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Executive Summary

Problem Statement:

Minnesota’s most enduring languages are in danger of disappearing. Without timely intervention, the use of Dakota and Ojibwe languages – like Indigenous languages throughout the globe -- will decline to a point beyond recovery.

These languages embody irreplaceable worldviews. They express, reflect, and maintain communal connections and ways of understanding the world. Deeper than the disuse of vocabulary or grammar, the loss of an Indigenous language is destruction of a complex system for ordering the relationships among people and the natural world, for solving social problems, and connecting people to something beyond themselves.

Models for successfully bringing languages back from the brink of extinction exist throughout the globe, from America’s southwest to Wales and New Zealand. One important first step is the recognition that language revitalization requires a pedagogy that includes more than “foreign language instruction, including strong immersion programming. Language immersion environments in which fluent first speakers take an active, prominent role have proven to be invaluable in revitalizing Indigenous languages.

Fluent speakers are one of many critical resources that have yet to be developed within the borders of Minnesota, where language revitalization is in its infancy. Some reservations and urban American Indian communities simply do not have the number of fluent speakers (and especially “first speakers” who were born to the language) to offer extensive language instruction. Especially in the immediate future while teacher preparation programs are being developed, some communities will need the involvement of first and fluent speakers from outside their own borders – from other reservations within Minnesota, other states, or Canada. Each community has a local history with its language, reflected in subtle distinctions of language use, and the involvement of instructors from elsewhere, if needed, is a hard compromise for saving the language. Current public policies present logistical barriers to that involvement and to other necessary steps for language revitalization. Also, social forces of assimilation continue to endanger Dakota and Ojibwe languages. These are some of the imposing challenges faced by language revitalization.

But after centuries of public policies on federal and state levels that were intended to destroy Indigenous languages, the importance of language revitalization is now increasingly recognized. Native communities today are fiercely committed to strengthening their languages. Federal and state legislation has begun to address the issue of language loss. Tribal, federal and state governments have joined with educators and language activists to begin laying the groundwork for language revitalization.

The benefits of language revitalization are abundant. For Dakota and Ojibwe people the effort is a matter of cultural survival, the maintenance of systems that are required absolutely for the health of Indigenous communities. For students and other American Indians who negotiate lives in wider communities where their cultural identities are largely invisible, language instruction is a source of strength that, among other benefits, provides the possibility of addressing the educational achievement gap that exists between American Indian and white students. The health of Indigenous languages also enriches the broader society. Indigenous languages are place-specific; they provide the deepest possible understanding of the historical and natural relationships that animate and enrich Mini sota –
the place where water reflects the sky. With the revitalization of Ojibwe and Dakota languages, all Minnesotans have a better chance of moving beyond learning about Indians, toward a more productive and richer place of learning from our most enduring cultures.

**The Volunteer Working Group:**

The Minnesota Legislature established a volunteer work group to “develop a unified strategy to revitalize and preserve Indigenous languages of the 11 federally recognized American Indian tribes in Minnesota.” Guided by ten directives from the Legislature, the work group held monthly meetings for the past 18 months to assess the status of Minnesota’s Indigenous languages and of language revitalization efforts, identify obstacles to language revitalization, and develop recommendations for action. The Working Group has laid an extensive foundation on which future activities, educators, and policy makers can build effective strategies for saving our languages.

The Work Group is comprised of representatives from tribal governments, urban American Indian communities, community language experts, the Department of Education and Board of Teaching, the Minnesota Historical Society and fields related to language revitalization. In monthly meetings over the course of 18 months, work group members have contributed their knowledge, experience and research to ensuring that Indigenous language revitalization will be achieved in Minnesota.

In addition to the resources provided by individual members, the work group has consulted with the Department of Education and with immersion schoolteachers who are on the front lines of language revitalization. Surveys of educators, tribal governments and community members have been commissioned, and the work group has consulted with many experts on Dakota and Ojibwe language revitalization.

In the course of its work, the work group has compiled data on language instruction in Minnesota schools at all levels, and on the availability of funding for language revitalization locally and nationally. Curriculum materials currently used in Dakota and Ojibwe language instruction have been reviewed, and careful attention has been paid to immersion schoolteachers who have expressed what they need for success. A comprehensive list of Ojibwe and Dakota language instruction programs in the State has been compiled. Federal and state statutes that mandate, shape, and limit language revitalization have also been examined.

As a result of its effort, the work group has been able to address all ten directives set by the Legislature, resulting in:

- A reliable picture of the status of Dakota and Ojibwe languages and of current efforts to revitalize Minnesota’s Indigenous languages.
- The identification of best practices for addressing language revitalization.
- The identification of barriers to successful language revitalization.
- Recommendations for action that can be taken by tribal governments, the Minnesota Legislature and the State Department of Education to remove obstacles and advance the cause of language revitalization.

**Key Findings:**

- Dakota and Ojibwe languages are in critical condition. The population of fluent and first speakers of these languages is small, and only a few first speakers live in Minnesota. Virtually nobody who speaks Ojibwe or Dakota as a first language has standard teaching credentials.
• Successful models do exist for bringing Indigenous languages from the brink of extinction.

• More than 100 programs and activities in Minnesota provide exposure to and/or instruction in Dakota and Ojibwe languages, reflecting the importance placed on this effort by language activists, educators, tribal governments and the Minnesota Department of Education. Few of these programs, however, recognize the essential pedagogic requirements for language revitalization, which include a role for strong immersion programming and the leadership roles for fluent speakers.

• Language immersion programs are crippled by a lack of trained teachers; a dearth of curriculum materials; policies that adversely affect the licensure, training and availability of required personnel; and limited funding. Currently, only the University of Minnesota campuses in the Twin Cities and Duluth offer preparation for licensure for teaching across the curriculum in Ojibwe and Dakota languages; neither of these operates for teachers in grades 9-12 and subsequently languages are seldom taught formally at that level. A limited number of teacher preparation programs offer tracks toward licensure for teaching Ojibwe and Dakota as world languages, and conflicting federal policies create a situation in which it is difficult to coordinate the varying expertise of fluent speakers, teachers licensed in subject areas, language teachers, and immersion teachers who are licensed to teach across the curriculum in Ojibwe and Dakota.

• Successful language revitalization will require a leadership role from tribal governments and a coordinated effort involving the Minnesota Department of Education, local school districts with significant populations of Dakota and Ojibwe students, and language activists.

• Language revitalization has the potential to make a positive impact on efforts to bridge the educational achievement gap between Minnesota’s Indian students and non-American Indian students, among other benefits.

Recommendations

The Volunteer Working Group has identified curriculum, teacher training, funding and other needs that are required to revitalize Dakota and Ojibwe languages. The next step is to engage community members and policy makers in meeting those needs. To this end, the Volunteer Working Group recommends:

• The establishment of a Working Group that can build on the foundation already laid to
  o Develop a 25-year strategic plan for language revitalization
  o Build the cooperative efforts needed among Tribal governments, Indigenous communities, State agencies, and educators to create immersion schools, teacher training programs, a repository of teaching materials and other resources.
  o Recommend methods for applying world language proficiency standards to instruction in Dakota and Ojibwe; creating teaching materials in those languages for subjects across the curriculum, and addressing barriers to teacher recruitment.

• Continued appropriation of funds for grant support to programs and activities that are currently working in the field of Dakota and Ojibwe language instruction.

• The establishment of an American Indian advisory group for the Department of Education, to provide their perspectives on policies throughout the Department including ways in which languages instruction can narrow the achievement gap between American Indian students and their peers.
Introduction: Language Loss

Indigenous Language: Identity, Place

American Indian languages such as Dakota and Ojibwe are more than grammar and vocabulary. They are inseparable from American Indian identity. Languages express, reflect, and maintain the connections of people to one another and to the world around them. They are shaped over millennia by communal experience, and they shape how a people come to know who they are and what is true, where they came from, where they live, and how the world around them works materially and spiritually.

One distinguishing characteristic of Indigenous languages such as Dakota and Ojibwe is that they are intimately connected to place. Embedded in these languages are the most enduring and deepest connections to a specific land. If people want to know about where they live, they will find the richest and most reliable source of information in the local Indigenous language that arose there, the language that delineates the human relationships and cultural methodologies most appropriate to that landscape over the long haul, the language in which spiritual and physical realities of a particular place intersect.

Place – or sense of Place -- ... suggests the concepts, memories, histories, ideas, emotions, relationships, identities (both individual and community) and objects associated with a particular physical space... Indigenous people are a people of Place, and the nature of Place is embedded in their language.

Assaults on Indigenous Language

Since languages are so inseparable from individual and communal identity, they are difficult to destroy. Severing a people from the land where their language arose cannot by itself stop the use of an Indigenous language. Denying a people the material sustenance needed to keep individuals alive will not end the life of a language. Language cannot be beaten or shamed away. We know these methods will not destroy American Indian languages because for more than 100 years such assaults were aggressively pursued as the official policy of federal and state governments in the United States--and yet the languages of Dakota and Ojibwe people survive.

During the treaty making era, when the United States acquired American Indian homelands and ominously assumed responsibility for the education of American Indian people, the choice that policy makers debated was not between saving Indigenous languages or destroying them; the prevailing policy conflict was between destroying American Indian languages or destroying American Indians. The attempt to obliterate the culture and language of American Indians was for decades considered the enlightened alternative to more brutal measures. When the founder of the Carlisle Indian Industrial School (the first government run boarding school for American Indian children, 1879) selected as his motto “Kill the Indian, save the man,” he was not using an idle metaphor.

By 1900, Carlisle founder R. H. Pratt could report of his students that “they have been systematically taught self-repression.” While this system was not completely successful in obliterating Indigenous languages, it contributed to creating the crisis point at which those languages now stand. Generations of American Indians, as a means of protecting their children, replaced their Indigenous language with English. Generation by generation, American Indian languages have become ever more endangered, a development accelerated by the insistence of a mass-media, consumer driven American culture on English as a requirement for participating in the economic, social, and political life of the country.
In the past few decades, the importance of revitalizing American Indian languages has become more broadly recognized. Federal legislation has made language preservation an official policy, and provided minimal funding for that policy. The State of Minnesota has also taken legislative and administrative steps to support Indigenous language instruction. Tribal governments have made language revitalization a higher priority in the long list of necessities for protecting sovereignty, promoting community health, and ensuring cultural survival. Nearly all of the eleven Minnesota Tribes have passed resolutions declaring Dakota or Ojibwe as their official language.

The survival of Dakota and Ojibwe languages, however, remains a question. After centuries of assault, Indigenous languages require heroic life-saving measures on many fronts.

---


2“The Red Man” (school newspaper of Carlyle Indian Industrial School), February, 1900

---

The Volunteer Working Group

During its 2009 session the Minnesota Legislature appropriated a pool of funds generated by the Legacy Amendment for a report on “Dakota and Ojibwe Language Revitalization and Preservation in the State of Minnesota.” To this end, the legislature established a Volunteer Working Group and charged it with providing information in response to ten specific directives.

Since its first convening in August, 2009, the Volunteer Working Group has met regularly to share the wealth of expertise held by its members. In December of 2009 the working group contracted a consultant to assist in the research required to address the ten legislative directives, and an extensive body of research has been compiled. In addition, the working group commissioned two statewide surveys of stakeholders in language revitalization. During the period in which this report has been generated, the Volunteer Working Group has also used state funding to support language instruction through a series of grants to educational and community institutions.

It is the intention of the Volunteer Working Group to present in this report:

- A reliable picture of the current condition of Dakota and Ojibwe languages and of language revitalization efforts.
- The results and analysis of research on best practices for language revitalization, and of obstacles to implementing these practices.
- The basic information and background needed to create a strategy by which Minnesota’s 11 tribal governments, the State of Minnesota, and other stakeholders can cooperate to ensure the survival of Dakota and Ojibwe languages.

A list of Volunteer Working Group members and their affiliations can be found in Appendix 1.
Context: Language Immersion and the State of Language Revitalization in Minnesota

The Volunteer Working Group identified more than 100 programs and activities within the borders of Minnesota that provide opportunities for exposure to or instruction in Dakota and Ojibwe languages. Any opportunity to learn about endangered languages is critically important; these programs help meet the interest in Dakota and Ojibwe as world languages and expand the pool of language learners.

In all but three of these programs, however, Minnesota’s Indigenous languages are presented as optional subjects. Among the myriad of activities that “expose” students to American Indian language and culture, serious and effective language instruction is taking place in Minnesota. But, relying on Indigenous language as a subject to be studied fails to reflect the unique needs of language revitalization. In situations where fluent, first language speakers are few and elderly, and language transmission to younger generations is rare, language revitalization requires the inclusion of instruction in immersion settings.

The Volunteer Working Group was charged by the Legislature with addressing ten directives, half of which focus specifically on building language immersion programming. But the vast majority of Dakota and Ojibwe language students receive instruction in non-immersion settings. Current language instruction models must be maintained during and beyond the development of immersion programming. All language instruction is vital to the health of Ojibwe and Dakota languages. While this report focuses at points on immersion in order to meet the directives of the Legislature, it should be clear that addressing the challenges of immersion models can strengthen all Dakota and Ojibwe language instruction.

Immersion programming is in its infancy in Minnesota, and the timely development of the resources required for success faces imposing challenges on every front. But planning here is not taking place in a vacuum. The Volunteer Working Group has amassed research from successful programs around the world that serve as models for language revitalization. The lessons from these models are sobering but clear:

- In immersion settings, language is not a subject but a medium in which all instruction takes place. Immersion schools face a necessary burden – one that other schools do not face – in developing lesson plans and other curriculum materials in Indigenous languages that meet Minnesota K-12 Academic Standards.

- Immersion transmits, in addition to language, a cohesive worldview that the language embodies. In order for this transmission to occur, language proficiency must be developed to the point of what language revitalization expert Jonathan Fishman calls “re-vernacularization,” a state of language health in which speakers are engaged in creating a living language in informal settings.

  We are not very good at language teaching because vernaculars are inter-generational on informal, spontaneous bases, outside any formal institutionalized bases.¹

- Unfortunately, the number of fluent speakers of Ojibwe and Dakota languages has fallen to such a low number in Minnesota that informal settings for language transmission are rare. An institutional approach in immersion schools is the only available option for immersion instruction, and this option is not available to 99% of American Indian students within the borders of Minnesota. The revitalization of “vernacularized,” living languages depends on interaction among (elderly) fluent speakers and younger students –preferably beginning before school age.
• Indigenous languages embody a cultural perspective that understands the world in very different categories than “social science” and “art.” Immersion schools, to reach their greatest success, must transmit language at such a high level of proficiency that contemporary academic and communicative concepts can be introduced and learned to exacting standards. While the Minnesota K-12 Academic Standards are key to creating contributing citizens in modern society, immersion schools again face imposing challenges that other forms of instruction do not—and this includes immersion instruction in European languages, where the goal is to create language vocabulary and grammar proficiency but not transmit a distinct world view.

• In Minnesota, American Indian students meet academic standards in math, for instance, only half as often as their white counterparts in 3rd grade, and only one third as often in 8th grade; the dropout rate for American Indian students here far outstrips that of white students. Indigenous language immersion has the potential to address this achievement gap for American Indian students. Immersion instruction is additive—it does not replace English, but gives students an entire new skill set. It offers the brain development and mental acuity benefits notable in much research on bi-lingual education. It also consistently raises the level of student engagement in classroom activities—an important factor in academic achievement. In some model immersion programs elsewhere in the US, immersion students meet or exceed the achievement of their peers by 8th grade.

• Unlike “foreign language” instruction, Indigenous language revitalization does not enjoy the resource of billions of foreign speakers. If Minnesota fails to provide effective foreign language instruction, Chinese and Spanish will survive; these languages are supported by a population base of millions of speakers elsewhere. American Indian languages do not enjoy this level of resources. Language immersion here must engage every available speaker to the greatest possible extent, from within the boundaries of Minnesota and beyond, and develop proficient speakers with all due haste.

• Successful language immersion have resulted from a specific pedagogy that features cultural identity and tradition as an asset. The New Zealand Department of Education, for instance, has called this the “Potential Approach,” and it has in fact revitalized the Maori Language. This approach features:

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{Less focus on…} & \text{More focus on…} \\
\cdot Remediating deficit & \cdot Realizing potential \\
\cdot Problems of dysfunction & \cdot Identifying opportunity \\
\cdot Government intervention & \cdot Investing in people/local solutions \\
\cdot Targeting deficit & \cdot Tailoring education to the learner \\
\cdot Cultural minority status & \cdot Indigeneity and distinctiveness \\
\cdot Instructing and informing & \cdot Collaborating and co-constructing
\end{array}
\]

By highlighting this approach, the development of immersion programming can help create an environment in which all language instruction is supported more effectively.


2 Minnesota Kids Count Databook, 2010

KEY FINDINGS

Directive One
Create an inventory of existing programs designed to preserve Dakota and Ojibwe languages in the state, including postsecondary programs, programs in tribal schools, and other schools throughout the state.

Until approximately 40 years ago, Indigenous languages and culture were assaulted rather than supported by state and federal governmental policies. It was not until 1978, for instance, that the American Indian Religious Freedom Act removed prohibitions against fundamental American Indian traditional practices. In Minnesota, the 1988 Indian Education Act finally mandated State support for meeting educational needs that are unique to American Indian children, and this impetus has led gradually toward support for Dakota and Ojibwe languages.

Given the relatively short time frame in which Dakota and Ojibwe language instruction has developed, it is remarkable that any quality programming exists, yet pockets of effective teaching exist throughout the state. The current scope of language instruction, however, falls far short of meeting the needs of language revitalization.

Key Findings:
• More than 100 programs and activities in Minnesota provide exposure to, or instruction in, Dakota and Ojibwe languages, reflecting the importance placed on this effort by language activists, educators, tribal governments and the Minnesota Department of Education. However, most of these current activities are not intended to develop fluent speakers of Ojibwe and Dakota.

• Few of these programs recognize the essential pedagogic requirements for language revitalization, which require immersive language experiences and leadership roles for fluent speakers.

• Two American Indian language immersion schools exist in Minnesota, serving only a small fraction of American Indian students. One Lab School offers instruction in an immersion setting outside the regular school day.

• Schools that offer Ojibwe and Dakota language instruction reported an average of 30 minutes per day devoted to instruction. However, many times beading, singing, and learning about culture are also taught in these 30 minutes; the instruction often takes place outside the regular school day. Most of the programs in which students are exposed to Dakota and Ojibwe languages are not geared toward creating fluent speakers.

These findings are based on a survey of Indian education programs, tribal and public schools, community language tables, universities and tribal colleges that offer Dakota or Ojibwe language. For details on language programming compiled from the survey, see Appendix 2: Surveys.
Directive Two

Create an inventory of available resources for Dakota and Ojibwe language revitalization and immersion programs, including curriculum, educational materials, and trained teachers.

Key Findings

• Ojibwe language lesson plans are used in 31 school settings, generally providing exposure or the most basic language instruction; a yearly curriculum of Dakota language lesson plans has been created with Grotto Foundation support, and some additional exposure to Dakota language may be available in American Indian language, history and culture assignments (often provided from a non-Indigenous perspective).

• Lesson plans and other resources for Dakota and Ojibwe language instruction are most frequently created by individual instructors, following no standard format and existing in isolation from one another.

• Approximately 160 resources, ranging from published storybooks that feature Indigenous language words to web-based resources for immersion teachers (seldom specific to Ojibwe or Dakota) were compiled by the Volunteer Working Group. This represents a dearth of usable materials for revitalizing endangered languages. The identified resources might support instruction in Dakota or Ojibwe as a second language, but seldom would be applicable in immersion settings.

• Ninety five percent of the schools responding to the Working Group’s state-wide survey have had to create their own curriculum materials in order to offer instruction in Dakota or Ojibwe.

• Teachers in immersion schools have created materials to offer instruction in Ojibwe to address subject areas across the curriculum for lower grade levels, but no system is in place for sharing this material. Also, immersion schools are not operating beyond 6th grade, and curriculum materials beyond this level have yet to be generated.

• There is a critical shortage of teachers for Dakota and Ojibwe language instruction in any setting, and the number of available teachers is wholly inadequate to meet the need for stable, high-quality instruction in more immersion schools.

• The number of licensed teachers with Dakota and Ojibwe language proficiency is inadequate to meet the needs of language revitalization.

• Teachers may be licensed to teach Ojibwe and Dakota as world languages; they may be licensed to teach in specific academic areas or grade levels and have attained some level of language proficiency; based on their language proficiency alone, they may have received a waiver from the Department of Education to teach while attending a formal program of licensure preparation. The total number of all of these teachers is less than 80, and most of those are not teaching Dakota or Ojibwe language.

• Federal education policies limit the number of teachers available to immersion schools that receive federal funding. Only 5 teachers have Immersion Certificates from the Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition at the University of Minnesota – the only resource for such credentials.

Further information about specific curriculum resources and the use of language lesson plans is available in Appendix 2: Surveys.
Directive Three
Identify curriculum needs to train teachers of Dakota and Ojibwe languages in immersion programs and barriers to training language teachers.

Key Findings
• Seventy four responses to the Volunteer Working Group survey of language instruction programs (Appendix 2) identified a variety of teacher training needs, including:
  o Accredited immersion-specific training;
  o Opportunities to maintain and improve second language acquisition proficiency;
  o Community-based, accredited professional development for first speakers;
  o Storytelling techniques;
  o Vocabulary reinforcement for teaching across content areas;
  o Enhancement of curriculum writing skills;
  o Assessment techniques;
  o Integration of technology into language instruction.

• Formal training in Ojibwe and Dakota language instruction does not include any requirement for learning about Ojibwe or Dakota culture.

• Professional development plans for instructors exist only in immersion instruction settings, and are dependent for their implementation on securing grants. More professional development plans and technical assistance in developing those plans -- are needed.

• Teachers responding to the Working Group’s statewide survey indicated the following teacher training resources needed to strengthen or expand Dakota or Ojibwe language instruction:
  o More mentors that are fluent speakers.
  o A First speaker (fluent) to connect with and learn from.
  o Resource people.
  o Technology - computers, specifically Macs to do movies, recordings, multimedia projects.
  o Dakota CDs.
  o Dakota Language Curriculum Specialist.
  o Systematic curriculum. Since Ojibwe is a spoken language, we have struggled to find a systematic approach to teaching the language. As the number of native speakers shrinks, it creates an unsustainable demand on them.
  o Lexicon creation for contemporary life, and for academic settings.
  o Curriculum for younger learners, more D-dialect resources, teacher training with increased language fluencies.
  o Up-to-date dictionaries for modern language, summer learning opportunities, better access to speakers and resource people, additional staff, and ***SCHOLARSHIPS.
  o Ongoing training for teachers and First Speakers in SLA and reading strategies.

• Additional barriers related specifically to licensure and the availability of fluent speakers in Minnesota classrooms are described under Directive Nine.
Directive Four
Identify classroom *curriculum needs for teaching students* in Dakota and Ojibwe languages.

**Key Findings**

- Immersion schools are challenged by a severe shortage of available integrated immersion curricula.
- Non-immersion schools are also severely challenged by a shortage of available curriculum.
- The two immersion schools, one Ojibwe and one Dakota, currently operating need the involvement of first and highly proficient speakers both for cultural content and as a language resource for teaching across all content area.
- Quality preK-12th grade immersion curricula still need to be developed to address Minnesota K-12 Academic Standards across content areas, including language arts, mathematics, science, social studies, art, and health and physical education.
- No commercial Dakota or Ojibwe immersion curricula exist. Curriculum materials that have been created by individual teachers need to be shared through the development of a clearinghouse.
- Existing curriculum materials are most often developed by individual teachers and are not widely available beyond individual instructors’ classrooms.
- Teachers responding to the Working Group’s statewide survey indicated the following curriculum needs for expanding Dakota or Ojibwe language instruction:
  - Books, cultural materials, leaning trunks, posters/media, technology materials, charts, adult/parent resources and games. Music, live demonstrations of cultural activities for students and staff.
  - Authentic artifacts for the classroom - wild ricing materials (knockers, baskets, moccasins), maple sugar materials(tap, bucket), animal puppets...hands on stuff
  - Language labs
  - Classroom Dialogues-School building & Classroom vocabulary-Content specific word lists (math, biology, etc.)
  - Support from educational department, funders, & parents so we can have more hours & days. We need more teachers. We need educational materials for elementary age students.
  - Literacy materials to support pre-readers, beginning readers, elementary and middle school level readers.
  - A variety of discourse items is necessary: from basal readers to fiction and non-fiction representations of an Ojibwean typification of written expressions.
  - Poetry and songs transcribed, contemporary expressions of music and oratory as well as historical representations of oration and dialogues.
  - Engaging literacy materials
  - More age specific material, first speakers, songs, simpler books, classroom management training.
  - Children’s book in Ojibwemowin and recorded on CDs. Content matter in Ojibwe (health, math, reading and so on).
  - Materials need to be developed for the successive developmental levels. Accurate materials for subjects (even for adults) are very rare.
  - Articulation of various discourse measures in Ojibwemowin, print examples of various discourse measures. Print materials for all subjects need to be developed for our immersion site to support academic goals.
  - All day immersion pre-k through college, a minimum of 6 hours a day 5 days a week.

For more detailed information from educators, see Appendix 2: Surveys.
Directive Five
Determine how the identified curriculum needs should be met.

Key Findings
• Meeting the curriculum needs of Dakota and Ojibwe language instruction requires a systematic, strategic approach to:
  o Quickly developing high-quality additional resources for addressing academic standards through the medium of Indigenous languages;
  o Creating avenues for the sharing of curricula by instructors around the state;
  o Expediting the creation of Dakota and Ojibwe immersion teacher preparation programs;
  o Overcoming barriers to the involvement of fluent first speakers in classrooms;
  o Stabilizing funding for immersion and world language instruction in Dakota and Ojibwe.
  o Developing a successful approach will require careful continued discussion involving tribal governments, language activists and instructors, the Department of Education and Board of Teaching.
  o Identifying and securing funding for distribution once curricula are created.
• A re-formed Volunteer Working Group of language revitalization stakeholders, empowered to create working subgroups, is required to develop a strategic approach for meeting curriculum needs.
• Continued legislative appropriation for grant support of existing language instruction programs is the only available centralized resource for keeping language instruction active, and these are the places where curriculum materials are being created.
• A repository and clearinghouse of materials are needed to support a system where available curriculum materials can be shared by teachers.
• Areas in which technical assistance from the Department of Education can facilitate meeting curriculum needs are identified under Directive Seven.
Directive Six
*Determine if there is a need for a central repository of resources, and if there is a need, where the repository should be located, how it should be structured, and who should have responsibility for maintaining the repository.*

**Key Finding:**

- A central repository of resources is a critical need for language instruction.

- This effort should include a clearing house for identifying & disseminating curricula and resources for teaching language and culture.

- Throughout the world, the creation of a repository of language materials has proven to be an integral and necessary component of language revitalization.

- The repository should hold teaching materials as well as video and audio capturing of conversational, technical and other language use in Ojibwe and Dakota. This need becomes more critical as elderly first speakers become debilitated or deceased.

- A few institutions such as colleges have begun to create repositories of language materials out of necessity. Communication among these independent efforts in the development of a state-wide language repository would benefit all participants.

- There are multiple repositories in the US, both private and public, that would consider contributing their Dakota and Ojibwe collections if Minnesota has a centralized resource clearing house and state of the art repository facility.

- Final decisions on location and structure for the repository will require further discussion, ideally by a Volunteer Working Group. Candidates for housing the repository include the Minnesota Historical Society, the Minnesota Humanities Center, tribal colleges, and tribal governments.

For further information on the parameters, structure, vision and operation of successful language material repositories developed elsewhere, compiled through research by the Volunteer Working Group, see Appendix 3: Models for Language Material Repositories.
Directive Seven
*Determine what technical assistance the state could offer to further Dakota and Ojibwe language immersion programs.*

Key Findings:
- The Volunteer Working Group has identified a number of critical areas in which the State of Minnesota, including the Department of Education, can offer and improve technical assistance to further Dakota and Ojibwe language immersion programs. Priorities for technical assistance are:
  - Increased consultation on, and interpretation of, Minnesota K-12 Academic Standards.
  - More focused technical assistance on how to create an immersion school, or expand what is currently being offered in public schools.
  - Facilitation of Dakota and Ojibwe immersion teacher preparation programs, and the expediting of approval for these programs.
  - Increased consultation on, and interpretation of academic assessments as AYP indicators: Relevant academic assessments in the language of instruction (Dakota or Ojibwe language) accepted as indicators of AYP status in order to yield more accurate and reliable information on what the student knows and can do. Assessments in the language of instruction for two to three additional years beyond the initial third grade math and reading assessments to ensure that the local education sites are producing valid and reliable information on what Ojibwe and Dakota immersion students know and can do on tests.
  - Technical assistance and financial assistance in the creation of academic content area assessments in the language of instruction.

World language standards for fluency are not now applied to Dakota and Ojibwe language, and the Department of Education can give assistance to educators in both immersion schools and second-language instruction in identifying and applying those standards in their work.

- In addition, several longer-term technical assistance efforts would enhance the presence of Dakota and Ojibwe language instruction in public schools and increase tribal/community involvement in immersion school development:
  - Facilitate meetings for American Indian communities and local schools districts – especially those with relatively high American Indian student enrollment – to encourage School District Education Authorities to promote the inclusion of Dakota and Ojibwe languages in the World Language curriculum *at a level that produces fluent speakers.*
  - Create an American Indian-member advisory group for the Department of Education that can provide a needed cultural perspective on education policy implementation.
  - Assist in the creation of more, and growth of current Dakota and Ojibwe language courses in public schools.

- As noted below under Directive Nine, the Department of Education can provide technical assistance in areas of teacher licensure and development of teacher preparation programs.

- Effective State technical assistance for Dakota and Ojibwe language revitalization can extend beyond the Department of Education. Bi-lingual and tri-lingual signage (in English, Dakota and Ojibwe) for instance, can give the revitalization effort more visibility and relevance.
Directive Eight
Identify private, state, and national financial resources available to further Dakota and Ojibwe language revitalization and preservation efforts.

Key Findings:
• One of the few sources of direct support for language revitalization efforts in Minnesota is the legislative appropriation that enabled the Volunteer Working Group to distribute $550,000 in grants to 10 language programs in 2010. In 2011, $700,000 will be granted. Grantees in 2010 included:
  o Department of Indian Studies-University of Minnesota, $90,000. Teacher training.
  o Upper Sioux Indian Community, $35,000. Language immersion activities.
  o White Earth Reservation Tribal Council, $105,536. Recording of first speakers.
  o Dakota Wicohan, $78,623. Apprentice program.
  o Prairie Island Indian Community, $15,000. Printing of materials, web page creation, teachers.
  o Rainy River Community College, $15,000. Materials, immersion activities.
  o ISD 318 American Indian Services, $23,841. Technology and curriculum assistance.
  o Concordia Language Villages, $100,000. Immersion activities.
  o Fond du Lac Tribal College, $75,000. Immersion activities.
  o Anoka Hennepin ISD #11, $12,000. Planning, curriculum development.

• Private foundations seldom venture into the realm of American Indian language revitalization. The Volunteer Working Group could identify four foundations (one regional, three national) that have grant programs specifically for this purpose. The Grotto Foundation in Minnesota stands out as an example of effective funding, having developed a 20-year plan for supporting language revitalization, and is attempting to engage other Minnesota foundations in this effort.

• The federal government provides severely restricted support for language revitalization through the Administration for Native Americans (ANA). They offer two relevant grant, one supporting language revitalization and the other language immersion. Tribes can receive support through only one of these programs per year, and educators in nearly 400 endangered American Indian languages compete for this support. This resource also focuses on tribal schools, and most American Indian students live in urban areas.

• Current funding trends for education in Minnesota indicate that, while educational institutions struggle to maintain their teacher staffing levels, it is possible that those few teachers who remain to teach Ojibwe and Dakota languages could have no budget with which to acquire or create any curriculum materials.

• It should be noted that this limited federal support – as well as tribal government support of language revitalization – takes place against a backdrop of the history of US-American Indian relations. In purchasing land from Native nations—every inch of privately and publicly owned land in the State – the US assumed, in exchange for the destruction of traditional lifeways, a legal trust obligation to provide for the education and benefit of American Indians. As noted in the introduction to this report, this obligation was met with policies intended to destroy American Indian cultures for a century, and today funding for education cuts to the heart of issues related to tribal sovereignty and the status of federal trust obligations. In the absence of federal funding, American Indian languages are racing toward extinction and their revitalization demands timely, more local solutions.
Directive Nine
Identify current state and federal law, rules, regulations, and policy that should be repealed, modified, or waived, in order to further Dakota and Ojibwe language immersion programs.

Key Findings:

• Language revitalization is crippled by a severe shortage of licensed teachers fluent in the languages and trained in immersion techniques; the supply of teachers is inadequate to meet the needs even of the few existing Dakota and Ojibwe immersion schools.

• The staffing of immersion schools requires navigation of complex licensure requirements as set forth in Minnesota Statues, Section 124D.75. The available options include:
  o teachers licensed to provide instruction in Ojibwe and Dakota as a world language (without a requirement for cultural grounding and with the development of language proficiency as a separate educational track);
  o teachers licensed to provide instruction across the curriculum at K-6 grade levels, separate from any language requirement;
  o proficient speakers working under a temporary/limited waiver of licensure available if they are enrolled in a teacher preparation program;
  o development of a visa program for teacher exchange with other states and Canada.

Strengthening and creating immersion schools will require that the state provide technical assistance to language activists in the creation of language immersion schools.

• Federal education policies on the licensure of language teachers for immersion schools are in conflict with one another. The Esther Martinez Native American Languages Preservation Act of 2006 (H. R. 4766) encourages license waivers for first and fluent speakers who play such a key role in language immersion. Such waivers are available in Minnesota as a short-term (limited opportunity for renewal) option. Title I regulations, however, require that classroom teachers hold licenses in specific grade levels or subject areas, and virtually no “first speakers” or highly proficient speakers of the Dakota and Ojibwe languages hold these licenses; given the advanced age of this population, few are likely to get licensed. This conflict causes a challenge for immersion schools who are seeking federal funding.

• Conflicting federal policies on language of instruction and of academic assessments result in Ojibwe- and Dakota-immersion students being tested for academic achievement in a language other than the language of instruction. P.L. 101-477 (Native American Languages Act 1990) encourages and supports ‘No Restrictions’ on Native American Languages use in any public proceedings, including publicly supported education programs. Assessment procedures in the public education programs should align with this policy to ensure that valid, reliable information on what the student knows and can do on tests of reading and language arts is delivered.

• Dakota members of the Working Group also identified the 1864 expulsion of Dakota people from Minnesota and subsequent abolishment of their reservations by Congress as a barrier that still needs official revocation on a federal level. The Volunteer Working Group commends the Minnesota House in passing H. R. 10, and encourages legislative support for overturning federal laws related to the 1864 expulsion of Dakota people from Minnesota.

• More information sharing is needed to engage immersion schools in the creation of teacher preparation programs and hire teachers through the Minnesota Visiting Teachers (J-1) Program. Also, an expedited approval process for immersion teacher preparation program approval is important. Approval of these desperately needed programs currently can take up to three years.
Directive Ten
Assess the level of interest in the community for Dakota and Ojibwe language immersion programs.

The importance of Dakota and Ojibwe language revitalization has been increasingly recognized in the past several decades. The adoption of Dakota and Ojibwe as official languages by Minnesota’s tribal governments and the passage of the federal Esther Martinez Native American Languages Preservation Act of 2006 (H. R. 4766) are important indicators that policy makers are making language revitalization a higher priority. This development is reflected in the 2010 Dakota and Ojibwe Language Community Survey commissioned by the Volunteer Working Group.

The Working Group conducted community forums across Minnesota at which language immersion was a primary topic of discussion. To expand on the community involvement generated in the forums, a survey was e-mailed to hundreds of potential respondents and posted on the Minnesota Indian Affairs Council website.

Surveys were completed by 454 people throughout the state including all 11 reservations, resulting in 323 responses to a question specifically related to the importance of Dakota and Ojibwe language.

Not surprisingly, the responses of community members – including teachers, parents and grandparents, today’s students, speakers of all levels of language fluency – closely mirrored the messages learned by the Volunteer Working Group through formal research and interviews with academicians and language theorists. The benefits of language fluency generated by language immersion were repeatedly stated by survey respondents: greater self esteem, stronger grounding in a specific cultural world view, a greater ability to negotiate “the two worlds we live in.”

Key Finding:
• Responses to the Community Interest survey universally spoke to the importance of teaching and learning languages.

• In addition, several questions in our state-wide School Survey indicated consistent interest in expanding Dakota and Ojibwe language instruction. Ninety four percent of school respondents answered “yes” to the question: Is your Tribal Community or School District interested in enhancing or expanding its current Dakota or Ojibwe Language program?

• The Volunteer Working Group has concluded based upon forum and survey results that statewide interest exists in immersion programming.

See Appendix 2: Surveys
Conclusion

The Volunteer Working Group on Dakota and Ojibwe Language Revitalization has been guided by a mission statement that frames the effort to preserve our languages:

“Dakota and Ojibwe are spoken and valued as vibrant, living and thriving languages throughout Minnesota.”

The Volunteer Working Group concluded its work on February 15, 2011. As a result of their work, language revitalization efforts in Minnesota can proceed with the benefit of thousands of pages of research, a clear sense of what is needed to save Dakota and Ojibwe languages, and an awareness of the obstacles and challenges to be faced in this effort.

Language revitalization will require a long-term commitment from tribal and state governments, community members, and educators. To build on the work it has completed to date, the Work Group recommends the following steps:

- The establishment of a Working Group that can build on the foundation already laid to
  - Develop a 25-year strategic plan for language revitalization
  - Build the cooperative efforts needed among Tribal governments, Indigenous communities, State agencies, and educators to create immersion schools, teacher training programs, a repository of teaching materials and other resources.
  - Recommend methods for applying world language proficiency standards to instruction in Dakota and Ojibwe; creating teaching materials in those languages for subjects across the curriculum, and addressing barriers to teacher recruitment.

- Continued appropriation of funds for grant support to programs and activities that are currently working in the field of Dakota and Ojibwe language instruction.

- The establishment of an American Indian advisory group for the Department of Education, to provide their perspectives on policies throughout the Department including ways in which languages instruction can narrow the achievement gap between American Indian students and their peers.

In support of these recommendations, the Volunteer Working Group on Dakota and Ojibwe Language Revitalization offers the following words of American Indian community members, offered in response to the state-wide Community Interest Survey question: In your opinion, what is the importance of knowing Dakota or Ojibwe language and culture in today’s modern world?

- Children need to know their culture… to be a whole person.
- The knowledge gained in learning language and culture can help shape attitudes and behavior in the future.
- The preservation of the language will guarantee the preservation of our culture, which is necessary for our children’s self esteem.
- The language teaches us everything we need to know about how to live a good, healthy life.
- I think the Ojibwe language and culture teachers maintain basic traditions, beliefs, and values that the modern world is lacking such as respecting the land, water, plants, and animals.
- Helps to walk in the two worlds we live in, with a better sense of self and respect for traditions.
- Our community values exist within the language and many lessons can be taught from it.
- The way we Dakota see the world is in our language – clothes, food, emotions, weather, expressions, history, humor, concepts; self-preservation is in our language. How is all this NOT important?
### Tribal Chairs (during the period of the Volunteer Working Group)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Tribe/Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chairman Kevin Leecy</td>
<td>Bois Forte Band</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairwoman Karen Diver</td>
<td>Fond du Lac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman Norman W. Deschampe</td>
<td>Grand Portage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman Archie LaRose</td>
<td>Leech Lake Band</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President Gabe Prescott</td>
<td>Lower Sioux Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Executive Marge Anderson</td>
<td>Mille Lacs Band of Ojibwe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President Ron Johnson (start of period)</td>
<td>Prairie Island Indian Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman Victoria Winfrey (end of period)</td>
<td>Prairie Island Indian Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman Floyd “Buck” Jourdain, Jr.</td>
<td>Red Lake Nation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman Stanley Crooks</td>
<td>Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman Kevin Jensvold</td>
<td>Upper Sioux Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairwoman Erma Vizenor</td>
<td>White Earth Nation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Tribal Appointments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Tribe/Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Merlin Williams, Co-Chair</td>
<td>White Earth Band</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne Wells, Co-Chair</td>
<td>Prairie Island Indian Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorna LaGue, Secretary</td>
<td>White Earth Band</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Chosa</td>
<td>Bois Forte Band</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Shabiash</td>
<td>Fond du Lac Band, Reservation Tribal Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veronica Smith</td>
<td>Fond du Lac Band</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Morrin</td>
<td>Grand Portage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Swanson</td>
<td>Grand Portage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Lindstrom</td>
<td>Leech Lake (Superintendent, Bug-O-Nay-Ge-Shig School)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie Harper</td>
<td>Leech Lake / Niigaane Immersion School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Geshick</td>
<td>Lower Sioux Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace Goldtooth</td>
<td>Lower Sioux Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syngen Kanassetega</td>
<td>Mille Lacs Band of Ojibwe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leah Owen</td>
<td>Prairie Island Indian Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eileen Stand</td>
<td>Red Lake Nation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonard Wabasha</td>
<td>Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audrey Fuller</td>
<td>Upper Sioux Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan LaVoy</td>
<td>White Earth Nation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Representatives from Legislatively Mandated Organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Karen Balmer</td>
<td>Board of Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice Seagren, Commissioner</td>
<td>Minnesota Department of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Garay-Heelan</td>
<td>Minnesota Department of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janice Kittok</td>
<td>Minnesota Department of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Metson, Commissioner</td>
<td>Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Gerhardsen</td>
<td>Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travis Zimmerman</td>
<td>Minnesota Historical Society</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Appointed by Work Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shannon Bad Warrior</td>
<td>Saint Paul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Bendickson</td>
<td>Wicoie Nandagikendan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Bendickson</td>
<td>University of Minnesota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope Flanagan</td>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Denman-Wilke</td>
<td>St. Paul Public Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Henry Flocken</td>
<td>Bemidji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Rick Gresczyk</td>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Isham</td>
<td>Minnesota State Colleges and Universities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaVon Lee</td>
<td>Grotto Foundation and Saint Paul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naidi Medicine Crow</td>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Meuers</td>
<td>Bemidji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Morrison</td>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mindy Myers</td>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lillian Rice</td>
<td>Wicoie Nandagikendan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherry Sanchez-Tibbetts</td>
<td>Duluth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patty Shepard</td>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Spears</td>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All meetings were open to the public and the Volunteer Working Group Members acknowledge the following community members for their participation, thoughtful comments and feedback.

- Billie Annette, MCT Tribal Nations Education
- Ben Bongo, Red Lake Nation
- Margaret Boyer, DOLRA
- Anita Gates, DOLRA
- Dallas Goldtooth, Lower Sioux Community
- Deanna Lasley, Red Lake Nation
- Chris Leith, Prairie Island Indian Community
- Laurie May, Red Lake Nation
- Leonarad McDougall, White Earth
- Jerry Ojibway, Fond du Lac
- John Poupart, American Indian Policy Center
- Frances Miller, Red Lake Nation
- Collins Oakgrove, Red Lake Nation
- Terry Tibbetts, White Earth Tribal Council
- Robert Tibbetts, White Earth Band
- Dr. Anton Treuer, Bemidji State University
- Miguel Vargas, University of Minnesota

**Staff support from the Minnesota Indian Affairs Council**
Appendix 2: Survey Results

1. The Statewide Dakota & Ojibwe Language Revitalization MN School Questionnaire

114 contacts statewide, contacted between March 10, 2010 and May 30, 2010, including:
- PreK-12 Public Schools
- Charter Schools
- Tribal Colleges
- Private and Public Universities
- First Speakers.
- Tribal Contract Schools
- Immersion Schools
- Community Colleges
- Community Language Tables

74 completed feedback forms were returned between April 18, 2010 and June 7, 2010

2. Statewide Dakota & Ojibwe Community Language Questionnaire

453 feedback forms submitted by community members, June 1, 2010 to July 29, 2010

NOTES:

Survey results are based on completed surveys only.

Individual responses presented among the results are often representative samples. All questionnaire results are available by contacting the Minnesota Indian Affairs Council.
Dakota & Ojibwe Language Revitalization MN School Questionnaire

RESULTS

Is your Tribal Community or School District interested in enhancing or expanding its current Dakota or Ojibwe Language program?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>96%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of those who answered “Yes” a series of selections for expansion were offered, and they could select as many as applied to their Dakota and Ojibwe language efforts.

**Language Expansion Responses**

![Bar chart showing the distribution of responses for language expansion options.]

**What is the goal of your language program?**

Teach basic Dakota or Ojibwe language, words and phrases 62%

Create speakers in the Dakota or Ojibwe language 38%

Those who responded to “Create Speakers” indicated in their comments they currently only have the capacity to teach basic words and phrases,

**Number of hours spent teaching language.**

The majority of schools who responded offer instruction outside of the Immersion PreK-5 schools in the state, the average spent on actual language is thirty minutes per day, with most schools offering language as an elective in a daily, once a week, once a month or semester course.

NOTE: “Thirty minutes per day” may include language or cultural “exposure” activities that do not create fluent speakers.
What types of additional curriculum, educational materials, resources or support systems do you need to strengthen and expand Dakota or Ojibwe language instruction at your education site?

Comments shared from respondents:
- Teacher training
- More teachers, speakers that work with immersion staff to build more fluency
- More money for programs
- Resource people
- Support from education department, funders, and parents so we can have more hours and days.
- We need educational materials for Elementary age students.
- Literacy materials to support pre-readers, beginning, elementary, middle school level readers.
- A variety of discourse items is necessary: from basal readers to fiction and non-fiction representations of an Ojibwean/Dakotan typification of written expressions.
- Poetry and songs transcribed, contemporary expressions of music and oratory as well as historical representations of oration and dialogues.
- Engaging literacy materials.
- Lexicon creation for contemporary life, and for academic settings.
- Dakota Language Curriculum Specialist
- Books, cultural materials/tools, learning trunks, posters/media, technology materials, charts, adult/parent resources and games. Music, live demonstrations of cultural activities (tanning, parching rice) for students and staff.
- More mentors that are fluent speakers
- Systematic curriculum. Since Dakota and Ojibwe is a spoken language, we have struggled to find a systematic approach to teaching the language. As the number of native speakers shrinks, it creates an unsustainable demand on them.
- Language labs
- More technology - computers to do movies, recordings, multimedia projects, smart board, etc.
- More language for teaching different areas/subjects

What types of programs would you like to see developed that would create Dakota or Ojibwe speakers?

[Bar chart showing program preferences]
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What curriculum or educational materials are currently used to teach Dakota or Ojibwe language at your education site?

**Dakota**
- University of Minnesota Dakota Language Textbook (Flute and Schommer)
- 550 Dakota Verbs (LaFontaine and McKay)
- New Lakota Dictionary (Lakota Language Consortium)
- A Dakota-English Dictionary (Riggs)
- An English-Dakota Dictionary (Williamson)
- Dakota Grammar (Riggs)
- Dakota Language Interactive Course website
- Dakota Online Dictionary
- St. Paul Public Schools/Dakota Classroom Curriculum (to be introduced in fall 2010)
- Dakota-net listservs

**Ojibwe**
- Concise Dictionary of Minnesota Ojibwe
- Talking Gookom's Language
- White Earth Curriculum
- Our Ojibwe Grammar
- Ojibwe Word Lists by Rick Gresczyk CD's
- Traveling with Ojibwe
- Ojibwe Language Syllable and Consonant Charts
- Oshkaabewis Journal
- Ojibwemowin Series 1 & 2
- Apanimowinaynence - Sound & Vocabulary
- Every Day Ojibwe-Gresczyk
- Daga Anishinabemodaa (Jones)
- Pimsleur Speak and Understand Essential Ojibwe
- Mishomis Book (Benton-Benai)
- A Concise Dictionary of Minnesota Ojibwe
- Ojibwe-net listservs

Currently there are no commercial Dakota or Ojibwe immersion *curricula* available. The commercially produced resources (books, etc.) would not support an immersion program; only supplement it on a limited level. The materials researched would best suit a public school setting that delivers Dakota and Ojibwe language as a foreign language subject.

Of the schools that responded to the Statewide School Survey, approximately 95% have created their own language materials. The following represents the types of materials created to teach language:

- Videos in the language
- CDs in the language
- Computerized/interactive language lessons
- Interactive Television (ITV) Ojibwemowin Classes to other school districts is available.

Materials created in the language included:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Math</th>
<th>Biology</th>
<th>Health</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>Language Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astronomy</td>
<td>Native Crafts</td>
<td>Earth Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maple Sugaring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NOTE: These materials have been generated by individual teachers, often working in isolation from one another, to meet the immediate demands of daily lesson plans.*
Types of additional curriculum, educational materials, resources or support systems teachers indicated they needed to strengthen and expand Dakota or Ojibwe language instruction at their education site:

- More mentors that are fluent speakers
- A First speaker (fluent) to connect with and learn from
- Resource people
- Technology - computers, specifically macs to do movies, recordings, multimedia projects
- Books, cultural materials/tools, leaning trunks, posters/media, technology materials, charts, adult/parent resources and games. Music, live demonstrations of cultural activities (tanning, parching rice) for students and staff.
- Dakota CDs
- Authentic artifacts for the classroom - wild ricing materials(knockers, baskets, moccasins), maple sugar materials(tap, bucket), animal puppets...hands on stuff
- Classroom Dialogues-School building & Classroom vocabulary-Content specific word lists (math, biology, etc.)
- Support from educational department, funders, & parents so we can have more hours & days. We need more teachers. We need educational materials for elementary age students.
- Literary materials to support pre-readers, beginning readers, elementary and middle school level readers.
- A variety of discourse items is necessary: from basal readers to fiction and non-fiction representations of an Ojibwean typification of written expressions.
- Poetry and songs transcribed, contemporary expressions of music and oratory as well as historical representations of oration and dialogues.
- Engaging literacy materials
- Dakota Language Curriculum Specialist.
- Systematic curriculum. Since Ojibwe is a spoken language, we have struggled to find a systematic approach to teaching the language. As the number of native speakers shrinks, it creates an unsustainable demand on them.
- Lexicon creation for contemporary life, and for academic settings.
- Language labs
- Curriculum for younger learners, more D-dialect resources, teacher training with increased language fluencies.
- Up-to-date dictionaries for modern language, summer learning opportunities, better access to speakers and resource people, additional staff, and ***SCHOLARSHIPS*** for students who want to learn Dakota or Ojibwe!!
- More age specific material, first speakers, songs, simpler books, classroom management training.
- Children’s book in Ojibwemowin and recorded on CDs. Content matter in Ojibwe (health, math, reading and so on).
- Materials need to be developed for the successive developmental levels. Accurate materials for subjects (even for adults) are very rare.
- Articulation of various discourse measures in Ojibwemowin, print examples of various discourse measures, ongoing training for teachers and First Speakers in SLA and reading strategies. Print materials for all subjects need to be developed for our immersion site to support academic goals.
- All day immersion pre-k through college, a minimum of 6 hours a day 5 days a week.

Types of programs teachers would like to see developed that would create Dakota or Ojibwe speakers (by highest ranking):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Immersion Camps</th>
<th>Access to First Speakers of Dakota and Ojibwe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Training Programs</td>
<td>Mentor-Apprentice Language Immersion Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immersion Schools</td>
<td>Immersion Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Language Nests</td>
<td>Electronic Language Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Nests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please select the number of Dakota or Ojibwe Language Acquisition training hours the language teachers at your education site have?
(This can include a combination of college credit, self-directed study, mentor-apprentice training, language tables, etc.)

Please select the type(s) of certifications or credentials currently held by each Dakota or Ojibwe teacher at your education site:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Certification</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eminence Credential</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Expert Waiver</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Physical Response (TPR)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dakota Teaching Certificate</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARLA Immersion Certificate</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accelerated 2nd Language Acquisition</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN State Teacher License/Credentials</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you have a Professional Development Plan for teachers of Dakota or Ojibwe language at your education site?

YES 10.5%  NO 89.5%

Please note those who indicated having a Professional Development Plan for their language teachers were the immersion schools, and many of their activities and in-service training are reliant on securing grants.

- There are no training tracks of professional development tracks that address Indigenous language education.
- There are no unified Second Language Acquisition (SLA) standards and fluency requirements established for Dakota and Ojibwe language teachers.

Do you have established language proficiency standards and testing measurements in place at your Dakota or Ojibwe educational site?

YES 11.1%  NO 88.9%

- There are no standardized curricula for Dakota and Ojibwe immersion or non-immersion language instruction.
- There are no PreK-12 Scope and Sequence standards established for Dakota and Ojibwe Language.
- There is a need to develop standardized curricula for both the immersion and non-immersion setting.

Have you encountered state or federal laws/policies that have or hinder creating Dakota or Ojibwe Language Immersion programs and schools in your community?

Comments shared by respondents:

- Minnesota Teachers Union
- Teachers are required to hold a Minnesota State teaching license with a subject specialty in order to comply with the No Child Left Behind Act. However, these folks are not proficient in Indigenous languages.
- At Indigenous immersion schools all subjects are taught in the language. People who are proficient in the language and child development ideas as well as empowering, liberating ideas of pedagogy and delivery - do not hold the Minnesota Teacher College Teaching License, and are deemed 'unqualified' to teach children.
- The burden of being charged with having a Minnesota State licensed English Language Education teacher, and with Middle School Teacher licenses - and although they cannot speak, write, or even understand language, schools are required to have a person on site with this license - in effect, immersion programs are struggling and must find funding to cover this person's salary, when this licensed person has no duties at the work site to which they can contribute! This is demoralizing for all parties, and a waste of resources.
- State requirements for teacher licensure keep first speakers out of the classroom.
STATEWIDE DAKOTA & OJIBWE COMMUNITY LANGUAGE QUESTIONNAIRE

RESPONSE CHART 1: INTEREST IN LANGUAGE
Survey Statements:
- Immersion is the best way to ensure the survival & revitalization of Dakota and Ojibwe language.
- I am interested in my children attending a Dakota or Ojibwe language immersion program or school.
- I am interested in participating in a Dakota or Ojibwe language immersion program.
- The Dakota and Ojibwe languages are worth saving.
- Preservation of Dakota and Ojibwe languages is an unrealistic idea.

RESPONSE CHART 2: LEADERSHIP
Survey Statements:
- It is important for Tribal Leadership to make Dakota or Ojibwe language a priority through strong Official Proclamations.
- It is important for Tribal Leadership to officially adopt either Dakota or Ojibwe Language as the "Official Language" of their Nation.
- It is important that the State of Minnesota officially recognize Dakota and Ojibwe language as the first languages of the State of Minnesota.
- Official State and Federal support are needed to keep Dakota or Ojibwe language alive.
- Current State and Federal law, rules, regulations, and policy must be repealed, modified, waived or created in order to further Dakota and Ojibwe language immersion schools and programs.

Would you support a unified, statewide long range plan to revitalize Dakota and Ojibwe language?
YES NO
96.8% 3.2%
Appendix 3: Models for Language Materials Repositories

In addressing the issue of developing a repository for language revitalization materials, the Volunteer Work Group examined the following resources:

- Community Protocols for Indigenous Language Projects, Federation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Languages (2004)

The results of this examination are reflected in the Report. As an example of material contained in these resources, the Working Group offers the following excerpt from: Aboriginal Archives Guide. Association of Canadian Archivists Public Awareness Committee, 2007. Please note that spelling and nomenclature refer to practices in Canada.

Steps to Establishing an Archival Programme

Creation of an Archives Committee, which should

- include representatives from band council, community groups, and businesses;
- be given a clear mandate to develop an archival programme;
- call an open community meeting to discuss the idea and solicit support.

Development of a mission statement and mandate, which should outline

- the purpose and goals of the archives, and;
- the specific plan regarding the type of material the archives will acquire and under what conditions the archives will accept material.

Approval and endorsement of the archives policy,

- first by the community council, who would then;
- present the mission statement, mandate and policy documents to the community at large, to illustrate council's support for the archives and encourage community participation and support.

Completion of an archival survey under the authority of the Archives Committee, which should

- provide a simple overview of the nature (oral and written), extent, and condition of the records found in the community;
- indicate the potential extent of the archives' holdings, and allow the archivist to plan for the future;
- ideally, be carried out by a professional archivist who can, with the assistance of community volunteers, assess the enduring historical value of the records;
- be recorded in a report submitted to the community council, for use in future planning.
Development of a proposal for an archival programme, which should
• incorporate the results of the inventory into a proposal to manage the records under a common
  programme;
• outline staffing requirements: who should work in the archives (paid employees or volunteers),
  what will they do, and how will they be paid;
• outline facility needs and supplies to operate a programme;
• investigate alternative funding sources, depending on whether or not the community council can
  and will ensure on-going funding on an annual basis.

Creation of a central facility for the records, which should
• provide a secure area with adequate temperature, humidity and lighting controls;
• include areas for records processing, storage, staff, and research;
• have space for the future growth of record holdings;
• consider co-operation with an existing Aboriginal cultural centre that may already have library
  and/or museum components sharing overhead expenses.

Ongoing activities of the Archivist and/or staff include
• Acquiring appropriate material and actively gathering records from the community - whether as a
donation from a person or an organization in the community, or transfer from the council
• enlisting the community council's support to encourage community members to place their
important records - including maps, photographs, videos, sound recordings, scrapbooks, diaries,
and correspondence in the archives for long-term preservation;
• appraising all potential acquisitions to determine whether the material meets the criteria
  established in the mandate statement and is of permanent historical value and relevant to the
  community.
• Gaining legal control over archival holdings and documenting the archives' ownership of records,
  through completing a Deed of Gift form for all donations to transfer ownership of records from the
  donor to the archives.
• Gaining intellectual control over archival holdings, knowing what material is in the archives, and
  where it came from, through
  o recording key information about each "accession" of material, assigning each acquisition a
    unique Accession number for identification and control purposes;
  o creating an Accession Record as the primary source of information about what is in the
    accession, where it is stored, who donated it and when.
• Gaining physical control over archival holdings, storing them properly, and securing them against
  theft, damage, and environmental or human hazards, through
  o organizing the contents of each Accession following the principles of provenance, original
    order, and levels of arrangement (series, file, item);
  o placing the organized material in containers suitable for each type of material;
  o marking all storage containers with the Accession number and a box number;
  o once everything is organized, filed, labeled and boxed, shelving the containers in appropriate
    storage areas, according to a consecutive numbering system that puts each new accession in
    next vacant space on the shelf.
• Making archival materials available for use by the creators, donors, and the general public, by
  o creating archival descriptions and listings of the material;
  o entering this information into a database, if possible, or a paper-based finding aid system;
  o providing reference services to the band council, members of the community, and the general
    public.
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