfully in the life of the centre.

The fluid boundary between the training program and the community meant that when program graduates assumed roles as leaders in child care initiatives, community members such as Elders, parents and other resource people expected and readily agreed to become actively involved. Eliciting community involvement, and knowing how to integrate community members meaningfully into children's programs are frequently reported challenges for practitioners. These challenges are amplified when the practitioner is not a member of the community or has completed training away from the community.

### ***Embedding professional practices in community contexts***

There was considerable variability across communities in designs for serving children and youth because every community was culturally different. Each community was embedded in a host of varying socioeconomic and geographic conditions. The open architecture of the Generative Curriculum Model is intended to accommodate and respond to new input from each partnering group. In order to avoid a pan-

Aboriginal approach which the instigators of the partnership program at Meadow Lake Tribal Council critiqued as fundamentally misguided, the curriculum generated in one partnership program was not passed along to subsequent partnerships. Rather than viewing culturally and contextually appropriate programming as a product, it was experienced in the partnerships as a process in which the particular cultural concepts and forms of each First Nations partner community were elaborated and applied to child and youth care.

Program graduates showed that they were committed to transmitting and sustaining the culture of their community in their practices and responding flexibly to the rhythms and demands of community life. The generated concepts and practices flowing from each training program have not been held up to other communities as best practice models or viewed as definitive methods for grounding child care approaches in culture.

### ***Determinants of program success***

Analysis of participants' accounts led to the identification of five antecedent conditions that enabled teaching and learning processes leading to program success. The conditions identified most frequently as having a causal link to program outcomes are described in this part of the report. Briefly, they were:

- partnership – especially the reciprocal guided participation of willing community and institutional partners
- community-based delivery that enabled community inclusion in all phases of program planning, delivery and refinement

- student cohort involvement in professional development
- open architecture of curriculum that depended upon community input
- facilitation of cultural input in curriculum.

Participants' accounts suggested that it was the combined effects of these antecedent conditions that contributed to the success of the partnerships. Together, these conditions enabled the cultural 'fit' and social inclusiveness of the training process and curriculum content. In turn, the training program resulted in outcomes that were consistent with community goals.

#### *i. success determinant – partnership*

##### *community will*

The seven First Nations partners shared certain characteristics that favoured successful partnership:

- a pre-existing identification of quality of life for children and families as a priority for community development
- a commitment to preserving the wisdom of Elders and revitalizing culturally-based strengths through policies and programs
- an openness to bicultural or multicultural approaches
- a prior commitment to strengthening capacity to promote well-being among children, youth and families in the community
- geographic proximity to other First Nations communities and willingness to

collaborate with them to recruit at least 10 prospective students to form a cohort

- effective community leadership and infrastructure to manage community-based delivery of the program.

It is difficult to gauge how many of the more than 500 First Nations in Canada share the characteristics of the 47 villages that were represented in the seven partnership programs. First Nations in Canada vary with respect to their priorities for community development and their receptivity to bicultural initiatives. It is reasonable to assume that not all cultural communities want this type of partnership program or are prepared to take it on. Some First Nations spokespeople have argued for exclusively indigenous curriculum content – constructed and delivered by indigenous institutions – in order to avoid the culturally diluting, assimilationist effects of many policies and programs delivered by non-First Nations institutions.

In the seven partnership arrangements, community will to invest in training in Early Childhood Care and Development and to subscribe to a bicultural partnership model involving community-based delivery typically took time to evolve. Community administrators described how the momentum for initiating a partnership emerged over a period of years before contact was made with the university-based team. During the initial pre-program phase of the partnership, local administrators worked hard to inform the community-at-large about the nature and purpose of the program, and to rally support for it while also recruiting eligible community members, Elders and instructors. The seven partnering communities showed that some First Nations have the public will and the social cohesion to take the driver's seat in a program initiative that depends on community participation and a long-term investment.



### *institutional will*

Evaluation participants attributed successful partnership in part to a clearly and consistently demonstrated intention on the part of the postsecondary institution to maintain the partnership – referred to here as institutional will. Participants identified a willingness on the part of institutional partners to make changes in policy and procedures in order to accommodate the needs of First Nations students in the areas of:

- admission criteria, course registration dates, fees and procedures
- scheduling of terms to accommodate seasonal community activities including hunting, fishing and gathering
- course content
- assignment/evaluation procedures
- inclusion of community members in key planning and delivery decisions
- promotion of relations of reciprocity between the institutions and the community
- recognition that First Nations people offer unique and valuable contributions to curriculum development and that no university-based team could effectively contribute this knowledge.

At the outset of the First Nations Partnership Programs, it was understood by the university-based team and the communities that the approach taken by most postsecondary institutions has been flawed by modernist assumptions, including the universal applicability of research-based knowledge about child development and program evaluations showing ‘best

practices’ without sufficient regard to ecocultural contexts. In contrast, a fundamental strength, as well as a challenge, of the First Nations Partnership Programs was the willingness to suspend judgment – to be willing to not know – both about community values, beliefs and perspectives, and about certain features of the engagement that would evolve or be discovered over time, including:

- the way each partnership would develop
- precisely what shape the program would take in each partnership
- what the content and teaching methods of the program should encompass with respect to culturally specific input.

First Nations communities are linked by certain historical events and current political objectives. Yet they encompass many different realities that reflect tribal ancestry, geographic location and a host of varying socioeconomic conditions. The destinations envisioned by partnering bands and tribal councils in the First Nations Partnership Programs were not identical and no two programs looked exactly alike. Flexibility on the part of the partnering institutions supported each community’s vision of how to use the program to pursue its own goals.

For the institution-based teams, there were new learnings with each new partnership about how to act in ways that would support each community’s identified goals for capacity building. Similarly, each community had unique requirements and styles of partnering as well as different ways of understanding the institution’s roles and resources. Accountability in the partnerships was as much about the process of engagement as it was about the content of the training curriculum.

## ***ii. success determinant – community-based delivery***

Community participants explained that for many people in rural settings, 'distance education' is really the opposite of how it is conventionally defined by educators. In rural communities, distance education occurs when students have to leave their families and the sources of knowledge in their communities – travelling distances in order to access generic education and training programs that often have little applicability to the migrant student's realities back home. Using the Generative Curriculum Model, education is both spatially and socially closer to home, keeping students in close proximity to cultural knowledge and support in their own ecologies.

Community-based delivery enabled extensive community involvement and other program processes that combined to distinguish the Generative Curriculum Model from traditional examples of good, constructivist, participatory pedagogy. Instructors at mainstream campuses who were asked to comment on the model and compare it to their own teaching experiences pointed to the difficulty of constructing generative curriculum in programs where students are at a distance from their home communities. When capacity-building initiatives through education and training are arranged so that the community is excluded from participating, the potential for community-wide transformations that could sustain and magnify the capacity that is built is seriously attenuated.

A comparative view of varying educational terrains came sharply into focus through the evaluation project. The absence of community in traditional university education, and the exclusion of community even in some programs that are physically located in the community, create major challenges for making professional

training relevant. Students are not practising with and receiving input and feedback from the people whom they are training to serve. In the partnership programs, many program graduates explained the positive impacts of the training on their own parenting with reference to the fact that they did not need to leave their families in order to participate in the program, enabling ongoing opportunities for practice, feedback and reflection.

The greatest challenge arising from basing the university program in the communities was that the program was not visible to the on-campus teaching, learning and administrative community in the partnering institution. First Nations student participation in the two-year program of course work represented a large proportion of the First Nations students enrolled at the University of Victoria. However, their absence from the on-campus community appears to have been more salient than their presence as members of the university community beyond the walls of traditional classrooms.

## ***iii. success determinant – student cohort involvement***

Many program graduates identified the high level of personal support that they experienced throughout the program as an enabling condition for persevering with full-time studies to program completion. They also accounted for their personal and professional development largely with reference to the support they experienced as they underwent significant change. Regular meetings of a group of students moving through the program together, alongside instructors-in-residence and Elders, led to essential characteristics of the learning environment, including:

- a climate of cultural safety for self-exploration and open debate about concepts of child care
- reliable support for students as they worked through memories of childhood stresses and loss of cultural identity and ventured out into practica
- sustainable social and professional networks.

Students, instructors and Elders became the centre of a community of learners that was characterized and enhanced by familiarity, proximity and shared experiences. Among program graduates, classmates were the most frequently identified sources of support, followed by instructors and intergenerational facilitators. In one community, the intergenerational facilitator twice intervened with a 'time out' from regular classes and assignments so that students, Elders and instructors could hold healing circles and sweat lodge ceremonies to promote recovery from residential school trauma and other personal and interpersonal difficulties. Students and instructors frequently compared the cohort to a 'family.' In all seven partnerships, social cohesion was significantly enhanced as a result of cohort involvement in a co-constructed, community-focussed experience of personal and social transformation and professional development.

One of the challenges posed by the one-time delivery of the program meant that all students needed to succeed and move through the program together. While this had a motivating effect overall, when a student failed a particular course, it was a challenge to find ways for the student to meet the course requirement at a later date. This situation was resolved using a 'learning contract' negotiated by the student, instructor and university or college-based team, and carried out during the program follow-up phase.

#### *iv. success determinant – 'open architecture' curriculum*

Course content in the first two partnerships adopted a spiral structure, with the idea that material generated through student-instructor interaction and through Elders' contributions would be incorporated into successive course offerings. Formative evaluation of these initial partnerships led to the conclusion that this spiral model focussed too narrowly on knowledge creation as an output. In addition, it risked leading to the same kind of pan-Aboriginal representations which had been rejected by the initial partners in the Meadow Lake Tribal communities. Finally, every First Nations partner group expressed reluctance to pass on their own cultural knowledge to other groups or to the university.

The five more recent partnership programs (1995-1999) were iterative: Each partnership generated a curriculum that was conceived through interaction among community members about their own culture and about the ideas presented in the course materials provided by the university-based team. Many evaluation participants observed that the process of constructing the curriculum had more impact and value for the community than the product. As one instructor remarked: "It was a lived curriculum." Nonetheless, cultural knowledge that was reconstructed and elaborated through the participatory curriculum development process was preserved through journals, books, audio and videotapes for purposes internal to each community.

Instructors recruited by partner communities agreed at the outset not to replicate the 'expert-driven' framework of most mainstream training and development assistance programs, nor to preordain exactly where the journey of generating curriculum would lead. Accounts given

in the evaluation by 19 instructors, each of whom had taught in one of the seven partnership programs, underscored how their teaching had differed in fundamental ways from prevailing teaching approaches in universities and professional training programs. As a way to capture these differences, the instructors were asked to formulate advice for future instructors using the Generative Curriculum Model, based on their reflections on what was effective in their own teaching practices in the partnership programs. Recurring themes are noted below.

- Respect the cultural and historical experience of community members as valuable sources of knowledge, rather than elevating as singular the authority of Euro-Western theories and research.
- Assert the power of ‘not knowing’ where an informed discussion might lead, rather than maintaining the colonialist presumption of ‘knowing’ what is true and best for all people and relying on pre-packaged curricula developed by ‘experts.’
- Ground teaching and learning in consideration of many viewpoints, rather than relying principally on the modernist approach of ‘universal’ truths and ‘best practices’ in human services.
- Encourage participation and promote social inclusion in building human service capacity, rather than accepting the exclusivity that often has been imposed by professional ‘gate-keeping’ organizations and by ‘dominant’ cultures on ‘minority’ cultures.

#### *v. success determinant – facilitation of cultural input*

Instructors cited Elders’ participation in curriculum development and teaching as the catalyst both for new and rekindled inter-generational relationships and for reinstatement of traditional social structures that ensure cultural transmission. In First Nations communities, Elders are typically the main source of knowledge of traditional ways of supporting children and families. In all seven First Nations Partnership Programs, Elders contributed portions of the content of each course. At the same time, they modelled ways of storytelling, listening and learning that are themselves expressions of First Nations culture.

Instructors reported staying alert in every course for opportunities to:

- involve Elders in teaching activities
- integrate teachings gleaned from Elders into the course work
- encourage students to reflect on Elders’ words throughout their discussions, assignments and practicum activities.

Students attributed several program experiences to the central role of Elders, including: developing a personal relationship with an Elder, often for the first time; receiving emotional support and practical guidance from Elders; and acquiring knowledge from Elders about their culture of origin, traditional language and socio-historical roots.

***Challenge: variations in Elders' availability and cultural knowledge***

*"We have no healthy community members over 50 years old."*

*"Our old people all attended residential school and as a result they don't know the culture and have forgotten the language."*

*"Most of the Elders here were converted to Christianity and that is what they are likely to want to teach us."*

These concerns were voiced by members of two community partners during their exploration of the 'goodness of fit' between the Generative Curriculum Model and their own community goals and resources. While representatives of these two communities were convinced that mainstream training programs were not culturally sensitive or applicable to their communities, they were initially at a loss as to where community-specific, traditional cultural input for the curriculum could come from.

The university-based team also had doubts about whether a co-constructive process, intended to embody elements of the traditional culture of the partner communities, was feasible in these cases. However, agreements were negotiated to deliver the program, and to begin by bringing in guest speakers from beyond the communities, including First Nations authors and Elders who were well known in the region. Eventually, students suggested inviting their elderly relatives, and gradually other Elders in the community began to offer workshops on traditional crafts, language and ceremonies. By the time these programs ended, graduation halls were filled with community members, including many Elders who had participated in the programs.

Thus, the partnership programs varied with regard to the extent of Elders' involvement. Analysis of participants' accounts suggested that high levels of Elders' involvement in the program were primarily associated with greater pre-program social cohesion within the community as well as greater community awareness and organization for supporting the partnership program. However, communities with initially low Elder participation grew in social cohesion and cultural pride as a result of their efforts to revitalize active roles for Elders in program activities.

***Discussion***

The evaluation research yielded evidence of individual and community-wide impacts that are unprecedented in published reports of postsecondary aboriginal education initiatives in Canada. The program evaluation revealed many expected and unexpected positive outcomes when professional training is seen as a tool for:

- retention and completion of aboriginal students in postsecondary education
- application of professional training in community relevant vocations
- personal transformation
- cultural revitalization
- community development
- institutional change.

Despite considerable differences among the First Nations partners in terms of their infrastructure, location, culture, economic status and

existing services for children and families, all of the partnerships yielded unprecedented successes for students, for the communities and for the institution-based teams. The evaluation shows that postsecondary education can be delivered in communities as small and distant from the partnering university as Tl'azt'en Nation, with an on-reserve population of about 600 people in three villages nestled in wilderness. And it worked as well, though differently, in the larger, semi-urban setting of the Cowichan Tribes, co-located with one university-college partner and within an hour of the other university partner.

Yet, as this report has already identified, challenges arose in every partnership. Challenges ranged from initial difficulties recruiting a sufficient number of students and initial skepticism about the feasibility and value of involving Elders in classes, to extreme initial difficulties securing funding to mount the program. There is much to be learned from how challenges were addressed in each partnership.

It is likely that the Generative Curriculum Model is applicable to a range of cultural communities in North America and internationally, and to a range of professional training fields. There are, however, limitations to the applicability of the program in its present form. In particular, the program cannot be mounted in very small and isolated communities where student numbers do not make the investment financially feasible and where students have no local access to practicum settings with skilled supervision. The cost-effectiveness of the program, in its current form, depends upon having at least 10 students enroll in the program. Many communities that have inquired about implementing the program have been too small to recruit, support and eventually employ this number of students.

### ***Implications for reconceptualizing professional training***

What can be done to sustain and extend this kind of socially inclusive generative approach to expanding the reach and relevance of professional training in cultural communities? Recommendations for future steps are discussed in this part of the report.

The evaluation findings are only as useful as there are willing 'users' who are positioned to make a difference in how we think about the lives of children and families in communities. It is not First Nations communities that have most to learn from the insights yielded by the evaluation research, but the educational and development assistance institutions, policy-making bodies and agencies – both First Nations and non-First Nations – which are involved in establishing and enforcing criteria for funding and delivering professional training in human services.

Being responsive to indigenous communities means more than letting community members voice their concerns or preferences, more than acknowledging diversity and more than arranging a welcoming environment on mainstream campuses to accommodate indigenous students who are able to come to them. Educators need to open up the foundations of how training programs are conceived and delivered, how they are funded and how communities can play leading roles in capacity-building initiatives.

### ***What does it take to be an effective partner with cultural communities?***

Administrators who participated in the evaluation addressed a set of attitudes and forms of interpersonal engagement.

- Tolerate high levels of uncertainty and shared control of the program.
- Clarify and confirm informally, and later formally, agreement about the 'mission' of the partnership and the core elements of the program.
- Make a long-term commitment and persevere.
- Respond to expressions of community needs regarding program implementation with a high level of flexibility. Postsecondary partners need to be self-critical and willing to jettison the 'excess baggage' of their institutions and work around some of the constraints of their institutions.
- Become familiar with the priorities, practices and circumstances of the community without becoming involved in them. (In the First Nations Partnership Programs, the postsecondary partners did not seek or presume to become experts or insiders of the cultures or social life of the community partners.)
- Assume an encouraging, non-directive stance while waiting.
- Avoid 'doing' when non-action would be more productive of community agency and, ultimately, capacity building.
- Be receptive to what the community brings to the project, although these contributions may come in unfamiliar forms and at unexpected times.

### *Institutional commitment*

The most serious challenge facing this program approach is that it remains at the margins of mainstream university and government priorities. This challenge persists despite a decade of documented successes and appeals from both First Nations communities wishing to mount the program and postsecondary institutions wishing to respond to these communities through partnerships.

A specific financial challenge for both communities and partnering institutions is the length of time needed to develop community and institutional will, establish a partnership relationship and negotiate formal agreements, deliver the program and provide follow-up support for program participants. As community and institutional administrators underscored in this evaluation, the importance of the pre-program delivery phase cannot be underestimated. Yet funding for education and employment training typically is available only for the period of formal program delivery when students are enrolled in courses. Across partnerships, the program lasts approximately 23 months. This represents no more than one-half of the time invariably needed to bring a successful partnership program to fruition.

The First Nations Partnership Programs effectively broke new ground with the open architecture of the Generative Curriculum Model. The evaluation shows that universities and colleges can effectively reach beyond the walls of on-campus structures and respond flexibly to communities that recognize education as an important tool for social and economic development. The challenge remaining is how to go beyond the open architecture of the Generative Curriculum Model to an open architecture in



the pedagogical and administrative structures comprising postsecondary institutions as a whole. One way institutions could start to demonstrate a new vision would be to show substantial support for off-campus programs that are receptive to community initiative and inclusion in program delivery and curriculum design.

First Nations Partnership Programs demonstrate the benefits that can flow when partners recognize the need to anchor capacity-building initiatives deeply within the context of the local people, their existing social organization and cultural strengths, their potential for transformation and their will to move forward on internally articulated agendas. Many human service training and program initiatives at both individual and community levels proceed on the basis of the assumption that the more chronically oppressed or needy a group of people seems to be, the more one must bring to the situation in order to be helpful. The evaluation of the First Nations Partnership Programs shows the opposite.

To be supportive of community efforts to strengthen capacity, institutional partners and community leaders themselves must be scrupulous about not being pre-emptive and not overwhelming the community with imported 'goods and services' from outside their own context and out of step with their own internal rhythm and pace. Rather than evoking the potential in any community for passive receptivity and eventual dependency, capacity-building initiatives must capitalize upon the community's agency.

While not conceived within the crucible of post-modernism, the impetus for the partnerships in the desire of the Meadow Lake Tribal Council to present students with "the best of both worlds" so that they can construct their own truths and "walk in both worlds" implies a post-modernist acceptance of multiple ways of know-

ing, sources of knowledge and criteria for evaluating the validity and utility of knowledge [Dahlberg, Moss and Pence 1999]. The Generative Curriculum Model resonates with an increasingly influential shift in education from essentialist to feminist [Lather 1991] and from logical positivist to sociocultural constructivist ideologies [Kessler and Swadener 1992; Wertsch and Toma 1995].

Most importantly, students, instructors, Elders and community administrators emphasized that their experience with the 'both/and' framework of the 'Generative Curriculum Model' enabled them to ensure that their own culture was represented both in the curriculum content and in the teaching and learning process. As a result, the training program resonated with the realities of the communities in which they lived and intended to work. Dennis Esperanz, a First Nations educator who played a key role in implementing the partnership program with Onion Lake First Nation, commented:

*We educators have to be visionaries, and when we talk curriculum, there has to be a view to what our communities are envisioning – what their goals are. The Generative Curriculum Model contains a larger vision of how to bring these two different visions together – the one that academics see and the one that guides people out there in the communities. So we've learned a new approach to making what we do here [in this institution] meaningful and effective for all parties. People are just starting to understand what this is all about.*

The evaluation research provides strong support for involving communities in co-constructing curricula in order to achieve three related objectives:

- increasing retention and academic success among aboriginal students in postsecondary education
- ensuring the cultural relevance and vocational utility of professional training within the context of the needs and internally-identified goals of Aboriginal communities
- decreasing the sociopolitical hegemony of mainstream academic canons and pedagogical approaches by recognizing alternative criteria for evaluating the validity and worth of diverse sources and ways of knowing.

The curriculum innovation described in this report illustrates how we can re-position mainstream educational institutions to respond effectively to Aboriginal student groups and to other cultural communities in ways that avoid the pitfalls of colonizing assimilationist tendencies of many modernist educational practices. Generative curriculum development begins with ensuring that the privilege of knowledge is diffused. Inviting community members as collaborators in co-constructing curricula and placing culturally embedded constructs at the core rather than at the periphery of education has profound implications for educators. This approach affects the kinds of questions we ask about our roles as educators; the curriculum designs we use; the ways we assess the value of education and training; and the kinds of relationships we

forge as educators with diverse cultural constituencies. All aspects of the education process and outcomes are affected, therefore constituting an alternative paradigm.

### *Summary*

Seven Canadian Aboriginal communities initiated partnerships with a university-based team to co-construct curriculum using a 'Generative Curriculum Model' and to co-deliver a community-based training program leading to certification in Early Childhood Education and a university diploma in Child and Youth Care. The effectiveness of this participatory, constructivist, community-involving model of curriculum design was demonstrated in program evaluation research completed in July 2000. Positive program impacts included: unprecedented high rates of Aboriginal student retention, program completion, leadership and application of training to relevant vocations within their communities; revitalization of intergenerational relationship through involvement of tribal elders in curriculum construction, teaching and learning; enhanced community cohesion; and reinforcement of valued cultural concepts and practices. The benefits of decolonizing postsecondary education by providing a place of value in curriculum design and delivery to cultural knowledge transmitted by community members alongside the established canon of knowledge in mainstream training programs were discussed.

## References

- Archibald, J. (1995). "Locally developed Native studies curriculum: An historical and philosophical rationale." In *First Nations Education in Canada: The Circle Unfolds*. In M. Battiste and J. Barman eds. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, pp. 288-313.
- Archibald, J., and S. Bowman eds. (1995). "Experiences of First Nations Graduates. First Nations postsecondary education: A review." *Canadian Journal of Native Education*. 21(1): 161-199.
- Armstrong, J. (1987). "Traditional indigenous education: A natural process." *Canadian Journal of Native Education*. 14(3): 14-19.
- Armstrong, R., J. Kennedy and P.R. Oberle. (1990). *University and education and economic well-being: Indian achievement and prospectus*. Ottawa: Indian and Northern Affairs Canada.
- Ball, J. and D. Nicholson. (1999). "Strength in gathering." Proceedings of a forum of postsecondary educators in early childhood education in First Nations communities. Victoria: First Nations Partnership Programs, University of Victoria.
- Ball, J. and A. Pence. (2000). "A post-modernist approach to culturally grounded training. Early Childhood Care and Development." *Australian Journal of Early Childhood*. 25(1): 21-25.
- Ball, J., and A. Pence. (1999). "Beyond developmentally appropriate practice: Developing community and culturally appropriate practice." *Young Children*, March, pp. 46-50.
- Ball, J., A. Pence, M. Pierre and V. Kuehne. (2001). "Breeching the walls: Rediscovering First Nations values in child care training curricula in Canada." In M. Kaplan, N. Henkin and A. Kusano eds. *Inter-generational program strategies from a global perspective*. Honolulu: University Press of America, forthcoming.
- Barber, C.A. (1986). "Persistence in Canadian Native Teacher Education Programs and inner-city high schools." Unpublished master's thesis. Regina: University of Regina, Faculty of Education.
- Brant, C. (1990). "Native ethics and rules of behaviour." *Canadian Journal of Psychiatry*. 35: 534-539.
- Brokenleg, M. (1990). *Reclaiming youth at risk: Our hope for the future*. Bloomington, IN: National Education Service.
- Calliou, S. (1993). "Toward community: The community school model and the health of sovereignty." *Canadian Journal of Native Education*. 20: 27-43.
- Charleston, G.M. ed. (1988). *Tradition and education: Towards a vision of our future*. National Review of First Nations Education. Summerstown and Ottawa, Ontario: Assembly of First Nations.
- Couture, J.E. (1996). "The role of native elders: Emergent issues." In D.A. Long and O.P. Dickason eds. *Visions of the heart: Canadian Aboriginal issues*. Toronto: Harcourt Brace, pp. 41-56.
- Dahlberg, G., P. Moss and A. Pence. (1999). *Beyond quality in early childhood education and care: Post-modern perspectives*. London: Falmer Press.
- Evans, M., J. McDonald and D. Nyce. (1999). "Acting across boundaries in Aboriginal curriculum development: Examples from northern British Columbia." *Journal of Native Education*. 23(2): 190-205.
- Friesen, J. W. (1986). "Teaching in the Native outreach program at the University of Calgary." Proceedings from the Mokakit Conference of the Indian Education Research Association. Winnipeg: ERIC Documentation Reproduction Services No. ED 28966, October.
- Gillis, J. (1992). "Views of native parents about early childhood education." *Canadian Journal of Native Education*. 19: 73-81.
- Glaser, B.G. (1992). *Emergence vs. Forcing: Basics of Grounded Theory Analysis*. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.
- Glaser, B.G. and A.L. Strauss. (1970). "Discovery of substantive theory." In W. Filstead ed. *Qualitative methodology*. Chicago: Rand McNally, pp. 288-297.
- Grant, A. (1995). "The challenge for universities in First Nations education in Canada." In *First Nations Education in Canada: The Circle Unfolds*. M. Battiste and J. Barman eds. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, pp. 208-223.
- Haig-Brown, C. (1995). "Taking control: Contradiction and First Nations education." In M. Battiste and J. Bar-

- man eds. *First Nations Education in Canada: The Circle Unfolds*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, pp. 262-287.
- Hesch, R. (1995). "Teacher education and Aboriginal opposition." In M. Battiste and J. Barman eds. *First Nations Education in Canada: The Circle Unfolds*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, pp. 179-207.
- Ignace, R. (1996). "Partners in success: The Simon Fraser University and Secwepemc First Nations Studies Program." *Canadian Journal of University Continuing Education*. 22(2): 27-45.
- Kessler, S. and B. Swadener eds. (1992). *Reconceptualizing the early childhood curriculum: Beginning the dialogue*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Kirkness, V. (1986). "Toward Indian control of Indian education." *Canadian Journal of Native Education*, 13(1).
- Kirkness, V.J. and R. Barnhardt. (1991). "First Nations and higher education: The Four R's – Respect, Relevance, Reciprocity, Responsibility." *Journal of American Indian Education*. 30(3): 1-15.
- Knowles, M.S. (1980). *The Modern Practice of Adult Education*. Chicago: Follet.
- Lather, P. (1991). *Getting Smart: Feminist Research and Pedagogy Within the Postmodern*. London: Routledge.
- Leavitt, R. (1995). "Language and cultural content in native education." In M. Battiste and J. Barman eds. *First Nations Education in Canada: The Circle Unfolds*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, pp. 124-138.
- Lockhart, A. (1982). "The insider-outsider dialectic in native socio-economic development: A case study in process understanding." *Canadian Journal of Native Studies*. 2: 159-162.
- Mackay, R. and L. Myles. (1995). "A major challenge for the education system: Aboriginal retention and dropout." In M. Battiste and J. Barman eds. *First Nations Education in Canada: The Circle Unfolds*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, pp. 157-178.
- Pence, A. and J. Ball. (1999). "Two sides of an eagle's feathers: Co-Constructing ECCD training curricula in university partnerships with Canadian First Nations communities." In H. Penn ed. *Theory, Policy and Practice in Early Childhood Education*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.
- Royal Commission on Aboriginal People. (1996). *Gathering Strength*. Vol. 3. Ottawa: Canada Communication Group Publishing.
- Wertsch, J.V. and C. Toma. (1995). "Discourse and learning in the classroom: A sociocultural approach." In L.P. Steffe and J. Gale. eds. *Constructivism in education*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, pp. 159-174.
- Wilson, P. (1994). "The professor/student relationship: Key factors in minority student performance and achievement." *Canadian Journal of Native Studies*. 14 (2): 305-317.
- Wright, B. (1991). "American Indian and Alaska Native higher education: Toward a new century of academic achievement and cultural integrity." Washington, DC: Indian Nations at Risk Task Force. ERIC Documentation Reproduction Services No. 343771.