HASKELL INDIAN NATIONS UNIVERSITY AND THE UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS AMERICAN INDIAN SCIENCE/TECHNOLOGY/ENGINEERING/MATHEMATICS (STEM) GRANT PROGRAMS PARTNERSHIP

A Dissertation

presented to

the Faculty of the Graduate School

at the University of Missouri-Columbia

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

---

by

PABLO BUENO MENDOZA

Dr. Peggy Placier, Dissertation Supervisor

JULY 2012

The undersigned, appointed by the dean of the Graduate School, have examined the

dissertation entitled

HASKELL INDIAN NATIONS UNIVERSITY AND THE UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS AMERICAN INDIAN SCIENCE/TECHNOLOGY/ENGINEERING/MATHEMATICS (STEM) GRANT PROGRAMS PARTNERSHIP

presented by Pablo Bueno Mendoza,

a candidate for the degree of doctor of philosophy,

and hereby certify that, in their opinion, it is worth of acceptance.

_____

Dr. Peggy Placier, Advisor
Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Analyss

_____

Dr. Joseph Donaldson
Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis

_____

Dr. Jeni Hart
Department of Educational Leadership & Policy Analysis

_____

Dr. Karen Cockrell
Department of Educational Leadership & Policy Analysis

_____

Dr. Clarence Lo
Department of Sociology

Dedication

This dissertation is dedicated to my life partner, Brenda Ann Stalcup. She is always there with me through the good and bad times. With her strong skills with the English language, she accepted me as the toughest rhetoric student she has ever had. I am eternally indebted to you.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This dissertation is not the work of a single person collecting data and writing about the experience. This work is a collective result of the guidance of my advisor and my committee members, training from mentors, assistance from my research sponsors, inspiration from students, encouragement of colleagues, and support from my family and life partner.

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my advisor, Dr. Peggy Placier, for her excellent guidance and patience and for providing me with the sociological tools to perform this research. I would like to thank Dr. Karen Cockrell for her guidance on how to be appropriate in working with the American Indian populations from whom I was fortunate to collect data in the field. I would also like to thank Dr. Jeni Hart, Dr. Joseph Donaldson, Dr. Vicki Rosser, and Dr. Peter Hall for guiding my research for the past several years and helping me to develop my background in higher education policy research. Special thanks goes to Dr. Clarence Lo, who was willing to participate in my final defense committee at the last moment.

I would like to thank those who mentored me in my research internship: Dr. Karen Cockrell, Dr. Cornel Pewewardy, and Dr. Nocona Pewewardy, whose guidance on working with American Indian students gave me the spark for my dissertation topic. Many thanks to Dr. Venida Chenault of Haskell Indian Nations University and Dr. Ray Pierottie of the University of Kansas, who served as my research sponsors for the institutional review boards of their respective campuses.

The inspiration for this work has grown from my interaction with American Indian and

Chicano college students over the years. I want to thank in particular Javier Avitia, whose efforts with University of California-Davis and Deganawidah-Quetzlcoatl University showed me for the first time the intersection between American Indian and Chicano advocacy. Special thanks also to former members of From the Four Directions at the University of Missouri, whose advocacy for American Indian rights on campus opened eyes: Dr. Jenny Tone-Pah-Hote, Dr. Charlotte McCloskey, Linda Russell, Thomas "Ed" Smith, and Travis Willingham, Esq.

The encouragement of many colleagues helped me immeasurably in the completion of this work. From the MU community: Dr. Cathy Scroggs, Dr. Roger Worthington, Laura Hacquard, Dr. Kirsten Upcraft-Kennedy, Kim Dude, Nathan Stephens, Joyce Jesse, Noor Azizan-Gardner, Noel English, Sang S. Kim, Melissa Fayad, Sue Yun, Soo Ihm, Kerry Hollander, Dr. Linda Blockus, Dr. Robin Walker, Dr. Donna Pavlick, Dr. Sandy Matsuda, Dr. Wendi Rogers, Dr. Gladys Swan, Dale Langford, Julie Barry, Brad Marsh, and Charles Baerwald. From the Asian American higher education field: Dr. Connie Rose Tingson-Gatuz, Dr. Daniello Balon, Lisa Mansueto, Corinne Maekawa-Kodama, Rey Guerrero, and Windi Sasaki. Much gratitude to June Clevy at the University of Idaho and Madeleine Pilar Ferbal.

I would also like to thank my family. My parents, Dr. Pablo Jimenez Mendoza and Maria Benilda Bueno Mendoza, and my sister, Dr. Maria Corazon Bueno Mendoza, have always supported and encouraged me. My aunts, Manuela Flores Bueno and the late Josefa Flores Bueno, helped my parents raise me and always had faith in my abilities. Finally, I want to thank my extended family, Donald Soule Stalcup, Ann Ussery Stalcup, and the late Ruthie Soule, who have graciously accepted me as part of their family over the last two decades.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1

Introduction

Institutional partnerships between minority-serving higher education institutions (MSI) and predominantly White institutions (PWI) have been examined for several decades. This examination has primarily focused on the relations between historically Black colleges and universities (HBCU) and White institutions, both private and public. The relationship between a tribal college/university (TCU) and a predominantly White institution has received some attention but not to the degree that relationships between HBCUs and PWIs have received. This study will be an examination of Haskell Indian Nations University (Haskell), which falls under the umbrella of a tribal university for the purpose of this study, and the University of Kansas (KU), a state public research institution. This study will examine how the partnership between the two institutions functions and how the difference of their missions establishes the boundaries and behaviors for collaboration in the science/technology/engineering/mathematics (STEM) fields. The relationship will be examined through the eyes of administrators and faculty on both campuses as expressed through on-site interviews.

Haskell Indian Nations University and the University of Kansas

During the last two decades, Haskell and KU have developed partnerships around different curricular areas. A strong example of this relationship is the development of STEM programs between the two institutions, based upon federal grant funding. Perceptions of the programs at each institution cannot be fully comprehended without examining the history of the two institutions, which co-exist in the same city but until recent years rarely interacted. This chapter briefly summarizes this history; Chapter 4 will provide more depth.

A Brief Historical Overview. Originally Haskell was an American Indian boarding school that offered primary, secondary, and vocational education (Vuckovic, 2008). The school fell under the oversight of the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA). Eventually, Haskell shifted its curricular focus to higher education while maintaining its status as a BIA operation. Haskell's mission shift mirrored changes in national policies concerning American Indians. KU was initially founded to provide higher education to the White population of the state of Kansas, although the university gradually desegregated over time. Currently, KU is classed under the Carnegie classifications as a research university with very high research activity (RU/VH) (University of Kansas, 2008). The university offers undergraduate and graduate degrees in a wide variety of disciplines.

The Relationship between KU and Haskell. These two institutions are dissimilar in their respective missions, history, government sponsorship, size, resources, and the general populations served. Partnering across these differences is bound to be complex. One key to their partnership is the simple fact of geographical proximity: Both schools are situated in the medium-sized town of Lawrence, approximately 30 miles away from Kansas City, the nearest large metropolitan area. Perhaps more essential is the historical evolution both institutions have experienced. In recent years, Haskell has become functionally equivalent to the small regional universities of the Midwest, the main difference being the ethnic makeup of its student population (American Indian Higher Education Consortium, 2008). KU has evolved into the flagship research institution of the state of Kansas, similar to such institutions as the University of Illinois or the University of Missouri. Both institutions have recognized that they could benefit each other by developing cooperative curricular relations. Haskell is unlikely to be able to offer high-cost programs in the STEM disciplines to its

students, while KU, like most PWIs, has difficulty recruiting American Indian students. Because of their strongly dissimilar missions—Haskell strives to preserve American Indian culture, while KU is an example of a university committed to research that serves the state's developmental goals —the formal relationship between these two institutions could be considered unique.

Minorities in the STEM Fields

This study also takes place in the context of a national interest in recruitment and retention of minorities and women in the STEM fields (from K–12 pipeline initiatives to college graduation to career success). This initiative has mostly focused on the African American and Hispanic American populations (Lam, Doverspike, & Mawasha, 1997; Wechsler et al., 2005). In recent years, however, more attention is being paid to American Indian participation in the STEM fields. The American Indian Science and Engineering Society (AISES), formed in 1978, has helped the tribal colleges and RU/VH institutions to pipeline American Indian students into the STEM fields through programs that aid institutions in understanding the needs of American Indian students (Thomas, 2008).

In the case of the Haskell–KU STEM programs, recruitment of American Indian students is facilitated through the federal-funded partnership between the institutions. However, student retention in STEM might still be an issue. The literature tends to generalize student retention as an interaction between individual and institution. In contrast to other retention literature, research into American Indian retention often examines the disparities in treatment based upon cultural differences and obstacles that traditional educational systems unknowingly erect. Traditional academic structures do not sufficiently address the needs of American Indians within research university settings (Taylor, 2001). Student services do not

account for cultural communication difficulties, nor do faculty understand intercultural communication issues when these occur.

Research into the role of tribal colleges in the retention of American Indian students suggests that cultural preservation and identity development efforts increase the probability for completion (Ness, 2002). The presence of services that provide a safe space for American Indian students, faculty who understand their cultural communication styles, and institutional assistance to help students walk in "two worlds" (i.e., to navigate the academic world while maintaining cultural identity) greatly assist tribal college students in completing their degrees.

Literature with regard to ethnic minorities in the STEM fields identifies a number of barriers for retention at the collegiate level: inadequate precollegiate education, institutional programmatic requirements such as GPA, and poor environmental support networks. These general barriers seem to affect most of the ethnic minority populations in profound ways that can lead to stopping out of college by the individual student (Wilson, 2000). For example, one recent case study examines African American women working toward STEM careers at Spelman College, a historically Black women's college (Perna et al., 2009). This case study examines Spelman’s efforts to establish support systems that help the students successfully complete STEM coursework. The barriers identified by Wilson, particularly inadequate precollegiate education and poor environmental support networks, were addressed by the Spelman faculty through mentoring relationships established between the students and research faculty and through support tutoring in subject fields to develop strong content knowledge.

Statement of the Problem

The history of American Indian education indicates that the best interest of the American Indian student is seldom the central focus of the general curriculum in either K–12 public schooling or higher education. For most of the history of American Indian education, the primary foci have been on deculturalization of indigenous students and the development of labor skills for the benefit of the colonizing population (Adams, 1995). It is only in recent decades that this curricular focus began to change. American Indian education has moved from a tool for assimilation and cultural destruction to a tool for empowerment (Boyer, 1997).

Given this history, the partnership between indigenous institutions and PWIs is a reflection of the relationship between indigenous peoples and the colonizers. The interaction between the two types of institutions can explain a great deal about the current societal relationship between the two populations (Barden, 2003). The tenor of the relationship can either suggest that the former colonial perspective about American Indian education still persists (American Indian participants are expected to forget their cultural heritage and accept wholesale assimilation into both the discipline and the dominant culture) or that there is now a collegial arrangement between the two institutions to train the American Indian student in the disciplinary requirements while simultaneously making an effort to preserve the student's culture. If the research indicates that the latter condition has arisen, this would suggest that the problematic relationship between the two cultures has been ameliorated to some extent.

Because there is a lack of literature on collaboration between various MSIs and PWIs, there is a need to examine collaborative relationships that have formed over the last few

decades. The examination of the Haskell and KU partnership can help explain the evolution of curriculum that seeks to empower rather than deculturalize and assimilate the American Indian student population.

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study is to examine how the current formal institutional relationship between Haskell and Kansas in the STEM fields was developed, what the collaboration was intended to accomplish, and how the administration and faculty operate within the relationship. The aspects of the partnership to be analyzed include formal agreements, the level to which the two institutions' administrations implement cooperative programs, the degree of faculty collaboration, and the degree to which both administrators and faculty preserve the American Indian mission focus within the relationship.

Research Paradigm

Due to the nature of the institutional relationship in this study, two theoretical frameworks will be used. The first theory will be institutional theory, in which the formalized structures that have been established between the two universities will be examined. In the examination of the structures, institutional theory explains how the actors (administrators and faculty) make meaning of the relationship and elucidates how they communicate. Institutional theory also provides insight into how universities are affected by outside organizations, such as federal agencies, academic disciplines, and educational accreditation boards. In a sense, institutional theory explains how participants develop an organizational culture.

To supplement the institutional theory analysis, tribal critical race theory will be employed to examine the language the administrators and faculty use respecting both the

mission of Haskell and the students they serve. The analysis of the language that they use to describe how they perceive Haskell's curriculum efforts will be helpful in determining if there is any sense of discriminatory attitudes or behavior still present within the relationship.

Institutional Theory

Institutional theory explains how organizations operate and construct their philosophies. A brief examination of institutional theory and some research on how community colleges' missions are evolving will be briefly described in this section. At the end of this examination, the relationship between Haskell and KU will be analyzed using this lens.

In Meyer and Rowan's "Institutionalized Organizations: Formal Structure as Myth and Ceremony" (1977), the concept of rational institutional myths is presented. According to this work, institutions respond to environmental factors, changing their language to reflect the goals that they wish to achieve. Another aspect of formal structure change is compliance with assessment from outside agents and developing a sense of legitimacy. Kezar and Eckel (2002) argue that to fully understand change within institutions, it is necessary to use Bergquist's cultural archetypes to explain collegial and managerial culture, in conjunction with Tierney's individual/institutional culture models. Kezar and Eckel's model is comprised of the following five strategies: senior administrative support, collaborative leadership, robust design, staff development, and visible actions. By examining these five strategies, it is possible to see how formal and informal structures develop to respond to environmental factors.

Neo-institutional theory as explained by Donaldson and Petersen (2007) provides a basis for understanding how organizations develop and evolve their structures. They argue

that mechanisms and carriers are how organizations frame internal meaning, wherein values or behaviors can be explained as coercive, mimetic, and normative. Values that are coercive respond to outside influences that structure internal functioning. Mimetic behaviors are attempts to replicate perceived ideal models. Normative values are developed in response to the perception of what a profession considers appropriate. The authors describe field logics as how participants make sense of the work they perform. According to the authors, the concept of field logics contains content, penetration, linkage, and exclusiveness. Through neo-institutional theory, it is possible to understand how organizations present themselves and their missions, how organizations develop leadership hierarchies and peer-to-peer relations, and how a certain operational construct determines organizational priorities. The final component of this theory is how sources of influence affect organizational actors' behavior and beliefs—in this case, how environmental factors such as disciplines or outside agencies influence the development of structures.

Morphew's work "*A Rose by Any Other Name": Which Colleges Became Universities* (2002) provides a way of looking at how college missions evolve in the process of becoming universities. Morphew suggests that many institutions of higher education transform from colleges to universities due both to changes in their student body and alterations in the political and societal environment. Morphew further examines how these transformations can be successes or failures depending on how the students, faculty, and political environment perceive the outcomes.

One move that institutions may make in the process of their development is to partner with other institutions. In Donaldson and Kozoll's *Collaborative Program Planning* (1999), the authors introduce the theoretical foundations for collaboration. In this introduction, they

explain five concepts for the maintenance of collaborations: continuum of relations, collaborative relationships are organizations themselves, leadership as a critical variable, developmental stages of relationships, and tensions and balances. Using their five concepts, it is possible to see how the actors within a collaborative relationship develop their interaction and systems to facilitate evolution over time. Institutional theory would predict that collaborations between institutions with different myths, values, and structures would be complex.

According to Townsend and Wilson's "The Transfer Mission: Tried and True, but Troubled?" (2006), community colleges have increasingly sought to partner with four-year institutions to improve their course offerings. These efforts often shore up previously identified deficiencies in the community college. In Townsend's "The Outlook for Transfer Programs and the Direction of the Community College" (2009), the growth of a concept called the community college baccalaureate reveals the evolving importance of community colleges in creating specialized baccalaureate degrees. Of primary interest for this work is the development of applied baccalaureate degrees, in which areas of study that have practical application are offered to students. Because of the increased emphasis on the applied baccalaureate, community colleges have changed instruction from vocational educational models to a college focus on a discipline (e.g., moving from an automotive maintenance vocational program to an mechanical engineering degree that may include an automotive focus). Another evolutionary strain that has been developing in community colleges is the role of research. Townsend and Rosser's "The Extent and Nature of Scholarly Activities among Community College Faculty" (2009) examines how institutional leaders at

community colleges are increasingly encouraging faculty research both to improve teaching in the classroom and to develop a sense of institutional prestige.

To effectively research how the formal relations between a TCU and a PWI assist American Indian students toward graduation, it will be necessary to employ research methods that will provide an intimate understanding of how students, faculty, and staff observe and experience the institutional mechanisms employed to facilitate the relationship.

Tribal Critical Race Theory

To understand the partnership between Haskell and KU, something more than institutional theory is required. The distinguishing factor of tribal critical race theory from other forms of culturally focused race theory is the incorporation of the colonial experience. Though all forms of critical theory are complex, tribal critical race theory's incorporation of colonial oppression dynamics adds a dimension that does not exist in other forms (Brayboy, 2006).

Tribal critical race theory deconstructs majority population notions of what it means to be American Indian and sheds light on the ways in which such preconceptions can adversely influence academic study of native populations. For example, in his essay "Comfortable Fictions and the Struggle for Turf," DeLoria (2006) contends that most study of American Indians by non-indigenous writers incorporates cultural prejudices that essentially serve to oppress the studied population. Value judgments about native individuals and tribal groups are carried into majority writers' analytical assessments of the studied populations' behavior. Such behavioral analyses essentially reinforce cultural stereotypes of the majority population. In this study, DeLoria's insights will be applied not to the

relationship between academic researchers and their research "subjects," but to the relationship between two institutions that have parallel differences in identity.

Tribal critical race theory incorporates a research approach that Smith (1999) calls decolonizing methodologies. As DeLoria notes above, the voice of indigenous populations is generally excluded in research performed by non-natives. Smith argues that for any research on indigenous populations to be valid, the researchers have to decolonize their thinking about the subject being studied. Decolonization is a multistep process similar to deconstruction. The foundational piece is for researchers to acknowledge that previous ways of research were grounded in Western modes of thought. If the Western-centric thought is acknowledged, researchers can begin the process of becoming more indigenous-accountable in their approach to the subject. This means increasing individual understanding of indigenous perceptions of the topic at hand. Case in point: Where a Western-centric researcher may unknowingly stress the importance in a study of the development of specific skill sets that are White culturally normative, scholars who have decolonized their thinking will question how the development of such Western-centric skill sets impact the indigenous individual's own personal development with regard to cultural identity preservation.

Tribal critical race theory is the most appropriate research paradigm to analyze how a relationship between a TCU and a PWI benefits American Indian students. This paradigm allows the researcher to account for the motivation that traditional higher education has used in reference to all minorities in general and American Indian populations in particular. Its use helps the researcher understand how the traditional structures within which American Indian education has been framed have changed during this time of increased recognition of tribal sovereignty, as well as the implications of how this transformation refocuses the educational

efforts of the institution. It provides the researcher a lens through which an assessment of the level of collegiality between the TCU and the PWI can be determined.

By employing the tribal critical race theory paradigm, it is possible to see the American Indian higher education institution as representing the indigenous populations who have been oppressed by the colonial powers and the research institution as representing the English-speaking colonial population. This paradigmatic lens enables the researcher to develop a perspective that is more inclusive of American Indian interpretations of education than would be gained using non-indigenous critical theory (Grande, 2004). Indigenous critical theory helps to determine whether the current relationship between the respective institutional types reflects the historical tensions between the respective populations or if the relationship represents a transformative change between the two populations (Smith, 1999).

Institutional and Tribal Critical Race Theories Together

Using both institutional and tribal critical race theory in concert allowed an examination of how the language of the interview participants explained the structures of the relationships. Institutional theory was employed to analyze how the respondents describe the formal structures of the partnership. Additionally, it was utilized to examine the field logics used by the participants to describe institutional behaviors. Institutional theory was utilized to assess the power of external forces upon the partnership. Finally, institutional theory was employed to explore any informal ways in which the partnership has developed.

Tribal critical race theory was used to examine how the participants frame their structural relationships with regards American Indian concerns. Are the structures established in the partnerships truly centered on the cultural needs of the American Indian students these administrators and faculty serve? Does the language they use suggest any types of overt or

covert discriminatory attitudes or behaviors to the students or to the mission that Haskell is trying to fulfill in the national tribal educational system? Does the partnership serve the goals of both institutions equitably, or do the priorities of one campus supersede the priorities of another? Are all actors within the structure treated equitably? Or is there a stratification of the actors?

Used in conjunction, the two theories could provide insight into how formalized institutional structures either perpetuate discriminatory behaviors or establish equity between the campuses.

Researcher Role

My experience as a career student affairs professional who has worked with minority students for over twenty years influences both my interest in this subject and my choices of analytical tools. Since the beginning of my career, I have been involved in social justice education in one form or another. My current professional experience is working in a minority services support office (multicultural center). In this role, I have had a great deal of opportunity to become familiar with the obstacles to graduation that minority students face.

My choice of research topic and tribal critical race theory as an analytical tool is based upon three developmental periods of my career. The first developmental experience is my work with a collaborative residential setting named Casa Cuauhtémoc. As the community development coordinator of this residence, I worked with Chicano students in their leadership cooperation with Deganawidah-Quetzalcoatl University, an American Indian state college in northern California in the early 1990s. My second developmental period was my work in my current position with strong student leaders who represented American Indian concerns to the administration of the University of Missouri in the late 1990s and early

2000s. These students comprised the smallest ethnic minority population but proved to be the leaders who could mobilize peers more effectively than others to challenge discriminatory practices. The third developmental period of my career was assisting my graduate research internship advisor, Dr. Karen Sunday Cockrell, and her colleagues, Dr. Cornell Pewewardy and Dr. Nocona Pewewardy, in their research on the American Indian campus climate within the Big XII conference.

These three career experiences defined for me a research area that broadened my definitions of cultural preservation and perseverance. As a Pilipino immigrant who has been naturalized as an American citizen, I was able to see parallels between the American Indian colonial experience and that of the Philippine colonial experience under the United States during the 20th century. These experiences led me to further investigate this population, the colonial experience, and my continuation in the field of minority student support.

Research Questions

The overarching question this study seeks to explore is whether the relationship between Haskell and KU is one that supports American Indian education in the STEM fields, while also meeting Haskell's mission of preserving cultural identity. This study will examine the following questions:

1. How were the STEM programs developed between Haskell and KU over the last decade?
2. According to administrators and faculty at both institutions, what were the explicit intentions for the partnership?
3. According to administrators and faculty at both institutions, how does the partnership operate? What are the points of tension?

Significance of this Study

Collaborative Partnerships

Study of the collaborative curricular programs for the benefit of ethnic minorities is not extensive. Higher education literature tends to examine particular types of institutions separately. There is a great deal of literature concerning the development and internal functioning of research universities, as well as some literature focusing on the degree to which research universities work with the greater community or reflect the educational goals of the society they serve (Rosenstone, 2003). The literature about other institutional types primarily concentrates on the particular educational missions they fulfill. For example, some literature exists on the development and functioning of HBCUs. Over the last twenty years, a similar literature has arisen about indigenous higher education, leading to greater examinations of the role that higher education can play as a tool of cultural preservation (AhNee-Benham, 2003).

Literature about how different types of higher education and post-secondary institutions work together focuses primarily on the collaboration of community colleges and research universities. There is some literature on how PWIs interact with HBCUs and on how single-sex colleges have worked together (e.g., Hobart and William Smith; Harvard and Radcliffe). The literature on how PWIs and TCUs collaborate is very limited in comparison to other collaborative partnership literatures (Nichols & Monette, 2003).

My study analyzed one relationship between a PWI and a TCU. It is my hope that this study will provide both institutional types with useful information to aid in the development of programs that will directly benefit American Indian students.

Methods

With the theoretical framework defined, the methodology to be employed will be a qualitative case study. The goal of this research is to provide an in-depth investigation of how different institutional types work together to ensure an equitable partnership (i.e., a TCU and a PWI maintain a grant partnership). This relationship has clearly demarcated bounds with defined goals. A case study seems to be the most appropriate means toward providing a thick description of the relationship and will be key to understanding how it works (Merriam, 1988). Because the number of relationships similar to the one between Haskell and KU is few, it is important to understand how one particular example operates. In a sense, the development of this understanding fits into what Stake (1995) calls an *intrinsic* case study—one that provides understanding of unique relationships or phenomenon.

Merriam further defines "case study" as describing a particular situation. The situation possesses systems and attributes that are clearly limited. The phenomenon that is to be studied may provide insight into a type of relationship but cannot be considered to be generalizable to all similar relations. The use of case study design additionally means that the understanding that arises is heuristic, contextual to the given situation, and may provide a basis for other types of studies that analyze similar situations.

Case study research lends itself to qualitative techniques. Unlike survey data collection, tools such as individual interviewing and focus groups allow for the collection of very subjective and individualized data. I interviewed faculty who instruct courses and mentor students in co-curricular activities and administrators who facilitate arrangements between the two campuses. Transcripts were developed from each interview. Each was analyzed in methods similar to grounded theory research analysis (Glaser & Strauss, 1967).

Once the interviews transcripts were completed, a line-by-line parsing of the transcript was used to identify key terms. This was the initial coding. Once these initial terms were identified, axial coding of the transcripts was used to develop common themes (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). The terms were categorized into groups that are thematically similar (Silverman, 2006).

The findings are presented in three distinctive chapters, one that discusses the history of the respective institutions and one each that will examine the responses of the administrators and the faculty within the institutional structure of the relationship.

Limitations

The importance of this study is tempered by its limited applicability to this one case. The institutions are unique in the sense of curriculum: Haskell is an American Indian–focused institution and KU is a university with very high research activity that serves the general population of Kansas.

Haskell differs from most other American Indian–focused institutions because it is a BIA institution and is not tribally controlled. The key component that distinguishes Haskell is its governance. As a BIA institution, it is ultimately answerable to the U.S. government in regard to its curriculum and educational mission (American Indian Higher Education Consortium, 2008). Most other American Indian higher education institutions are locally controlled by sovereign indigenous nations, which determine the educational focus and mission. Haskell is required by federal regulation to offer its curriculum to any member of a federally recognized American Indian tribe. Tribally controlled colleges are able to limit enrollment to members of that particular nation. Therefore, any findings that are discovered through this research are applicable exclusively to Haskell and only at this point in time. It

may be possible to make inferences on how collaborative compacts may affect other tribal colleges, but governance differences may limit the transferability to other institutional collaborations.

Chapter 2

Literature Review

The particular focus of this study is to examine, from the perspectives of administrators and faculty, how relations between Haskell and KU in the STEM disciplines developed through federal grant funding and how the partnership between two such disparate institutions works. This chapter will provide a context for the history of these two institutions in (1) the history of the education of indigenous peoples in colonizing relationships with Europeans, and (2) the history of the rise of the research university in the United States. Then the chapter will turn toward literature on the two theoretical perspectives for the study, institutional and tribal critical race theory. The chapter ends with a synthesis of this knowledge into a perspective for studying institutional partnerships between research and tribal universities.

History of the Relationship between Indigenous Peoples and Colonial Powers

The relationship between indigenous peoples and colonial populations has been contentious and filled with mistrust. The examination of colonial efforts in North America, South America, Africa, Asia, and Oceania tells the story of subjugation of native populations and resource exploitation and extraction (Schuetz, 2002). The early Spanish colonial efforts to control the land in the western hemisphere was through the establishment of encomiendas. An encomienda was basically a land grant that gave acreage and a labor force allotment to a Spanish family to become productive through some agricultural or industrial means. On the encomiendas, the indios (American Indians) were remanded into a property relation in which they were used solely as labor (Parry, 1966). If any educational efforts were initiated, they were often limited to conversion efforts by Catholic clergy. These efforts generally resulted

in the wholesale substitution of indigenous faiths and behaviors with those that were deemed correct under Catholicism (Jensen, 1984).

The efforts of the English-speaking colonial powers in North America (first those of Great Britain, followed closely by those of the United States and the Dominion of Canada) to relate to the indigenous populations of the continent were oppressive. Indigenous populations fought continually to preserve their cultural identity and their sovereignty in a political climate that used subjugation, assimilation, and extermination as means to eradicate native populations and prepare the land for colonial exploitation (Jackson & Galli, 1977). The history of the relationship is one in which each formal agreement between indigenous populations and the English-speaking colonial powers was used to the disadvantage of the indigenous populations' rights over time. The early agreements between the indigenous and colonial populations were initially framed in language that recognized the sovereignty of the indigenous leadership. Over time, the language moved away from seeming respect to unequal treaties that included means for the colonial power to abrogate agreements with little consequence (DeJong, 1993). The transformation from equality between sovereigns to subjugation of indigenous populations occurred in a short hundred-year timeframe, prior to the founding of many higher education institutions in British North America (Takaki, 1979). The continuous drafting of unequal treaties and the subsequent abrogation of each of these laid the groundwork for both the exploitation of the indigenous populations and the eventual wholesale appropriation of the continent for colonial expansion (Jackson & Galli, 1977).

The erosion of indigenous sovereignty and rights was not only a legal construction but also an often-violent act. Forcible settlement of American Indian populations to preserves or reservations began with the Spanish with the encomienda system, which limited range of

movement to a fraction of the territory previously used by the indigenous population (Wood, 2003). Forcible relocation from one part of the North American continent to another was the American government's invention to control its native populations (Murchison, 1901). The relocations eventually led to the development of reservations that effectively acted as concentration camps that limited indigenous mobility (Reyhner & Eder, 2004).

American Indian Education

Education and schooling are not synonymous. Schooling is more accurately defined as simply one form of education: formal education. All cultural groups engage in education as a mean of socializing young people, reinforcing important beliefs and values, and maintaining culture and language. Therefore, American Indians before European colonization were "educated" if not "formally educated" peoples. The purpose of American Indian schooling in the context of colonization was primarily to build social structures that *replaced* indigenous cultural values with those of the imperialist colonizing powers. As Grande (2004) suggests in replacing the term "mainstream" with "whitestream," colonial pedagogies were implemented to ensure that cultural normative behavior was defined within traditional Western European Christian values of culture. Any types of cultural preservation activity employed by American Indians were not considered normative in the eyes of educators. Instead, these were seen as hindrances to the transformation of the indigenous populations into labor pools for colonial exploitation (Connell-Szasz, 1988).

The structure of these schools was to teach those subjects that were valued by the colonizers. The educational curriculum was structured to remove the student's native language and replace it with the language of the colonizers. In both North and South America, the colonial forces were effective with this curriculum, systematically substituting

English, French, and Spanish for the many native languages in the western hemisphere. The forcible replacement of language gives an indication of just how much contempt the colonizers had for the American Indian pupils in their charge (Adams, 1995).

The mission system established by the Spanish throughout Nueva Espana took a toll on the native populations. With the Catholic Church playing a strong role in the conversion of native populations into a labor force for Spanish imperial efforts, a light into the process of deculturalization can be seen.

> In the course of conversion it was considered essential to remove the native from his normal ecological niche and to transport him to a completely new environment. Indeed, an organized effort was made to eradicate in his mind many of the distinctive cultural traits which had been an integral part of himself and his ancestors for generations. (Cook, 1943, p. 420)

The first schools founded for the education of American Indians had a simple mission: make the American Indian into a labor tool to be used by the colonial power. When the original colonial educational schools were founded in British North America, institutions such as Dartmouth, Harvard, and the College of William and Mary took it upon themselves to Christianize and westernize the native population. This excerpt from the Dartmouth founding mission demonstrates its role to Christianize the native populations as well as to teach them productive labor skills.

> KNOW YE, THEREFORE that We, considering the premises and being willing to encourage the laudable and charitable design of spreading Christian knowledge among the savages of our American wilderness, and also that the best means of education be established in our province of New Hampshire, for the benefit of said

> province, do, of our special grace, certain knowledge and mere motion, by and with the advice of our counsel for said province, by these presents, will, ordain, grant and constitute that there be a college erected in our said province of New Hampshire by the name of Dartmouth College, for the education and instruction of youth of the Indian tribes in this land in reading, writing, and all parts of learning which shall appear necessary and expedient for civilizing and Christianizing children of pagans, as well as in all liberal arts and sciences, and also of English youth and any others. And the trustees of said college may and shall be one body corporate and politic, in deed, action and name, and shall be called, named and distinguished by the name of the Trustees of Dartmouth College. (Dartmouth, 1769)

The goal of the education was to remove American Indian culture from the native pupils and instill within them the values of the West.

Eleazar Wheelock, a New England preacher and educator, stated "Few conceive aright of the Difficulties of Educating an Indian and turning him into an Englishman" (Axtell, 1981, p. 95). His sentiment on educating native students reflected the value the new colonies put forth on the assimilation of the native population and the elimination of any vestiges of Indian culture.

For much of the following three centuries, this was the primary mission of all levels of education aimed at the native population by the colonial government. The persistence of this educational mission continued from this early inception to the mid-twentieth century in both North and South America, being carried on by the newly independent nations as they lifted the imperialistic yoke.

This continued emphasis upon labor development can be observed in the Department of the Interior Office of Indian Affairs manual *Tentative Course of Study for United States Indian Schools* (1915).

> Indian schools must train the Indian youth of both sexes to take upon themselves the duties and responsibilities of citizenship. To do this requires a system of schools and an organization capable of preparing the Indian young people to earn a living (1) among their people or (2) away from the reservation home and in competition with their white brethren. This does not contemplate a college or university, or even a preparatory school for college entrance, but a practical system of schools with an essentially vocational foundation.

In this manual, education concentrates primarily on the development of agricultural labor skills. Education that would develop college-level learning skills was given no attention in this text.

The movement away from a strict labor development educational model began during the Progressive era. In the late 1920s, Congress approved funding for a report on the educational programs for American Indians. The Merriam report broadly criticized the varying efforts to educate American Indians.

> The most serious deficiencies in Indian administration were the total exclusion of Indians from the management of their own affairs, and the poor quality of services (especially health and education) rendered by public officials not responsible to the Indian people they served. (S. Rep. No. 91–501, 1969)

It found that most educational efforts had deleterious effects upon the population and did not provide any meaningful development of educational support structures.

The Merriam report led to the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 (IRA), in which previous legislation that hamstrung the development of tribal governments was curtailed or eliminated. In this case, tribal sovereignty was granted over educational missions and funding was provided both at the tribal and individual levels for the development of educational institutions and personal advanced education. The impact of IRA was the recognition of the need for American Indians to have some say over their own governance (Reyhner & Eder, 2004). Simultaneous to the IRA, the John O'Malley Act was passed. The outcome of this act was the transferal of federal responsibility for the tribal entities to the states. While this may seem to be deleterious, the act provided federal funds to states for the management of support services for the tribal groups (Reyhner & Eder, 2004).

Even though Progressive era reforms were established, the federal government was not consistent in how it worked with American Indian tribal governments. Shortly after the Merriam report, the Termination era began. The Termination era was the reorganizing of federal responsibilities away from supporting existing tribal governments and the substitution of federal funds for state funding. In essence, the intention was to terminate funding for all types of supports for American Indian tribes and individuals. Facets of the Termination era included forcible assimilation, elimination of day school curricula, and relocations of American Indian populations from geographic locations that were predominantly American Indian to urban and rural areas that would lead to mainstreaming the population (Stubben, 2006). The BIA commissioner overseeing the beginning of the Termination era was Dillon Myers, who also oversaw the internment of Japanese American citizens in the western United States during World War II (Woodcock & Aliwiye, 2001). The Termination era basically put all progressive efforts for American Indian development on the back burner.

American Indian Higher Education

Access to higher education in the United States was originally limited to the European majority population. Educational opportunities available to non-European populations, primarily American Indians and African Americans, were limited to elementary and secondary levels for most of U.S. history. Until the mid-nineteenth century, there was virtually no access to higher education available to these populations. The founding of the first historically Black colleges took place in the decade before the Civil War (Avery College in 1849, Ashmun Institute in 1854, Wilberforce University in 1855) (Drewry & Doermann, 2001). In the subsequent Jim Crow era, HBCUs were funded at both the state and federal levels to ensure that segregationist policies maintained the separation of the races in higher education.

Unlike the Jim Crow policies that ensured separation of the European American and African American higher education populations, U.S. policy toward American Indian education strongly emphasized assimilation and labor development (Spring, 2004). Because of these emphases, American Indian higher education did not really exist prior to the twentieth century and is historically a recent development in the history of U.S. higher education. Since the 1960s, changes in government policy toward American Indians have resulted in the transformation of former BIA educational programs and the growth of tribally governed institutions (Woodcock & Aliwiye, 2001).

The development of higher education services for American Indians paralleled the different government reports. The introduction of college learning skills into American Indian education came in the mid-twentieth century. Traditionally labor-skills–oriented tribal institutions introduced college-level curricula over time. In some cases, the transition from a

secondary level education to a college-level curriculum began in the 1930s and ended in the 1960s (Hale, 2002).

The first efforts to spur development of American Indian higher education came in the 1960s. Two reports commissioned during the Johnson administration noted that there had been no progress on American Indian services since the Merriam report of the 1920s. The two reports, the 1969 "Indian Education: A National Tragedy—A National Challenge" (otherwise known as the Kennedy Report) and the 1972 "National Study of American Indian Education" (summarized as "To Live on this Earth"), criticized efforts during the Termination era to destroy American Indian cultural and governmental structures. These reports argued that the exclusion of American Indian voices in their own governance had been a federal mistake (Clarkin, 2001).

As a result of these reports, Congress passed the Indian Education Assistance Act in 1975. This act put the governance of American Indian education in the hands of the tribes. For the first time, American Indians at all educational levels were given the autonomy to establish curriculum for their own communities (Clarkin, 2001). In 1978, Title XI of the Education Amendments Act further altered the relationship between the BIA and the American Indian population. Until this act, the BIA had been charged with educating and serving American Indians from the perspective of outsiders to the culture. From this point on, Congress instructed the BIA to let the tribes self-determine the best educational and social services goals for their respective tribal entities (Woodcock & Aliwiye, 2001). These educational policy reports and legislative funding programs ended the Termination-era policies and ushered in the Self-Determination era, allowing both for the development of

tribal self-determination and for a restoration of federal oversight of American Indian education. Curricular changes reflected this shift in governance structures.

Simultaneous to the transformation of curricular emphasis, the American Indian population was able to assert some local control over the curriculum and transform the mission from labor pool development to one that emphasized self-determination and tribal sovereignty. As the mission shifted, American Indian educational institutions evolved. Originally designed as primary and sometimes secondary level educational centers, some of these institutions began to offer higher education level coursework. The 1960s and 1970s saw the development of a higher education infrastructure for American Indians. In the early 1970s, the American Indian Higher Education Consortium (AIHEC) began the work of increasing communication between the existing American Indian higher education programs and served as a resource for the newly established tribal education institutions (Boyer, 1997).

Due to the history of the use of education as a tool of oppression, the American Indian population has sought to ameliorate the abuses of the past and has worked to make American Indian higher education a tool for cultural preservation. The curriculum of many of these institutions now includes American Indian language classes, provides history and sociology courses on different tribal entities, and trains individuals in skills deemed important by tribal governments (Oppelt, 1990).

The movement toward cultural preservation curriculum was aided with congressional passage of an amendment to the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act, in which the federal government was required to support Indian governments in their cultural preservation goals and to assist American Indian educational efforts at all grade levels (Connell-Szasz, 1988). Additionally, in the early 1990s, the *Indian Nations at Risk: Task*

Force Commissioned Paper made broad recommendations that the educational efforts of all levels should aim for the preservation of American Indian culture. This report resulted in the passage of the Native American Language Act, which has the goal of establishing language curricula to revive American Indian languages (Hale, 2002).

Chapter 4 will explain how the history of Haskell University, one of the institutions in this study, parallels this general history of American Indian education. It is essential to understand the institutional history and motives of Haskell as its leaders have negotiated partnerships with KU, the research extensive institution in the study.

The Mission of Research Extensive Universities

In the examination of the history of U.S. higher education, it is possible to see the strong emphasis on educating the masses and developing curriculum that perpetuates cultural, social, and economic structures for the benefit of the demographic majority (Lewis & Hearn, 2003). Research extensive institutions were developed to serve both political and economic interests to advance the nation's standing in world competition. The general model for these research extensive institutions is that of the European universities who embraced the Enlightenment (Lucas, 1994). The structure of the research extensive university in the United States began generally with the passing of the Morrell Act by Congress in 1865. Research extensive universities are divided into colleges that emphasize disciplinary curriculum. Students train within these disciplines to develop knowledge and skills that are transferable to post-graduation life (Lucas, 1994).

While students are present at research extensive universities, the primary goal of these institutions is to perform research that assists with the social, cultural, agricultural, industrial, and economic development of the state in which it resides. These institutions work

closely with the state government to establish research programs that concentrate on the state interests. Oftentimes, partnerships with corporations and industries residing in the state also determine the research emphasis of the university. Additionally, these types of institutions generally structure undergraduate and graduate student curriculums around these identified research interests.

Research institutions have not been known to respond quickly to the needs of minority populations within their structures or outside of their campuses. Until the mid-twentieth century, research universities generally were hostile to accommodating minority populations and were strongly resistant to working with minority institutions (whether these were run by majority or by minority leadership). For many decades, a strong segregation between majority and minority services was maintained. With the civil rights movement of the 1960s, the research universities became more inclusive of minorities and open to working with minority communities and institutions (Mihesuah, 2004). However, they remained predominantly White institutions (PWIs) and continued to enroll low percentages of minority students, which exposed them to political criticism.

Predominantly White Institutions and Racial Minorities

The historical relationship between PWIs and minority populations has not been positive. As higher education has democratized over the last sixty years, there has been strong resistance by PWI administrations both to accommodating minorities (gender, racial, ethnic, etc.) within the academy and to working with outside minority community organizations. PWIs typically only responded to the needs of minority populations when these groups employed tools such as civil disobedience or external legal pressure (Lucas, 1994). The establishment of many minority services centers on PWI campuses (i.e., minority

cultural centers or ethnic studies) came after on-campus civil disobedience took place. One case of this was the establishment of the ethnic studies programs at University of California–Berkeley. Minority students participating in the Free Speech Movement in the early 1970s asked the administration to establish curricula that told the history of minorities in California and the United States. The administration did not respond to student demands until protests actively took place. Only after many protests had occurred, some lasting months, did the administration establish both an ethnic studies program and minority support centers (Yamane, 2001).

PWI efforts to work with minority community organizations during this same time period were not highly developed. An examination of work of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) to open the doors of PWIs to Black Americans during the civil rights era demonstrates strong resistance to minority community efforts. Instead of working with minority groups to enroll minority students, many PWIs actively resisted the admission of minorities. Some did not enroll minority students until ordered to do so by federal authorities. In the case of both the University of Alabama and the University of Mississippi, the federal government used marshals to ensure the ability of Black students to enroll (Bowen & Bok, 1998).

Furthermore, the colleges and schools concentrating on mathematics, technology, engineering, and the sciences have only had limited success with increasing minority enrollments. One instance of a PWI actually working to ensure a strong pipeline from high school on through graduate school is the University of Maryland–Baltimore County, through its Meyerhoff Scholars program (Wilson, 2000). This university has recognized that most STEM programs do not provide sufficient financial and academic support for minority

students. The Meyerhoff program is an attempt to ensure that the pipeline for these students does not crumble through its intensive mentorship, tutoring, internship, and financial support components.

Collaborative Relations between Minority Universities and PWIs

The interaction between universities and colleges that were segregated from each other was limited for a good portion of the history of higher education. The minority-serving institutions did not benefit from the same resources that the majority-serving institutions enjoyed. The texts were out of date and the facilities did not have the same upkeep. The collaborations between the different types of institutions were not frequent nor on an equivalent or collegial basis.

The higher education relationships that were formed prior to the civil rights era may have been low level at best. In one historical example, the relations between Lincoln University and the University of Missouri were represented in a U.S. Supreme Court decision that required the state government to establish a law school for Black students. The University of Missouri would not admit Black students to its law school but helped the state legislature establish a Black law school under the aegis of Lincoln University in St. Louis by providing some of its faculty and old textbooks. But there was little other formalized relationship (Black Alumni Organization & Legion of Black Collegians, 1994). A more recent example of collaboration between an HBCU and a PWI is the effort of Hampton University to establish a doctoral program in nursing. Hampton worked with the University of Pennsylvania to create this program in the 1970s (Hammond & Davis, 2005).

The development of American Indian higher education over the last half-century provides some insight into the establishment of collaborative relations between TCUs and

PWIs. The founding of Deganawidah Quetzalcoatl University (DQ) in California during the crucible of the civil Rrights movement provides an example of partnerships between a TCU and two PWIs, the Universities of California at Berkeley and at Davis. In the early 1970s, the University of California yielded claims to the land that American Indian students had occupied. Eventually, both Berkeley and Davis provided faculty and material resources to DQ, even going so far as to establish relations between the Hispanic studies program and DQ in the 1990s. In another example, the development of Tohono O'odham Tribal College's academic success program is a direct result of the institutional relations between it and Pima County Community College (Nichols & Monette, 2003).

Theoretical Framework

Understanding the partnership between the two higher education institutional types in this study requires a synthesis of two theoretical perspectives, institutional theory and tribal critical race theory. Institutional theory alone is useful in explaining how institutions develop distinctive cultures, identities, and motives that mediate their relationships with other institutions and with society in general. Each institution in the partnership is engaged in a negotiation to preserve its identity and advance its status. However, given the negative history of relationships between PWIs and minority populations, even more is at stake for a minority-serving institution in the partnership. I decided to synthesize tribal critical race theory, with its emphasis on resistance to colonizing relationships, with institutional theory in order to understand the phenomenon in this study.

Institutional Theory

Meyer and Rowan's seminal work "Institutionalized Organizations: Formal Structure as Myth and Ceremony" (1977) introduced the concept of rational institutional myths. In this

work, institutions respond to environmental factors, changing their language to reflect the goals that they wish to achieve. Another aspect of the formal structure change is to comply with assessment from outside agents and develop a sense of their legitimacy. Institutional theory examines how organizations operate and construct their philosophies. Of particular use in understanding institutional theory is the work of Meyer and others in how education can be examined using institutional theory concepts.

Meyer's "Reflections on Institutional Theory of Organizations" (2007) compared realist and sociological institutionalisms. The primary differences between these two are that realist institutionalism operates on the assumption that actors within organizations behave within boundaries and derive their effectiveness through authority they gain while working within these boundaries, whereas in sociological institutionalism actors work within organizations or phenomenological structures. As a proponent of sociological institutionalism, Meyer argues that the behavior of actors is due to a culture that develops within the organization and does not necessarily derive from any authority vested in the actor by the organization. In other words, sociological models provide insight into how actors behave independently within the organizations analyzed. For example, Thornton and Ocasio (2008) provide an explanation of how organizations develop behaviors that reflect their internal actors' behaviors. They address how collective identities are developed, how contests for status and power within organizations may form structural behaviors. An examination of routines can explain how structural behaviors eventually evolve into ceremonies that advance the organization (e.g., annual activities such as a convocation, graduation, or the state of the union address).

Institutional theory has been particularly useful in the study of higher education. For example, Meyer, Ramirez, Frank, and Schoffer (2006) discuss how the conception of the university has developed into a universal concept of education accepted worldwide. They intimate that over the last century, the concept of the university has become an isomorphism that provides legitimacy to the development of both knowledge and teaching. The university has developed into a global "knowledge society." Morphew's work "*A Rose by Any Other Name": Which Colleges Became Universities*" (2002) provides a way of looking at how college missions evolved as they became universities. Morphew suggests that many institutions of higher education transformed from colleges to universities because of transformation in their student population. Morphew further examines how these moves can be successes or failures depending on how the various actors perceive the outcomes.

In *The Theory of Institutional Change Revisited* by Elsner (2012), asymmetry between cultures within a value-behavior–structure provides insight into how organizations form relationships both within and with outside constituencies. The key aspect of this paper is how organizations with different levels of power attempt to establish dominance with each other. Elsner's analysis of institutional theory introduces the use of game theory to explain behavior patterns between actors in the asymmetric relationships. This concept suggests that correlated behavior between organizations can be explained by how actors compete within the relationship to establish legitimacy. As the actors compete for legitimacy, Elsner suggests, that the organizations develop new structures to meet this changing dynamic.

An article that can provide a bridge between institutional theory and tribal critical race theory is Townsend's "Community College Organizational Climate for Minorities and Women" (2009). This article examines how minority populations fit within organizations, the

barriers that persist for these populations and the language used to describe the places they hold within them. According to the article, persistent barriers can be cultural manifestations of discriminatory practices that make organizations alienating for the minority populations. The article further discusses how these individuals can be potential change agents but may not be able to achieve change due to organizational resistance.

In summary, institutional theory informed the data analysis in this study by calling the researcher's attention to contrasting motives and cultures of the two institutions involved, as well as the actions of individuals within those institutions. Institutional theory highlights how higher education institutions are not static but are always evolving in response to external forces and internal intentions.

Tribal Critical Race Theory

Critical theory grew from the work of Hegel and the members of the Frankfurt school. Initially, critical theory was based on philosophic interpretations of Marxism and developed to critique the socio-economics of the capitalistic economic systems of the early twentieth century. The usage of dialectical language borrowed from Marxism formed the basis of developing new perspectives on the social, cultural, and economic systems that seemed to determine placement of individuals within the society of the time. (Peters, Lankshear, & Olsen, 2003).

In the late 1950s/early 1960s, Freire developed a pedagogy that moved away from systems that helped to maintain power relationships to one that aided those who did not fully enjoy the fruits of society. In Pedagogy of the Oppressed, Freire advocates the use of critical deconstruction of the educational and social mechanisms that ensure perpetuation of elites. He wants those who want to change society to then look at means for transforming the

curriculum so that these power preservation systems are dismantled and replaced with one that supports the views, and more importantly, the goals of the disenfranchised populations (1970).

The use of critical theory to critique social constructs within society eventually led to critiques of educational systems and the curricula that seemed to perpetuate the social systems that ensured the continuity of social statuses for individuals and specific populations. Giroux' understanding of critical theory allowed him to develop what is now termed critical pedagogy (Gur-Ze'ev, 2003). Giroux began to critically examine curriculum and structures within education and asked himself what these structures did to individuals and groups. Did education actually help individuals develop the skills to navigate the social systems in place? Or did education perpetuate social interaction structures that ensured elites would maintain strong control of the economic mechanisms of the society? To that end, Giroux initiated the development of critical pedagogy in order to deconstruct the constructivist curriculum of traditional educational systems and formulate a new pedagogy that truly liberates the individual.

Because critical theory is a tool for consciousness-raising, it has been used by different populations to examine the structures within society. An example of its usage is in feminist scholarly work. Glazer used a feminist critical perspective to examine how affirmative action has affected the status of women in the academy (1997). The use of the feminist critical perspective here illuminates the shortcomings of affirmative action in its application to universities' accommodation of women's needs. The critique of the place of university women in the mathematics/science pipeline provides another example of the power of critical theory as a tool of feminists. In this example, Stage writes about how

departments within the field of mathematics and science are not taking active steps to enlarge the pipeline. Stage notes how academic institutions are generally forgiving of departments and their hiring/advising idiosyncrasies. In her feminist critique of institutional policies, she recommends administrations take more active roles in increasing the numbers of women in the academic pipeline (1997).

To fully understand the dynamics of race and its effect on society, critical race theory was developed to allow for minority populations to provide critiques of society that traditionally excluded their experience (Parker, 2003). A good deal of critical race theory examines the racial injury experienced by minority populations at the hands of the overpowering majority population. Gutierrez-Jones writes that the interpretations of injury at the hands of the majority population adversely affect minority populations in numerous and variant ways. He presents the example of cultural interpretations of the Amadou Diallo case in New York. The interpretations of the guilt of the police officers in Diallo's death are divergent, with the White majority population indicating a belief that the officers were just doing their jobs. The minority perception of the facts of the case is tempered by generational oppression by the police with their history of racial discriminatory practices. While calls for justice were consistently heard from the minority population, the majority population generally did not understand the outcry. Critical race theory used within this context explicated the variance in perception of the majority versus minority populations (2001).

An evolutionary step within critical race theory has been the growth of critical race narratives and critical race pedagogies that are culturally centric. For example, African American, Asian American and Hispanic American scholars have developed race criticisms arising from their cultural identity (Parker, 2003). Consistent with this culturally centric

movement, American Indian critical race theory has developed over the last decade. This was the critical race tool through which this study's data was analyzed.

A further development of critical race theory is tribal critical race theory. The distinguishing factor of tribal critical race theory from other forms of culturally centric race theory is the incorporation of the colonial experience. Though all forms of critical theory are complex, tribal critical race theory's incorporation of colonial oppression dynamics adds a dimension that does not exist in other forms (Brayboy, 2006).

Tribal critical race theory puts the voice of American Indians at the center of the research. DeLoria's essay "Comfortable Fictions and the Struggle for Turf" deconstructs majority population notions of what it means to be Indian. He notes that most study of American Indians by non-indigenous writers incorporates cultural prejudices that essentially oppress the studied population. Value judgments about native individuals and tribal groups are carried into these majority researcher's analytical assessments of the studied populations' behavior. These behavioral analyses essentially reinforce cultural stereotypes of the majority population. The problem identified by Deloria is not only the reinforcement of cultural stereotyping by these outside researchers; he identifies the problem as total disregard for the critique by the American Indian population of these stereotyping studies. For effective tribal critical race theory to be applied to research, the indigenous voice must be used to represent the indigenous perspective, not to perpetuate prejudices held by the majority populations that oppress the indigenous population (2006).

Tribal critical race theory incorporates a concept that Smith calls decolonizing methodologies (1999). As DeLoria notes earlier, the voice of indigenous populations is generally excluded in the research by non-natives. Smith advocates that for any research on

indigenous populations to be valid, researchers have to decolonize their thinking about the subject being studied. Decolonization is a multistep process that is similar to deconstruction. The foundational piece is for the researcher to acknowledge that previous ways of research were grounded in Western modes of thought. If Western-centric thought is acknowledged, the researcher can then begin the process of becoming more indigenous centric in his/her approach to the subject. This means increasing individual understanding of indigenous perceptions of the topic at hand. Case in point, where a Western researcher may stress the development of specific skill sets that are White culturally normative in an educational setting as being important in the study unknowingly, the scholar who has decolonized their thinking will look at the development and question how it impacts the indigenous individual's own personal development with regards cultural identity preservation.

The next component of tribal critical race theory is indigenizing the academy. Alfred (2004) writes that this term means the incorporation of indigenous scholarly perspectives in the practice of research. As it is the responsibility of scholars to include the indigenous voice in their research of American Indian populations, it is the responsibility of the disciplines to incorporate tribal critical race theory as a tool for research. If this incorporation does not take place, traditional disciplines are strongly encouraged not to discriminate against its usage by scholars.

Building on the work of DeLoria, Grande (2004) calls for a pedagogy that recognizes the struggles of American Indians and sees this as a foundation for both research and curriculum. She suggests that researchers need to recognize the problems of post-modernism and post-colonial thought: These two are essentially Western constructions that do not fully recognize the American Indian experience. Post-modernism as a theoretical concept suggests

that all the educational practices of the past need not be considered any longer. The researcher is now able to pursue lines of thought that do not necessarily recognize the problems that took place with the use of older pedagogies. In essence, the researcher is able to forget the crimes of the past and establish a clean slate from which to develop new explanations of White colonizers' behavior. Grande sees the use of the term post-colonial in a similar vein, arguing that the persistent use of this term by White scholars in a number of disciplines suggests that the colonial project that began with the Western age of discovery is now complete because all there is to discover has been found. The use of the post-colonial term completely ignores the suffering of many peoples across the globe who were "discovered" and colonized to their detriment. Post-colonial implies for the majority population in the United States that the colonization and control of North America was successful. Post-colonial implies for indigenous scholars that the pain of colonial life felt by indigenous populations is to be ignored so that the White colonizers can move onto their next preferred project.

Tribal critical race theory is the most appropriate research paradigm to analyze how the relationship between a TCU and a PWI may benefit the institutions and American Indian students. The paradigm allows the researcher to account for the motivation that traditional higher education has used in reference to all minority populations and American Indian populations in particular. Its use will help the researcher understand how the structures within which American Indian education has been traditionally framed have changed in this time of increased recognition of sovereignty as well as the implications of how this change refocuses the educational efforts of the institution (Brayboy, 2006). It will provide the researcher a lens

through which an assessment of the level of collegiality between Haskell and KU can be determined.

Synthesis: Institutional Theory and Tribal Critical Race Theory

By employing a tribal critical race theory paradigm, it is possible to see the American Indian higher education institution as representing the indigenous populations that have been oppressed by the colonial powers and the research extensive institution as representing the English-speaking colonial population. This paradigmatic lens will enable the researcher to develop a perspective that is more inclusive of American Indian interpretations of education than would be gained using non-indigenous critical theory (Grande, 2004). Tribal critical race theory will help to determine whether the current relationship between the two institutions reflects the historical tensions between their respective populations or if the relationship represents a transformative change between the two populations (Smith, 1999).

The literature about how different types of higher education/post-secondary institutions work together to some extent. There is limited literature on how PWIs interact with HBCUs. The literature on how PWIs and TCUs collaborate is almost non-existent in comparison to other collaborative partnership narratives (Nicholls & Monette, 2003).

Chapter 3

Design and Methods

To effectively research the formal relations between a TCU and a PWI, it was necessary to employ research methods that provided an intimate understanding of how various groups observe and experience the relationship. Because a nuanced view of the partnership involved gathering information from individuals, qualitative methods were employed (Hatch, 2002).

The research paradigm for the study was a synthesis of institutional theory and tribal critical race theory. Institutional theory informs how behaviors within the partnership explain the manner in which participants structure efficiencies and develop cultures (Meyer & Rowan, 1977). To ensure accurate representation of American Indian perspectives on the research, tribal critical race theory analysis employing the most recent developments in American Indian research methodology was studied and applied to research methods and data analysis (Grande, 2004).

Theoretical Frameworks

As explained in Chapter Two, the major tenets of institutional theory examine how actors behave independently, how asymmetry between cultures within a value-behavior–structure provides insight into how organizations form relationships both within and with outside constituencies, how organizations develop behaviors that reflect their internal actors behaviors, mechanisms and carriers are how organizations frame internal meaning, and how environmental factors such as disciplines or outside agencies influence the development of structures.

Research into institutional theory at the higher education level can help to explain some of the institutional trends that are taking place. In this partnership, institutional theory in higher education could explain mission expansion of one of the partners, how minority faculty are treated within higher education, and what changes in curriculum mean for program development. These trends can provide the rationale for the partnership to exist.

The use of tribal critical race theory in this study provides insight into the transformation of Haskell's mission within the national tribal community. Tribal critical race theory incorporates a research approach that Smith calls decolonizing methodologies (1999). The next component of tribal critical race theory is indigenizing the academy. Alfred writes that this means the incorporation of indigenous scholarly perspectives in the practice of research (2004).

Tribal critical race theory was the most appropriate research paradigm to analyze the relationship between a TCU and a PWI. Through this research lens, the American Indian–serving institution became the central focus of the study. The paradigm allowed me to account for the motivation that traditional higher education has used in reference to all minority populations and American Indian populations in particular. Its use helped me to understand how the traditional structures of American Indian education changed during this time of increased sovereignty and the implications of how this change refocused the educational efforts of the institution. It provided me a lens through which to assess the level of collegiality between Haskell and KU.

The use of these two theoretical frameworks in this study was complementary. As parts of the relationship were analyzed, each framework informed me about the behavioral dynamics emerging from the data. The degree to which hierarchies are established within the

partnership between institutional types and the focus on indigenous culture helped to indicate the degree to which the campuses actually developed an equal partnership.

Research Design

With the theoretical framework defined, the methodology to be employed was a qualitative case study. The goal of this research was to provide an in-depth investigation of how a collaboration between two institutional types benefits a specific population (TCU and PWI grant partnership). This relationship has clearly defined bounds with stated goals. A case study seemed to be the most appropriate means toward providing a thick description of the relationship and is essential to understanding the possible benefit (Merriam, 1988). Because such institutional relationships are few in number and not located near each other, it is important to understand how one particular example provides benefit. In a sense, the development of this understanding fits into what Stake calls an "intrinsic" case study (1995). An intrinsic study is one that provides understanding of unique relationships or phenomena.

Kennedy further defines case study as describing a specific situation, possessing particular systems and attributes that are clearly limited. The phenomenon that is to be studied may provide insight into a type of relationship but cannot be considered to be generalizable to all similar relations (2005). Additionally, the use of case study design produces heuristic results that are contextual to the given situation, although they may provide a basis for other types of studies that analyze similar situations. Unlike the use of survey data collection, case study research utilizes tools such as individual interviewing that allow collection of very subjective and individualized data. In this study, individual interviews were combined with document analysis and site visits to develop a rich, contextualized understanding of the program.

To obtain the information needed to analyze this case, ethnographic interviews of program participants were arranged. The experience of American Indians throughout the history of indigenous education has been best obtained through ethnographic techniques. In prior work on primary school experience, interviews have provided valuable information about deculturalization through religion (Johnston, 1989) and labor skills development as a tool for deculturalization (Child, 1995). In these and similar works, the process of ethnographic interviews revealed valuable insight into the effects of education upon individuals, families, and tribes.

Data Sources to Construct the Case

The study employed individual interviews as the primary data-gathering method to gain insight into administrator and faculty perceptions. Individual interviews were set up with faculty who have instructed one or more courses within the curriculum and with administrators who oversee curriculum development/articulated agreements. The two types of interview subjects enabled me to develop a triangulated understanding of the themes that emerged (Weiss, 1995). The individual faculty and administrator interviews allowed me to determine what types of professed cultural preservation/accommodation actions are part of the curriculum.

I performed all the individual interviews. As a Pilipino-American male who is an outsider to the American Indian population, I had to obtain a strong understanding of the cultural experiences of those faculty and staff interviewees who are American Indian. As a student affairs administrator, I was able to establish a rapport with most of the interviewees due to the listening skills I have developed over the last two decades of working in higher education. Because of my ethnic background, it was necessary for me to understand the

complexities of cross-racial interviewing. As Gunaratnam cautions about interviewing against race, I remained mindful that I was limited in sharing cultures with the interviewees (2003).

As a university administrator with nearly twenty years of experience at four Carnegie research extensive universities, I came to the interviews with some understanding of curriculum and administrative partnerships. I established rapport with the grant-participating faculty and administrators to develop an understanding of their role within the grant framework.

As a supplement to the ethnographic interviews, media reports, institutional assessments for accrediting agencies, and syllabi were all examined to provide a historical sense of the institution. Each of these provided more insight into how Haskell developed as an institution and how the partnership between the two campuses started and grew. During the document analysis, particular attention was paid to the tenor of the discourse (how goals were developed and progress measured) (Gee, 1999).

Selection of interviewees. The selection process was performed with the assistance of the Haskell and KU administrations. The selection of interviewees involved two specific populations, each representing groups that had different perspectives about the collaborative curriculum. The populations were administrative staff at both Haskell and KU who facilitated the inter-campus structure of the joint partnership and the faculty members of the two institutions who instructed the curriculum.

To identify faculty to participate in the study, I developed a letter that was sent out to all faculty who participate in the STEM partnership. This letter asked for volunteers to contact me directly. From the list of volunteers, interviews were set up with those faculty

who had instructed classes most recently to learn their perceptions of the collaborative curricular efforts (Seidman, 1998).

To identify administrators to participate in the study, I developed a letter that was sent to staff whose campus roles were identified as providing academic support to students. The letter asked for volunteers to contact me directly. From the list of volunteers, interviews were arranged to understand their perspectives about the collaborative curricular efforts.

As I interviewed subjects, I included a question asking if there were any other people I should interview as well. This was a modified snowball method of participant identification.

Timeline. The individual interviews were gathered over the course of three academic semesters. The total number of interviews included four faculty each from Haskell and KU respectively and four administrators each from Haskell and KU respectively. Transcription of the interviews was completed concurrently (Miles & Huberman, 1984). Data analysis was concurrent with the completion of transcriptions. Data analysis involved axial and co-axial coding of the transcripts (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). The data analysis was the most time-consuming part of the timeline. This data were further parsed into themes.

Setting. All interviews were conducted in neutral settings, meaning places that were not associated with specific affirmative action services. The interviews were conducted in closed spaces (their offices primarily and some laboratories) to ensure that the interviewees felt comfortable and were able to openly express their perspectives on the collaborative STEM programs.

All interviews were tape-recorded to ensure accuracy of data collection. Simultaneously, I took handwritten notes to record responses that led to further questioning to clarify statements.

Human Subjects' Protections

To ensure the ethical treatment of interview participants, strict confidentiality protocols were implemented. Participants were presented with informed consent forms explaining the possible risks and benefits of the research. The participants were given additional prerogatives to withdraw from participation at any time during the research and to have their interviews eliminated (Kimmel, 1988).

To protect participant confidentiality, each interview was categorized by date and participant classification (faculty, administrator). No other identifiers were kept with the interviews to ensure no future mishandling of the data (Sieber, 1992).

At the end of the research, interviews were stored as per federal institutional review board guidelines to provide confidentiality for the participants in the study. Data presented in the study were simply identified by categories (Sieber, 1992).

Obtaining Institutional Research Board Approval

Initial contact was made with the institutional review boards (IRB) of the University of Missouri, Haskell, and KU to ascertain each institution's requirements to obtain permission to conduct research. I learned both Haskell and KU required full IRB application submission to grant permission to conduct research on their respective campuses.

Both institutions directed me to have academic sponsors from their respective campuses. I obtained sponsorship from an administrator at Haskell and a faculty member from the Global Indigenous Nations Studies program at KU.

With the sponsorships obtained, the IRB process at each institution required an approval letter from my home campus. The process for approval from the two institutions varied greatly: KU took one month, while Haskell took three months. The time differential for approval between the institutions provided some insight into institutional resource differences. At the PWI, the process took a fairly short time due to the fact that full-time staff are employed in the office of research to process IRB applications. At the TCU, the sole coordinator for the process is also a full-time faculty member with instructional duties first, IRB duties second.

Arranging Interviews

Because the University of Missouri is located approximately 150 miles from Haskell and KU, I initially made contact through electronic mail. Appointments were arranged with the campus sponsors to initiate the snowball identification of possible interview subjects.

At the conclusion of the meetings with the campus sponsors, I asked whom they would recommend I should interview next. From this question, a list of potential interviewees was drawn up. As each interview was conducted, this question was repeated to identify new interview candidates. Over time, this method resulted in repeat referrals to individuals at both campuses, which helped me determine when saturation was beginning to develop.

I made initial contact through electronic mail with each possible interview subject. Once contact was established and a time was set, I arranged to meet the subjects in their offices or laboratories to ensure their maximum comfort.

Conducting Interviews

My standard procedure was to introduce myself to the interview subject, discuss how I decided on this particular research subject, and explain the interview protocol and the tape-recording instruments to be used. After this introduction, the subject was asked to sign a participant consent form. Each participant was given a personal copy of the consent form, and I filed the signed consent form.

I began recording the interview upon completion of the informed consent signing. The interviews took between twenty minutes to eighty minutes. The shortest interview was fifteen minutes with the longest lasting one hundred minutes.

Each interview was based on standardized questions that aligned with the category of the subject (administrator or faculty). In the case where an administrator also taught classes in the grant programs, the subject was asked questions from both instruments. The questions for each instrument were designed to provide insight on the motivations of the subjects and learn how they perceived the grant programs' efficacy.

The Interview Instruments

Administrator Interview Questions

The interview questions for administrators were designed to ascertain their role within the relationship between the institutions and to assess their perceptions of how the cooperative programs functioned. The first question delved into reasons for establishing the program between the two institutions in order to gain historical perspective and assess any differences in motivation. The second, third, and fourth questions focused on how the administrators evaluate the programs, including their awareness of faculty participation and American Indian student perspectives. Depending on the interviewee responses, I would

sometimes ask between one to four questions for further clarification. The final interview question gave the administrators an opportunity to provide information pertinent to the study that was not covered by any of the previous questions. (See Appendix A for the administrator interview instrument.)

Faculty Interview Questions

The faculty questions were designed to ascertain their teaching motivations and their reasons for participating in the cooperative programs, their level of cross-cultural competency with regards American Indian populations, and the extent to which they accommodate the needs of the American Indian students in their classrooms and laboratories. The first two questions of the interview were designed to assess the motivation of the faculty, including the degree to which the faculty members volunteered for participation in the programs. The third question was intended to determine what preparation, if any, the faculty received to be cross-culturally competent with the American Indian students from Haskell. The next three questions were designed to examine faculty preconceptions of and interactions with American Indian students. The seventh question was designed to learn of any accommodations that the faculty made for the American Indian students in the program. The eighth question offered the faculty an opportunity to assess the effectiveness of Haskell efforts to prepare the students for the STEM fields. The final two questions were designed to determine the level of interfaculty cooperation to ensure student success. (See Appendix B for the faculty interview instrument.)

Data Analysis

I personally transcribed the completed interviews, then parsed the data using line-by-line analysis and a hand sort of the data-revealed themes. Using the methods recommended by Glaser and Strauss (1967), I coded these themes first axially and then co-axially.

I divided interview data based upon population category (administrator and faculty). The number of interviews completed for administrators was a total of eight. The total number of faculty interviews was eight. The total number of interviews was sixteen.

Initially, all interviews were examined through a key word/phrase search. This was the fundamental means of determining trends of thought within the grounded theory rubric (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003). These key phrases from the interviews were used to develop concepts about the perceptions of the partnership.

After the initial parsing of the data, I identified recurrent patterns of language use, which I divided into patterns of description. As the patterns of description from each population were clarified, I categorized statements by the particular aspect of the relationship that these phrases addressed. The first category contained the data that came out of both administrator and faculty interviews. The second category consisted of the data that arose solely from administrator interviews, while the third category was comprised of data from faculty interviews.

Limitations of These Methods

I identified three limitations to the methods used in this study. The first limitation was an overconcentration on administrator and faculty impressions of students; e.g., their evaluation of student performance. In essence, these questions were digressive in that they did not specifically address institutional factors of the relationship. Secondly, more questions

could have focused on intercampus communication. Finally, inclusion of questions concerning grant funding could have generated additional information about hierarchies within the intercampus relationship.

Chapter 4

Understanding Institutional Contexts

To understand how the relationship between the two campuses functions, it is necessary to learn about the two institutions' respective histories. Each brings to the relationship specific institutional imperatives that affect their perspectives on the world. These perspectives strongly influence what each institution seeks as outcomes from the relationship and determines how they interact with each other within it.

History of Haskell Indian Nations University

The origin of Haskell Indian Nations University is rooted in the efforts of the U.S. government to educate American Indians to serve as a labor force for its colonial expansion efforts. Founded in 1884 as the U.S. Indian Industrial Training School and later known as Haskell Institute, it was a federally controlled boarding school that offered primary, secondary, and vocational education (Vuckovic, 2008). Haskell Institute was named for U.S. Representative Dudley Haskell, who was responsible for obtaining the federal funding for an American Indian industrial institute and procuring the land for it. Haskell provided American Indian students agricultural and business skills based education that was primarily elementary and secondary level, with no provision for post-secondary education until well into the twentieth century. Because of its status as a BIA operation, Haskell's mission was to deculturalize the students and train them in manual labor that would befit their expected role in mainstream American society (King, 1988). As primarily a labor skills oriented institution, Haskell Institute served as a tool of the majority population to educate and acculturate American Indian students with a curriculum that removed their own cultural background and

replaced it with the morality and educational skills of the white colonizers of Kansas (Blackmar, 1912).

Beginning in the late twenties, Haskell Institute's curriculum began to change to incorporate post-secondary and higher education components. From 1930 to 1960, Haskell Institute slowly transformed its curricular focus from primary and secondary education to higher education. An examination of reports about Haskell from the late 1960s to the 1990s shows that the Haskell administration has been pursuing an evolutionary change of mission for nearly fifty years. These reports indicate that the evolution responded to the need expressed by the tribes for Haskell to provide more university disciplinary courses over the previous vocational trades classes (Characteristics and attitudes of 1968 Haskell Institute Students; Haskell Indian Junior College (1978); Haskell Indian Junior College (1988); Report of a visit to Haskell Indian Junior College (1989); Report of a visit to Haskell Indian Junior College (1991)). These reports note how the needs of students evolved, how the tribes that enroll students at Haskell asked the school to change its curriculum to better meet their needs, and how the Haskell administration met these needs through changes in accreditation over time. In the 1960s, the renamed Haskell Tribal College discontinued its secondary education program, concentrating instead on providing post-secondary educational curricula (Oppelt, 1990). Haskell received its charter as a junior college in 1970; with increased autonomy to serve the cultural needs of American Indians, it became a baccalaureate-granting institution in 1993 (Carney, 1999; Haskell, 2007). In the late 1990s, the school became a national resource, a clearinghouse for the American Indian community. This transformation has helped to establish Haskell, a former BIA boarding school, into a unique institution that services the whole American Indian community (Oppelt, 1990).

In the last decade, Haskell Indian Nations University has concentrated on providing American Indian students with university level academic training that encompasses arts and sciences, business, and education. Included in the disciplinary areas are classes on American Indian languages, indigenous cultural arts, and American Indian history, as well as courses that increase student understanding of tribal sovereignty issues (Haskell, 2007).

Therefore, from its origins to the present, Haskell has undergone two major shifts in mission: from secondary-level vocational preparation to university-level programs, and from deculturalization to cultural maintenance. This mission shift has followed national policies and politics vis-a-vis American Indians. Haskell is not, in that sense, as autonomous as a tribally controlled institution would be.

Definition of Terms

During the interview process, the respondents frequently used acronyms to refer to the different grant programs in which they have been involved over the last decade. To ensure that readers understand the different grants, definitions of the acronyms are provided (ODST Website notation).

- **500 Nations Bridge Program**
  The 500 Nations Bridge Program provides opportunities for students from Haskell Indian Nations University that facilitate their transition from Haskell to other universities, and thereby increases the number of students who complete degrees in the biomedical sciences. The program provides research experiences within laboratories of Kansas faculty. Students who are accepted into the program must be seeking an undergraduate degree in the biomedical sciences and have an interest in pursuing a career in biomedical research.

- **Initiative for Maximizing Student Development (IMSD)**
  The IMSD program provides support for undergraduate students at Kansas in the biomedically relevant fields. Major components of the program include student research experiences, enhancement programs in introductory science and math courses, and enrichment activities such as group seminars, faculty and peer

mentoring, and travel to scientific meetings.

- **Institutional Research and Academic Career Development Awards (IRACDA)** The IRACDA grant provides three years of support to postdoctoral fellows in various health-related research fields, preparing fellows for research and teaching careers in academia. The goals of the program are to enhance research skills by providing mentored research experiences while developing teaching skills through assignments that promote the advancement of under represented minorities. The IRACDA fellows conduct research at Kansas and become involved with teaching students from Haskell Indian Nations University.

- **Post-Baccalaureate Research Education Program (PREP)** Kansas PREP recruits talented students who have completed their baccalaureate degree from Haskell, Kansas, or elsewhere. These post-baccalaureate scholars complete a program of research, coursework and professional development that will prepare them to become highly competitive applicants to graduate school in biomedical disciplines.

- **Research Initiative for Scientific Enhancement (RISE) at Haskell Indian Nations University** The RISE project provides funding for student development, student research, faculty development, curriculum development and infrastructure development at Haskell Indian Nations University. The Kansas Office for Diversity in Science Training participates in several of these activities including the placement of Haskell students into Kansas faculty research labs for undergraduate research experiences.

Observations of the Haskell facilities. Many of the interviews that I conducted at Haskell took place in the classrooms of the faculty members in the STEM disciplines. Specifically, these interviews were held in Sequoyah Hall, the building in which many of the biology, chemistry, and mathematics classrooms and laboratories are located. Through these interviews *in situ*, I was able to assess the limitations that the Haskell facilities presented to the students and faculty who use them.

Upon entering Sequoyah Hall, I was immediately struck by how small it is. The south end of the building is where the laboratories are located, with some of the faculty offices

connected. The east side of the building is comprised of two computer laboratories and classrooms. The north end consists of a small space that houses some STEM faculty. The lighting in Sequoyah Hall was dim and appeared insufficient for conducting experiments, much of the laboratories' equipment appeared to be decades old, with signs of frequent usage by the students. In one laboratory, there was an older cathode-ray tube television on a cart with what appeared to be a videocassette recorder attached (the device may have also included a DVD player, but I am uncertain). There seemed to be a mix of both black- and whiteboards.

The rooms did not appear to contain any advanced equipment (no autoclaves, electron microscopes, high-speed centrifuges, etc.). The rooms were equipped with basic equipment to do basic analysis. An apt way of describing these laboratories is they are at an equivalent level of an average high school science laboratory. It would be difficult for Haskell students and faculty to do any type of advanced research with the facilities that they are provided.

Organizational climate at Haskell during the study. Data collection was collected during a tumultuous time at Haskell. The presidency at Haskell was vacant due to conflicts between the prior president and the Board of Regents. In the months immediately preceding data collection, the Haskell National Board of Regents, which is comprised of tribal leaders from throughout the United States based upon regions and a BIA representative, unanimously voted to remove the president and to install a senior Haskell administrator in an interim president position (Fagan, 2010).

The result of this disruption in leadership meant that Haskell could not make any major administrative decisions. This crisis had a profound effect on the faculty and administrators at Haskell. No one effectively advocated for Haskell's needs during this

vacuum. The situation was so disturbing that one of the U.S. senators from Kansas entered the process of presidential selection for Haskell. As one faculty member stated in the interviews,

> *Senator Roberts has been all over Haskell. [He] has had Echohawk [director of the Bureau of Indian Affairs] in his office. That's because of the president's position. We haven't had a president, I've lost track of how many years. So that's his top priority right now.*

Because of this leadership vacuum, relations between Haskell and KU have taken place at lower administrative levels.

Administrators and Faculty on Haskell's History and Purpose

Haskell administrators and faculty frequently spoke about Haskell's history especially in the context the treatment of American Indians. Awareness of this history motivates some Haskell administrators and faculty to center their efforts on the American Indian students they serve in this partnership.

Responsibility to Know Past History

One faculty member took the time to explain how the campus embodies the history of ill-treatment of American Indian boarding school students.

> *When Haskell opened 1884 to the late 1920s they forced the Indian kids. There's a cemetery down here with 150 graves, kids who died of sanitation diseases. There's a history here you have to understand. This building out here, right here, it is out here on this road, that's the old jail [where Indian students were punished]. In 1932, it was converted into a barbershop. You have to understand the history here. You have to understand the way Indian people view it. It's gone from a curse to an opportunity.*

And it has a history where kids were flogged here. They died of gunshot wounds, they died, they were electrocuted, they drowned. There is a history here that you have to respect. Every day the students that are here, they think about it. They really think about it.

In his response, it was possible to hear how he felt an obligation to be both an educator and protector of the students attending Haskell. It was also possible to hear how he approached the STEM program's partnership between Haskell and KU.

Intertribal University

Another theme that emerged from the interviews was Haskell's position as part of a tribal educational movement. A number of the respondents noted that Haskell is a tribal institution trying to meet the needs of many American Indian communities from around the United States.

Haskell is to meet tribal needs and concern. I'm going to give you a Haskell catalog so you can see that. That's what we are fighting for. We are fighting to address those needs.

Tribal College and University Advocacy

In addressing the needs of tribal entities throughout the United States, Haskell administrators and faculty see themselves as advocates for the newer tribal college and university institutions. One administrator stated:

Because the schools just received land-grant status, they were trying to work together. Tribal colleges were trying to work together to develop some type of professional, quasi-professional organization with the 1994 schools that they could come together and have a voice.

One administrator stated that if all the tribal colleges and universities could work together, they could more effectively advocate for their needs with regards federal funding agencies.

> *If minority institutions can develop a cohort to work directly with the funding agencies, that might improve relationships and understanding.*

Another faculty member corroborated this emphasis by relating how a colleague from another campus reminded the National Science Foundation (NSF) about the mission of the tribal colleges and how these differ from the mission of the federal funding agencies.

> *The president of the school [said] to the science faculty that was there, they kept on telling the NSF and the big schools "we have our own mission, people." We have to address what our needs are. Every time we get into Office of Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (EPSCoR) stuff, we're addressing your needs to have a wider diversity workplace, workforce. Our needs are, we have environmental issues on the reservation. I wish I had my hands on it right away so I could show this letter that David Giff wrote. He's president of United Tribes, a college up there in Bismarck. He wrote an absolutely stunning, simple letter to the NSF on behalf of the tribal colleges. "We have our own mission, our own needs. We do not need Great Father on the hill telling us what we need."*

A Place of Safety

A final theme directly related to Haskell's history and mission is how the institution works to ensure the students feel safe. The concept of safety mentioned by the Haskell administrators and faculty encompasses how the campus provides a home for the students, how the school responds to the responsibility entrusted to it by the tribes, and how faculty respects American Indian knowledge in the classroom.

One administrator pointed out that because Haskell is a minority-serving institution, it creates a majority experience for the students enrolled. The critical mass of American Indians - the fact that they are the numerical majority at Haskell – makes the school a place of safety for the students.

> *So those of us who have been in minority-serving institutions our whole lives, we're keenly aware of the role we play because we know we are creating spaces where people—whether Latino, Asian American, whether African American, American Indian, Alaska Native—you come to Haskell; you're not a minority. We're an all-Native school.*

A faculty member explains in his response that Haskell's mission is to ensure the students entrusted to the university are given sufficient support. He describes how the campus may have the responsibility of educating a solitary hope for a tribal group:

> *That's really a dilemma, especially when you are dealing with small communities of people, small Indian communities of people, maybe a small reservation like the San Carlos reservation down in Arizona or the Mission [Indians] in California. Their populations are so low; you only have a few kids. If they send them here, they really hope that this kid is going to do something and come back and help. And some cases, it may be the tribe's only hope in terms of having a professional. There's this constant battle that we have to constantly fight in terms of trying to get these kids through. Not that we bend over backwards to give them grades, but we have to do much more one-on-one teaching to help us focus on the academic disadvantages that the student has, like say writing skills, communication skills, and trying to build that up. They can*

master the material, but they may not be able to really communicate that mastery in a standard academic setting.

Another faculty noted that interactions with students regarding tribal knowledge had to include not only an appreciation for tribal practices but also respect for limits on sharing with outsiders.

One of the things we are supposed to do here is to incorporate Indian-related material. I don't do a great job of that. There wasn't much Indian, Native American chemistry. There is some: dyes, for example, and tanning, pottery, what temperature do you fire at, etc. But it was not an organized study. One has to be very careful, if you're in a different tribe or if you're not Native, in asking students about things like dyes. I had a student working the lab once, and she and I got along really well. She was a lab assistant. She was one day talking about tanning. I thought Oh here's…I'll ask her about tanning and I'll work that into my classes. What kind of materials do you tan with? Well, she was giving me very vague answers, and I thought maybe she doesn't know what the proper terms are, she only knows her Native terms. Well, after some – well I wasn't trying to grill her; after a little bit of talking about this, she finally said, "You know, this is a tribal secret." So I just backed off immediately. If I can get students to share with me, information about their culture, then I'll work that into classes.

In the identified themes (responsibility to know the past, inter-tribal university, tribal college and university advocacy, and a place of safety), it is possible to see the degree to which the Haskell administrators and faculty make efforts to be culturally aware and respectful.

History of the University of Kansas.

Founded in 1866 as a state land grant institution (Griffin, 1966), KU was mandated to provide post-secondary education to the white population of the state of Kansas (In 1865, Kansas established Western University at Quindaro to serve the state's black population (Walker-Hill, 2006)). Its mission was to serve the needs of the state as determined by the state legislature and to instill students with a strong moral education. Originally directed to provide education that covered a general curriculum, over time KU developed a broader curriculum that included normal education, engineering, law, and medicine (Blackmar, 1912). Currently, KU is classified under the Carnegie classifications as a research university with very high research activity (RU/VH) (Office of Diversity in Science Education, 2006). As such, its primary goal is to perform research that assists with the social, cultural, agricultural, industrial, and economic development of the state of Kansas. The state of Kansas can be broadly defined as the government representing the interests of the numerical majority populations (which is European in cultural background and Christian in religious background). These majority interests generally focus on providing for the needs of the numerical majorities to the exclusion of the needs of the minority ethic, racial and religious populations. KU works closely with the state government and in partnership with various corporations and industries to develop research programs that concentrate on state interests in business, engineering, the law, and general education. Additionally, KU generally develops undergraduate and graduate student curricula around these identified research interests.

Because of this strong emphasis on meeting the needs of the state and tacitly, therefore, the needs of the demographic majority, research universities with very high research activity have not been known to respond quickly to the needs of minority

populations (Lewis & Hearn, 2003). In fact, the case can be made that until the mid-twentieth century, research universities generally were hostile to accommodating minority populations and strongly resistant to working with minority institutions (Lucas, 1994). The realm of U.S. higher education was divided and stratified by race, and the majority considered this to be a kind of natural order. With the civil rights movement of the 1960s, however, the racial structure of U.S. society was revealed as a malleable (albeit very slow) social construction. All public colleges and universities were forced to desegregate and to become more receptive to the inclusion of minorities within their walls and to cooperating with minority communities and institutions (Mihesuah, 2004). Incentives for this were provided through federal and foundation funding for minority recruitment and retention programs. This historical development can be demonstrated by the way in which KU has opened its doors to working more closely with Haskell during the last decade.

Observations of the KU Facilities

The interviews with the KU administrators and faculty took place in departmental, museum, and laboratory settings. The variety of facilities available at the Lawrence campus is very similar to those available at other research flagship universities, and vastly superior to the facilities at Haskell.

The departmental settings involved a facility not too dissimilar to those on any university campus. Some floors contained classrooms and a reference library, while others housed professors' offices. The building contained no laboratories, as it was dedicated primarily to classroom instruction.

The museum served as a workspace for an interviewee who is a post-doctoral Institutional Research and Academic Career Development Awards (IRACDA) fellow. On the

two lower floors, displays of avian, mammalian, and reptilian taxidermy specimens were set in diorama displays that represented their habitats. The natural history displays were equivalent to any large city museum in quality and presentation. The interview was conducted on one of the building's upper floors, in which office space, specimen preparation, and storage existed in close proximity. After the interview with the post-doctoral fellow, I was given a tour to show the high quality of the science facilities available to students and researchers at KU.

The laboratory interviews took place in two different facilities. The first facility was a high-rise building that contained many research labs dedicated to both basic and advanced research. Each floor was devoted to a specific scientific research area (i.e. one floor appeared to be dedicated solely to microbiology, another to chemistry, etc.). It was clearly evident that the students and researchers in this facility had access too much more advanced equipment than Haskell possessed. Another laboratory interview took place on the new West Campus extension of KU, which is similar in concept to Discovery Ridge at the University of Missouri. Unlike any other facility in which interviews were conducted, at this location I had to sign in with a security desk, identifying which laboratory I was going to in the building and with whom I was meeting. This facility was very impressive in both architecture and the equipment that could be used to conduct research. Overall, I could easily see how much more training and research would be available to Haskell students participating in the STEM grant programs at KU than what Haskell is able to offer.

KU Respondents about their Institutional Motivations

Participant's Departmental Culture

The participation of the KU interviewees in the partnership with Haskell is rooted in the academic departmental disciplines. The goal of the administrators and faculty is to ensure a pipeline of minority students into the STEM fields. This is evident in how they recruit students from Haskell and the ethnic minority student populations at KU. This can be seen in the responses of the administrators and faculty and how this is presented in the annual Office of Diversity in Science Training newsletter.

Developing a Pipeline for Minorities into the Sciences

The KU respondents noted the importance of selecting the appropriate students to participate in the STEM grant programs. The administrators stated in the interviews that they viewed recruiting at Haskell as a challenge:

> *One of the challenges being, identifying the appropriate number of students to participate in the programs. Realize that Haskell is a relatively small school, with an enrollment of about a thousand students, and start paring that down to, let's say the students who are in the sciences, you get to a smaller group….We are searching for students who are in the sciences and not interested in graduate school. So we want to develop interest in research, and many of the students have interests that are either with professional programs such as dental, nursing, or public health and so on. It's not that we totally exclude those individuals, because [they] could incorporate the research into those careers – but simply saying by the time you get down to the number of students who may be directly interested in research in the sciences, it becomes not a huge number of students.*

This administrator notes that they are particular in identifying Haskell students who are interested in science curriculum specifically. This is to comply with the parameters of the grants, in which the grants are trying to develop a pipeline of minority students to enter the STEM research fields. The administrator's statement about discouraging those looking to enter the professions indicates a strong desire to be clear with the students at the beginning of their interest in applying for the grants. These non-pipeline students are acknowledged, but are not given a great deal of encouragement to pursue their professional interests. The administrator goes on to explain that though there is active discouragement of those seeking entry into the professions, the program is not averse to providing some guidelines to help the students find more appropriate avenues to develop their career interests.

> *We recruited them to go to graduate school and they've decided they would rather go to dental school, or vet school or going into some other area. We try to tell that, no, that's fine. You have to do what's right for you. If you aren't going to be happy doing research, you aren't going to be doing a good job with it. It's best to move into what you're interested in. We certainly don't bring any student into the program. We try to filter students who come into the program who have the inclination to test whether research is something they might be interested in.*

Preparation for the Disciplines

Both KU administrators and faculty identified preparing for the STEM disciplines as a goal of all the joint partnership programs. They indicated that the programs are designed to give the students sufficient preparation to excel at any graduate program in the nation and the minority pipeline development interest of the STEM fields.

One administrator notes that the preparation provided in the programs is career oriented.

> *You are asking me if KU prepares undergraduates to do a career in research in STEM disciplines. I would say that we have a really open admission policy at KU and we have admitted students with a wide range of skills. I think that you can graduate from KU without being prepared at all to go to graduate school or you can graduate from KU being prepared to go to Harvard and do very well. It's a wide range and it depends on a lot of factors, what could happen and how that could be navigated. So I want to say all of our students do well in the STEM disciplines.*

Another administrator described the various steps that KU takes to support students in the STEM fields.

> *So as an office of the program, we recruit all the students, figure out what they are interested in, match them with a faculty member so that they have the research experience that would be essential for them to be exposed to the environment which they're probably going to go through as a grad student. In addition to that we provide other support, academic support. We try as much as possible to provide help for our students so that they succeed and do very well in their courses. You have to have a good GPA to get into a good PhD program.*

The support provided by the KU side of the programs involves skill development and mentoring. In addition, KU provides students the opportunity to develop the skills necessary to present research in the STEM fields. Students are encouraged to submit their undergraduate research for publication and for conference presentations.

Our students are very prolific. We have students who crank out or produce publications every couple years or so – or sometimes yearly depending on how productive they are or how conducive to publication their fields are. We provide support to conferences as I mentioned, and they can present their work to their peers and to other individuals within their discipline. We also encourage them to be able to present their work within the science community between KU and Haskell. So every April we have the KU-Haskell research symposium, where we encourage students in my program as well as the students from BRIDGE and other programs over at Haskell to present any research they have. And that would be good training for them for graduate school.

Thus preparing undergraduate student for full participation in the STEM fields is an important facet of KU's programs.

Faculty Goals for the Program

The faculty focus on the disciplines motivates them to develop within students a similar passion for their disciplines. The KU faculty takes an active role in encouraging student interest in the subject matter and developing the skill sets necessary to further their graduate academic work or careers in the STEM fields.

An administrator commented on how faculty use laboratory research as a means to excite students about science.

Getting the students in their lab is, I would say, very good work …. They get to train students who are interested in their research, and [in] most cases the students… involved in research are really good help, they are conscientious with their work.

They are passionate about research …. So the faculty know or are aware that the programs help them get students in their lab.

Another administrator points out that faculty sometimes become involved with recruitment of Haskell students into the grant programs when the students demonstrate interest in the classroom.

For example, they have students in the classes they are teaching who become interested in research and [go] up to them and say, " I would like to be involved in your lab. I find your lab or your research interesting." And they happen to be a target group. Faculty would send them to me, and I would see if they are eligible to become part of our program, and that's [how] collaboration with the faculty and the students start.…I think the faculty are very much aware that KU does have a lot of these opportunities for research for undergraduate students.

A key component of the disciplinary focus of the programs on the KU side is providing students with the fundamental skills they need to work successfully within laboratory situations. One faculty member discussed the process of training students to help them feel comfortable in the research and work settings they will be assigned.

Every summer I teach a research in science methods class. It is Biology 418. This is a laboratory training course intended for students who are participants of the BRIDGE program. The whole purpose of the course, and we do this prior to the start of the summer semester, is to train all the students in labs. So I go through the process of scientific methods, the merits of keeping good records. And we do experiments, very basic experiments, the ones [that]are common in most molecular labs or statistics or things like that, so the students would have a general idea of what a lab is, how to

conduct themselves in a lab, how to proceed and develop an experiment and complete an experiment. It is a very brief training. Sometimes it [is] sufficient for the students to gain confidence that they could walk into a lab and actually know what a pipette is or any other equipment that is commonly used in a lab.

Another important component is the development of ethical standards in science research. One faculty stated that he expects the Haskell students who enroll in his course on scientific ethics to have an intrinsic interest in the subject matter due to the history of unethical experimentation on racial minorities.

My expectations are that academically they'll be just as capable of meeting the requirements of the course as the KU students. One additional expectation I have is that they might, on average, be a little more sympathetic to the way in which issues of… ethics in scientific research can arise in connection with groups who have historically suffered discrimination. One of the things we talk about in my course is human experimentation, and in that category, one of the things we talk about is the Tuskegee experiments. Although that was done, the subjects there, as I understand it, were African Americans rather than American Indians. That is just an example where in the past scientific research has been harmful to underserved populations rather than helping them. And I would assume even though that example is not about American Indians, any American Indian student in my class would be more able to appreciate that ethical issue than the average KU student, who would be, on average, White.

The focus on developing both ethical and practical skills in the STEM programs further support the disciplinary focus that KU approaches the implementation of the partnership.

Publications about Departmental Disciplinary Efforts

The disciplinary focus of the KU partnership is observable in the Office of Diversity in Science Training newsletters produced from 2004 to 2012. In each of these newsletters, Haskell student recruitment is enumerated. Haskell students and their KU faculty mentors are highlighted with respect to the research they are performing.

In one newsletter (ODST, 2007), a Haskell student who transferred to KU is interviewed. In this interview, she emphasized her involvement with both curricular and co-curricular activities in the STEM grant programs in her academic development.

The Power of Language to Influence the Construction of a Relationship

Throughout the interviews, one peculiar language usage emerged that appeared to reveal how the actors in the partnership actually view their campuses in relation to each other. On both campuses, interviewees utilized the terms 'up there/up here' when speaking of KU and 'down there/down here' when referring to Haskell. The term was used most often in the context of personnel and academic resources, sometimes when comparing Haskell's operations with KU's, at other times, to describe activities taking place on either of the campuses.

Statements made by both administrators and faculty were analyzed to determine how this language usage reflects the two campuses' respective views of their grants partnership. The responses then were examined from the institutional and tribal critical race theory perspectives.

Haskell administrators. Haskell administrators employed 'up/down' in their responses far more frequently than KU administrators. In the first example, a Haskell administrator described a joint event that takes place in the context of the partnership.

We also jointly hold a research symposium here at Haskell in the spring. Again, we invite all these [KU] mentors to come down and see if they have a [Haskell] student in their class and see what the students are doing in their lab.

In the next example, the administrator discusses the employment of a KU staff member to assist with the grant program at Haskell.

We have hired a young lady that worked at KU. And she is helping to develop this plus biology program down here.

The next administrator use of 'up/down' terminology indicates that KU and Haskell have both used grant funding.

It [access to the grant funds/overhead] doesn't take that long at KU when our money is up there, but now that the money is down here….

There are some other programs here at Haskell that work up at KU….

I think Haskell could do a better job of coordinating on campus the programs here and up at KU…. One of the benefits of our relationship with KU is that because we don't have all the bells and whistles, we have, the students realize a lot of value with our partnerships up at KU.

Another administrator used the terminology while discussing a KU staff member's involvement with Haskell students.

She does outreach to all the Native students up there and invites them up and talks about things going on that would be of interest to Native students. She comes down here on a regular basis and spends the afternoon.

In each of the above examples, Haskell administrators use 'up' to refer to the KU campus, and 'down' refers to their own university. In most of the above cases, access to the superior resources at KU seems to be the primary context in which this language is used.

KU administrators. In the examination of all the KU administrator transcripts, only one instance of the 'up/down' terminology appeared. In this case, the administrator described Haskell as being 'up.'

> *This program allows/requires these post-docs to teach several classes up at Haskell's campus.*

This difference in the use of 'up,' to describe Haskell rather than KU, suggests that this reference is only geographical in nature and rather than indicating a partnership hierarchy.

Haskell faculty. Out of all four populations (Haskell and KU administrators and Haskell and KU faculty), the use of 'up/down' terminology in the partnership is most prevalent from the Haskell faculty. In the following examples, it is possible to see a pattern arising.

> *A lot of [Haskell] faculty went to KU [as students]. I was not one of them. So they were familiar with the faculty up there and were anxious to bring some of those resources down here…. We have had several calls down here since we have had those successful efforts with people wanting to do more tokenism. Nothing is more irritating than that, and we just refuse to cooperate right away. Because a lot of people up there do not know, have not learned how to have a true bipartisan relationship.*

Another Haskell faculty member used 'up/down' terminology while discussing a post-undergraduate supplemental program at KU.

So if we have a student here who is doing research in a lab and they transfer up to KU, they could do research in the same lab under the IMSD program. Then there's the PREP program. It is basically two years after college in preparation of getting into graduate school. So if you feel – let's say you've gone to Haskell, and you feel you haven't had enough of a particular area, you can take courses for a couple of years and do research and then apply to graduate school. That's based up at KU, but a lot of our students have been the students in PREP.

Another faculty member employed the term 'down' in comparison of staffing discrepancies between KU and Haskell.

Now the RISE grant, one reason I didn't want to be involved with it when the renewal came around was the president at that time wanted the grant to be down here. Well, no one down here really knows how to handle grants….

We don't have that many PhDs down here.

Another faculty used the term 'up' while discussing the obstacles American Indian students confront at KU.

Those [Haskell students] who have succeeded [at KU] were very, very good. They had to go beyond the typical academic standards that are in coursework or even research. So they had to overprove themselves just to stick it out up there….

Then we have to figure out how to get the students to work with either the faculty or the people on the administrative side up there that help, that really basically help control how the STEM, like RISE and BRIDGE, work. When we first started sending students up there…we just spent a lot of time counseling, just being father or mother or priest or uncle. Just trying to get them through the racism that's there. Not just the

racism. It's not that we have low expectations. It's just that if somebody is identified as Indian, there seems to be, like I was saying, they have to rise to a higher standard because you have to prove yourself.

Later on, the same faculty member related an incident in which a KU faculty member, who does not have cross-cultural competency skills, basically violated cross-cultural communication expectations by exercising majority privilege in a minority context.

And I think what the guy did was disrespectful, but up in the regular university setting, it's not. This is how you talk down to people. Because they sit up there on the hill.

In this faculty member's comments about intercampus trust, he mentioned that KU misrepresents itself in grant reports.

They had in this grant some of the most outlandish facts we had ever seen. "We've got 60 Native Americans in the sciences" up there. We were saying, "No you don't. You don't have 60 Native Americans up there in the sciences. You might have six at the most, right now."

He further emphasized that KU employs tokenism in the relationship to further improve its image within the context of the grants.

We don't have a very good working relationship because they just – I know I've been up there several times in workshops, and they just kind of treated us as a number, like they are getting credit for having a Native American faculty member up there or something. And that's really disappointing….

There's always been, in my experience, a patronizing attitude that they take with the faculty down here.

Another Haskell faculty member used the term ‘up’ while discussing a Haskell student who transferred to KU within the context of the grant programs.

> *He was interested in going into engineering. He got As in a lot or maybe all of his courses here at Haskell and when he was – I can’t remember up to what level, maybe even calculus – but he transferred and was accepted in pre-calc up at KU. He was in my pre-calc program that second semester when I was teaching [both] there and here, and I worked with him, I was on campus four or five hours a day, so I probably worked directly with him two hours a day, every day of the semester. I still gave him an F.*

Another faculty member mentioned ‘up/down’ terminology to describe a student exchange program between the two campuses.

> *So say thirty students come down to Haskell and thirty students can go up to KU, something along those lines. That’s the KU/Haskell exchange program.*

He also explained that Haskell and KU professors frequently serve as guest speakers on each other’s campuses.

> *We have to liaison with the folks up on the hill…. There’s a lot of guest speakers that seem like there is an unending supply of guest speakers for us to draw on here at Haskell. To some degree, I think that goes both ways. I know that Dan Wildcat has gone up there to speak.*

The final Haskell faculty comment used ‘down’ terminology to describe the benefits that accrue from the joint relationship.

> *The grants obviously benefit us down here, with supplies, equipment, opportunities for faculty development.*

KU faculty. KU faculty used the terms 'up/down' in a variety of ways, most often in descriptions of activities in which faculty and students participate. One faculty member, who has enjoyed joint appointments at both campuses, was fluid in his use of 'up/down,' although he primarily employed 'down' to describe Haskell and 'up' to describe KU.

> *[I] came down [to Haskell] and was hired to teach ecology and taught for a couple of years… [then] went back up and taught for a couple of years at KU and then taught a little bit at both places.*

In the following example, he discussed his interaction with American Indian student at Haskell and compared their experiences on the KU campus.

> *I think that every time I've actually worked with students [at Haskell] we actually published something, which is not the case for most of the students that go up to KU…. If I'm going to work with the students, I get some research done so I have something to do with the student. Which from what I can hear is not what many of the students experience when they go up to the other side of town to do the lab work…. You hear about students being mentored up there and sometimes you're left with the feeling that the student's not really being mentored. Some [KU professors] are simply trying to say they mentored diversity students, so they take some into their lab [and] they sit there and don't do anything. You definitely rarely hear of a person up at KU who is willing to put in what I think is necessary time to actually mentor a student up to the next level.*

Another KU faculty member used the terms in his explanation of the differences he perceived between the universities.

As far as the faculty at Haskell, there's not a lot of interaction with them down there. I think they're busy enough. You know, … this is the first time they've had Native post-docs around. And they've got just these three of us. I think they view it as a resource, but we're not. They view us as a train passing in the night. So they are not going to get that invested in us. So I don't feel like I've gotten any training or insight from any of the faculty down there. I hope that doesn't come across as me being arrogant and unreceptive to that kind of thing. I know some of the faculty down there very well.

In another comment, he described what he perceives to be the lack of resources and academic rigor at Haskell.

Despite all this money and these resources going into the relationship, there's some structural problems down there at Haskell that I think are limiting.…

And the academic mission down at Haskell is different than most universities in that they often have to spend a fair amount of time training students up. A huge amount of resources go into just getting math up to snuff, to college level. The number of math faculty down there is huge in proportion to the rest of the science faculty. It's a little jaw-dropping on that front. Part of that is because it has a broader mission than most universities. So that was my classroom [experience] was that their elite students down there, a lot of them don't know how to use the system to navigate to reach their full academic potential.

In relating an incident that occurred at Haskell, this KU faculty member emphasized the impact that one individual can have within the administrative structures at the school

It shows what a small little pond down there, how that can be spoiled by one little problem. But it also shows the potential aspect of it where you as an individual can have a huge impact on the whole program down there.

Analysis of the Use of Up and Down in the Partnership between Haskell and KU

The use of the terms 'up/down' among the respondents to the study indicates three types of usage: geographical, attitudes toward the campuses, and descriptions of capability.

The geographical use of the terms indicates a description of physical location. If one is familiar with Lawrence, Kansas, the geographical use is an appropriate descriptor as to where each campus is situated. On the south end of town, Haskell is situated on a broad plain. In the central part of town, KU sits on Mt. Oread about 300 feet higher than Haskell. Therefore, in a strict geographical sense, the use of 'up/down' is appropriate.

The use of 'up/down' to describe the faculty relationship between the two can be analyzed from the tribal critical race theory perspective. In this case, particularly from the Haskell faculty side, 'up' seems to indicate those who possess discriminatory attitudes toward Haskell students and faculty, whether from a patronizing mindset or from a colonial perspective. KU uses 'up' as unconscious sense of superiority, 'down' to indicate inferiority. KU faculty employ discriminatory attitudes to Haskell in general.

The final use of 'up/down,' to describe the varying capabilities of the different campuses, can be examined through institutional theory. In this case, one partner due to larger resources simply has more capabilities to perform duties within the relationship.

Tribal Critical Race and Institutional Theories – History and Purpose

The findings, based upon the observations of the participants and the historical contexts of the institutions, analyzed through both tribal critical race and institutional theories indicate that two factors explain the operational perspectives of the respective campuses.

From the Haskell side of the relationship, there is an effort to 'decolonize their methods.' In a vein similar to Smith's (1999) research that asks the researcher to make indigenous culture and persons the center from which to analyze how they are examining American Indian data in both a contemporary and historical setting, it is possible to attribute to the statements of the Haskell administrators and faculty that they have decolonized their perspectives on how to structure the Haskell curriculum and services for American Indian students. In the evolution of Haskell from a labor-training institute to a university over the last few decades, it is possible to see a change from the deculturalization of the American Indian students to curriculum that is indigenously focused (e.g. indigenous language instruction and the teaching of native histories). In the statements of the administrators and faculty about the purpose of Haskell (a national university that is responsive to the needs of American Indian tribes and people), it is possible to infer that they have 'decolonized' their methods to be indigenous centric.

From the KU side of the relationship, the normative strand of institutional theory from Meyer and Rowan provides a sense of what is happening with the curriculum and services provided (1977). The emphasis in developing appropriate skills and knowledge through the program suggests that the KU administrators and faculty are trying to conform to the disciplines in which they instruct. In an effort to conform to the respective disciplinary standards (whether these be in the laboratory, the grant funding organization, or the academic

rigor of the particular STEM field), the administrators and faculty are trying to ensure that the minority students in the programs understand what is expected of them in the new academic realm they are entering. The students' success or failure will be assessed on how well they complete tasks that are assigned to them within the disciplines they choose.

In examining the two driving motivations that the two institutions are using as the foundation for their behavior, it is possible to see a divergence in the relationship. As indicated in one Haskell interview response, KU's insistence to adhere to the pipeline initiatives of the disciplines (increasing minority representation in the STEM fields) is in direct opposition to the tribal college mission of Haskell (to support the educational efforts of the tribes). If Haskell were to surrender to simply follow the pipeline initiatives, they would be possible participating in a tribal brain drain in which American Indian students do not return to the tribes to help their communities address problems on the reservations.

Chapter 5

Administrators and the Grants Partnership

This chapter will share the findings from the administrator interviews. The interview questions for administrators were designed to ascertain their roles within the Haskell-KU relationship and assess their perceptions of how the cooperative STEM programs function. The first question delved into reasons for establishing the programs between the two institutions in order to gain a historical perspective and assess any institutional difference in motivations or intentions. The second, third and fourth questions looked into how the administrators evaluate the programs and their general understanding of how the programs work together. The next set of questions gauged how responsive the administrators of the programs are to student needs. The penultimate question determined administrators' awareness of faculty participation in the grant programs. The final interview question gave the administrators an opportunity to provide any additional information they felt would be pertinent to the study. (See Appendix A.)

The Administrators

The special relationship between Haskell and KU in the STEM grant-funded programs is managed by a number of administrators and staff members who work to ensure its maintenance. Initially, I thought the relationship was a monolithic construction that began a long time ago due to propinquity. These interviews proved that the partnership's origins and support structures were much more complex than they appeared.

The administrators from both campuses provided responses that were generally convergent in perspective. Throughout the interviews, the administrators on both sides

tended to have similar observations of the relationship, offering very little critique of how the partnership functions.

For the purpose of this study, the definition of administrator is very broad. The lead administrators tend to come from the higher levels of the campus hierarchies, holding such position as department chairs or vice president of academic affairs. In each of the sections in this chapter, the lead administrators will be cited first followed by the support administrators. Support administrators vary from lead administrators in that they work directly with the students and faculty to ensure the day-to-day operation of the grant programs runs smoothly. These individuals make sure that all the administration of the grants are attended to, that faculty understand how the students are placed, and that the students complete all necessary tasks to qualify for continued participation in the grant programs.

First I will provide an overview of the administrative positions and structures relevant to the grant partnership. Then the interview findings will be presented in thematic sections. The following themes will be used to compare and contrast the perspectives of the administrators interviewed.

- administrator backgrounds
- Haskell's mission
- evolution of institutional relations
- establishing a pipeline to the STEM fields
- institutional responses to federal compliance
- congruence in the partnership

In each of the thematic sections, the Haskell administrators will be analyzed first.

Haskell Administrators

The administrative structure at Haskell is very compact in comparison to that at PWIs. In part, of course, this is a function of size. At Haskell, one administrator may hold many responsibilities that are divided among several individuals at KU. In some cases, administrators overseeing the grant operations at Haskell also serve as faculty. Four administrators were interviewed at Haskell. One individual fulfills the role of primary academic officer of the campus, one is a department chair and two serve as support administrators. I identified the primary academic officer and the department chair as lead administrators. Because of their direct responsibilities with grant implementation, I assigned the other two individuals to the support administrator roles.

KU Administrators

The administrative structure at KU for the grant programs is very different from the structure at Haskell. The administrators interviewed at KU do not have the same roles as their counterparts at Haskell. The participants in this set of interviews were:

Keystone Administrator: This person was appointed by the KU provost to establish the cooperative program between Haskell and KU. During the interview, this individual provided significant insight into the status of the institutions' relationship before and after the grant programs were established.

Lead Administrator: Two lead administrators participated in this interview process. The lead administrators supervise the Office of Diversity in Science Training.

Support Administrator: This individual oversees the day-to-day operation of one of the grant programs.

In the analysis of the themes, the administrators will only be identified with respect to the campus on which they work. They will not be identified by the roles that they fulfill, as that would jeopardize participant confidentiality.

Administrator Backgrounds

To fully understand the respondents' answers, it is necessary to acknowledge their educational and professional backgrounds. Knowledge of the professional backgrounds of the administrators can provide insight into their attitudes towards institutional priorities and meeting disciplinary objectives. This analysis may also indicate how the administrators approach the relationship within the context of both tribal critical race and institutional theories. Additionally, this analysis may suggest the reasons why some practices are viewed favorably by the administrators versus the faculty in the following chapter.

Haskell Administrator Backgrounds

In the case of Haskell, two administrators are alumni of KU; one completed a doctorate, while the other earned baccalaureate and master's degrees. As alumni, the administrators could possibly hold very positive perspectives of KU and could suspend any critical judgment about KU's intentions with regards the intercampus relationship.

One administrator, who is an American Indian, related in his interview:

I was in the military, served two years in the U.S. army. I got out in '74 and decided to use the GI bill. And because I had the GI Bill, I thought-"I'm not going to Haskell, I'm going to KU." At that time, Haskell was just offering associate of arts degrees and science degrees. I thought, "well, I'm going someplace where I can start working on a bachelor's degree," and went there and did my undergraduate work, later did my masters work, and was going to do my PhD work.

In other words, this Haskell administrator elected not to attend Haskell because at the time it was not a four-year college and going there may have limited his graduate school options. An online biography of another administrator interviewed for this study showed that this individual obtained two advanced degrees from KU:

> *Dr. A1 holds a Master of Social Work and a Doctor of Philosophy in Social Work from the University of Kansas.*

Therefore, these two senior administrators at Haskell are both graduates of KU. They both indicated in the interviews that they continue to look at KU as a resource they can tap into.

The other two administrators did not complete degrees at KU and did not indicate their educational backgrounds in their interviews.

The life experiences of the Haskell administrator interviewees indicated a strong connection to American Indian concerns – some possessed American Indian heritage or had worked closely with tribal organizations prior to their employment at Haskell. Two of the administrators are of tribal backgrounds. The most senior administrator who participated in the study "*belongs to the Prairie Band Potawatomi Nation and the Kickapoo Tribe and participates regularly in local tribal issues.*" The other administrator stated in his interview:

> *My tribal affiliation is a Euchee member of the Maskoke Nation, Tso Ya Ha of the Euchee people. [We] are a very small people that are not independently recognized as a people, "capital P," but are recognized as a part of the Muskogee or Creek Nation and yet linguistically we're different and unique. But we are recognized politically as part of Creek Nation*.

Because of this ethnic background, these two administrators have a great capacity to both understand the needs of the American Indian students who attend Haskell and to advocate for tribal sovereignty issues.

The other two administrators are not tribal in background but do possess some experience that helps them to work within the context of the Haskell and KU partnership. One administrator has lived in areas of the country that have high minority representation:

> *I was basically born and raised in Ohio, in a mostly a White culture. When I was in upper elementary school, my family moved to Arizona. It was a total change out there. We lived in the Phoenix area, Tempe, for the first year. Then we moved to Glendale. And so my first real interaction with minorities was Hispanics. And I lived in Arizona until I got married, and we moved to northern New Mexico. Very small community. My husband did work for the U.S. Forest Service. So we always lived in small rural communities until we came here. Over the years, I've lived in Arkansas, South Dakota, and Arizona and New Mexico. So I've been exposed to varying degrees of minority interrelationships in the community.*

Due to a great deal of exposure early in life to other races, this person may have a heightened awareness of cultural aspects of the Haskell/KU partnership. The other administrator interviewed did not indicate any significant background with regards to working with ethnic minorities.

KU Administrator Backgrounds

In the case of the KU interviews, one administrator spoke about her background.

> *I come from a family in science. My dad is a doctor; my mom was a chemist. I was always a very good student early on, and then I went for high school, I went to a*

magnet school in science. So I mean … I always had opportunities. I have a very good classics background, solid background, very good opportunities and availability to things. So I understand how it would be if you have nothing…. What it is to understand how you can make it without having opportunity. And I think it is also possible to understand people who have had this other type of background.... I have a solid science background.

In this response, this individual indicates that she is aware of having had great opportunities in life and is willing to work with others to share her knowledge. Additionally, it is possible to see that she possesses empathy for others who have not had the same access to education she has had. It seems evident that science is a strong source of identity for this administrator. The other three KU administrators did not mention any background information that could aid understanding their approach to the partnership between the two campuses.

Haskell and KU: Life Experiences

Based upon the two sets of responses, it is possible that Haskell administrators who are graduates of KU might hold a favorable opinion of KU's intentions within the partnership. Their background may indicate a desire to emulate KU's operations at Haskell. In the case of the Haskell administrator who did not graduate from KU, her background working in places with large minority representation may suggest that she possesses a cultural sensitivity that transfers to her work within the STEM grants partnership.

The science background of the KU administrator quoted above indicates that she may bring to the relationship a strong grounding in the STEM fields as well as some empathy to others (such as students from Haskell) who have not had her opportunities. This suggests that she would likely view KU participation in the partnership as positive attempts to improve the

opportunity for American Indian students to study a discipline that she highly values. Understanding these backgrounds sets the stage for exploring the observations of the respective sets of administrators have of how the partnership has developed over time.

Haskell's Mission

Administrator perspectives on Haskell's mission (the curriculum, campus responsibility to the students, and the overall responsibility of the institution to the greater American Indian community) might also indicate intentions for the partnership. In the responses provided by the Haskell administrators, it may be possible to see how they see the mission and their role in fulfilling the mission as the key reason for the relationship. Through the perspectives of the KU administrators, it is possible to see whether they respect Haskell efforts to meet their mission or not.

Haskell Administrator Perspectives on Haskell's Mission

One key aspect of Haskell's mission is its service to the greater American Indian community in the United States. The mission is comprised of two specific components described in the administrator responses: service to the American Indian community and acting as a role model for other American Indian institutions. In the case of outreach to the greater American Indian community, the administrators discussed how Haskell has developed curricula that are culturally based and ways in which student education can help tribal communities. The other component of the Haskell administrators' responses is how this partnership can be considered a role model to emulate for other TCUs.

One of the lead administrators described efforts to develop culturally based curricula at Haskell.

[I thought to myself] "Aha, here I am, I'm going to propose courses. I start doing in these courses these comparisons of these Western, sort of European-rooted worldviews and philosophies and indigenous philosophies and worldviews." And it was just completely fortuitous. Then I become chair of natural and social sciences, and I thought "Aha, here is one of those incredible divisions that is actually mis-educative in terms of the Western worldview." And that is, we tend to treat culture as if it is relatively autonomous from nature and environment. I think human history and certainly in the history of indigenous peoples… the reason we can see such diversity among tribal peoples and indigenous peoples on the planet is that their culture and their cultural identities are very much shaped by the landscapes and seascapes they call home. So I began to see this as a great opportunity to say "this kind of division between nature and culture is largely a function of this Western worldview." So I became very interested in looking at the scientific and technological and material cultural features of indigenous worldviews and life ways and cultures. Trying to do these comparisons between indigenous North American and Western European.

This administrator's response revealst a conscious effort on his part to ensure the students in the partnership do not just become competent in Western scientific perspectives, but also in the cultural perspectives on science that only Haskell offers.

The focus on incorporating American Indian worldviews into the curriculum provides a foundation for Haskell's mission of serving the American Indian community. The administrators at Haskell believe this is accomplished by developing opportunities to do academic work that can be tied to tribal needs. The academic work does two things – it helps

students develop skills within the scientific disciplines, and it allows the students to focus on problems that face their tribal communities. As one administrator noted:

> *It is a great opportunity for them to make a jumpstart for what a graduate school education would entail. That would mean doing research, doing some technical writing, working on some kind of tough questions that you have to tackle independently, and they are just basic skills sets you need to develop. And that's what we've tried to make this represent, while at the same time saying here's the beauty, we're going to offer you the opportunity to create a skill set and even more importantly for some of our students is its relevance. They are doing research that they know is actually important to their people, important to their nation. I think that really is one of the things that most attracts them to this program.*

Another administrator's comment further emphasizes the work of students to improve their tribal communities.

> *[We are] really trying to tie all those strands together in a way that helps students to be able to connect the value and the importance of STEM knowledge to issues that are occurring oftentimes in our tribal communities*.

Based upon these two responses, it is clear that in the intercampus partnership Haskell administrators keep in mind the curricular mission that Haskell has had since the institution became a full-fledged university in the 1990s.

Tied to the mission of an American Indian focused curriculum, the administrators stressed Haskell's position as a role model for American Indian higher education. Because Haskell is one of two federal American Indian universities, Haskell administrators know that the tribal institutions may look to the university and its operation as examples. One

administrator explained that the Haskell-KU relationship could potentially be emulated by other American Indian institutions within their respective states.

> *As I think about the relationship between Haskell and KU and our partnership, in my opinion, it's really a kind of a best practices model for collaboration between, particularly, a tribal college and a mainstream university. I base that on my experience in the tribal college movement in conversations with administrators and faculty that are at other TCUs that haven't enjoyed the same kind of relationship that is premised on both institutions being equally important and respect and relationship and a willingness to support the many mechanisms to ensure success.*

Understanding these components of the Haskell mission from the administrators' perspectives provides a sense of the objectives they bring to the relationship with KU.

KU Administrator Perspectives of Haskell's Mission

The KU administrators' perspectives on Haskell's mission centered on two concerns: trying to respect the minority focus of Haskell and ensuring that participant students can be culturally true to themselves. One administrator talked about how to work with the Haskell campus administrators:

> *There is a lot of ground that requires [working with a] school like Haskell….The minority institution is for people who are served by the institution…. Sometimes people are really something when they think they can go there and tell [Haskell] to do things and how to do it. You pretty much have to understand where [Haskell] is coming from. I think that's an issue, because working with people of a different background, you can't be patronizing. I think that's important. You should be doing things because you really care, not because you can get money. And they know that at*

Haskell: they are wary of people. That is the key thing. That is how collaboration works, not just only helping themselves to the money of a grant. There have to be people involved who care.

One may infer from the above statement that KU administrators acknowledge that Haskell has dealt with other institutions that have not respected its mission.

Another administrator response indicates that there is some effort on KU's part to help Haskell students maintain a balanced life, recognizing the desire of American Indian students to be culturally true to themselves.

You need to tell students, help students, about how they could have a personal life and be faithful [to]who they are and their cultural traditions and whatever they like or they believe, and at the same time do science. It shouldn't be like one or the other one. So I think the challenge for us is to help them navigate that….they could still care about their family and take care of their family and do things for them and do science.

The above response suggests that this administrator recognizes the need, as did an administrator at Haskell, for the program to help the students maintain their culture, whether this is in the curriculum or in their daily lives.

Another administrator at KU, who was directed to recruit American Indian students remarked about the collaboration can serve as a role model for TCUs working with PWIs:

The Haskell/KU collaboration has been recognized nationally as the most effective TC/Research I institution collaboration. Critics believe that this is because the activities are supported from the top [provost, chancellor, deans, etc.]. For example, for a decade I was supported by the provost office and reported to the provost. This is

probably the only collaboration in the country that has this report line and support. No one wants to break up this collaboration, and a couple of us are working past retirement because it is fun and because the collaboration is amazing.

Therefore, from the perspectives of both sets of administrators, collaboration with KU grant can give Haskell students access to science while at the same time respecting their cultural identities and the unique mission of their home institution.

Evolution in Institutional Priorities

Over the course of the collaboration's history, both campuses have taken steps to form programmatic goals that move beyond the basic 'let's work together' to disciplinary-based objectives that develop the curriculum. The two institutions have accomplished this through activities that improve faculty and student performance. Throughout the interviews, there is evidence of a strong concern by the administrators to make evolutionary changes in the partnership that improve their institutional statuses. This part of the chapter examines how the two campuses communicate these concerns to maintain equality within the relationship.

Accounts of the Partnership's Beginnings

When I asked the interviewees about the origins of the partnership, I expected to hear similar stories from the participants. However, I discovered their narratives differed. The one similarity was that in describing the beginning of the partnership, Haskell and KU administrators both noted the importance of individuals and individual social capital. When the respondents were asked about the origins of the grant, a recurring answer was that a certain individual exercised the most influence at the start of the grant programs. Even

though the respondents traced the partnership to the influence of one person, interestingly enough they identified different individuals.

Haskell Administrator Accounts

A Haskell administrator noted that the KU chancellor provided the leadership directive to shore up and strengthen the relationship with Haskell.

> *Chancellor Hemingway, he also had a very strong commitment to strengthening the relationship between Haskell and KU, as well as to improving initiatives for diversity on campus. And I believe that he communicated that to faculty and departments at KU, which increased their commitment and willingness to seeking out opportunities for us to do co-curricular program development in a number of areas, including STEM.*

In contrast to the above respondent's account, another Haskell administrator remembered that the relationship began through another level of interaction between the two campuses – faculty-to-faculty – rather than through the directive of upper administration on either campus. This administrator's perspective on how the relationship began highlights a disciplinary alignment between the two institutions and how this alignment grew into the programs that currently exist. In his response, he gives credit to a faculty/administrator at KU who saw a possibility to collaborate:

> *I think the reason is because I'm going to give a lot credit to W1…. I had invited her to one of our American Indian/Alaska Native climate change working group meetings… and as a result of that, she said "I really need your help because what I'd like to do is to bring you on as a co-PI [primary investigator], to help on the sea change program." And she said, "maybe we can start to recruit tribal college folks to*

come into this traineeship program." I said, "I think this is a great idea. "I said that would be really good if we can do that and so W1 and I collaborated then on the IGERT (Integrated Graduate Education and Research Training) Sea Change proposal ….Basically W1 and I started talking and she said, "Do you really want to do this?" I said, "I don't want to do this unless we can really get something meaningful out of this." And she said "What do you mean by meaningful?" I said "I think we ought to try to do, is let's do a summer undergraduate research opportunity program here, and let's use tribal college students. Let's give tribal college students an opportunity to come here and to work on climate change issues that are important to their communities.' It was really another opportunity to really get some tribal folks and native folks involved directly in climate-related issues and research….She clearly had the foresight to see out of the new interdisciplinary initiatives out of KU that there was going to be some space to do this kind of integrated graduate education research traineeship around these issues of climate change, particularly the physical, environmental, social, environment interaction. It was just a neat convergence of interest.

In this account, the KU administrator was initially exposed to the scientific work Haskell was doing and determined that a partnership could be fostered between the two institutions. The Haskell administrator saw the KU administrator as an ally to the American Indian community who had similar interests in fostering a pathway for students into a STEM discipline. This disciplinary interest converged with efforts that were beginning to take place at Haskell, and the two colleagues realized that forming a relationship between the two

institutions would be mutually beneficial – and would also advance Haskell's mission to serve American Indian communities.

Two Haskell support administrators, who work with both faculty and students to ensure grant compliance, identified yet another key individual as the catalyst for starting the grant programs. In their respective answers, each notes that Dr. M1, an American Indian faculty member at KU, had a collegial relationship with a Haskell administrator, and both her role at KU and her knowledge of National Institutes of Health (NIH) grant processes were instrumental in getting the programs started. According to the first support administrator,

> *It started before I really came on board, but there was a gentleman by the name of I9 who worked here and he had a professional relationship with a KU administrator named Dr. M1….Her job was to be the director of minority relations or something like that, I don't remember, of minority outreach. Because Kansas is notorious for not having enough minorities attending the university. So that was her job. She and I9 met and I believe they did the first grant with BRIDGES, but I'm not positive. She did the RISE and worked on several of them at the same time.*

She pointed out that Dr. M1's collegial relationship with a Haskell administrator was instrumental in beginning the grant funding searches that assisted Haskell in developing programs for its students and aided Kansas with its student population diversity efforts.

The second support administrator also recalled that the grant programs began because the same individual identified the opportunities through her experience with federal funding programs:

> *Dr. M1, this was back in the middle 90s….Dr. M1 saw a need for or an opportunity for recruitment of Native students into the sciences. There had been some grants prior*

to her establishing the Office for Diversity in Science Training that's at KU, but really she and Dr. I9 worked pretty intensely on writing the first BRIDGES to the Baccalaureate grant. And that grant is to recruit Haskell students after completing their associate's degree to transfer preferably to KU, but not necessarily, just another four-year institution and the long-term goal of getting a PhD in working in research…I think that Dr. M1, really through her connections with NIH, was instrumental in making this program what it is now.

In this administrator's view, a key individual's efforts are what made the grant possible in the first place. In a sense, this keystone individual created the program by seeking the funding (due to her familiarity with the NIH) and establishing the KU support office that persists to this day.

KU Administrators' Accounts

In the interviews with the KU respondents, three administrators acknowledged that one individual was crucial to getting the grant programs to function. One administrator noted that this program began at the direction of a high-level administrator. However, while this administrator wrote the grant proposals and provost office was responsible for them, she eventually delegated their administration to a manager:

From my perspective, the reason for establishing the STEM program was: that was my job.… Although I have written all of the proposals over the last 12 years, the need for me to play all of the roles has decreased over this period as a large staff, completely supervised by O2 who is a wonderful manager, has been hired. We have become efficient and effective.

The fact that this individual was hired and assigned to the role of campus liaison with Haskell by the KU provost gives a strong sense of just how important Haskell is to the KU community.

> *In about 1987 I was hired by Provost and Vice Chancellor X2 "to do good for American Indians." This was a pretty big charge but nicely vague. At that time I specifically asked my KU informants about Haskell and was told that things were pretty good between the two institutions. I believe that reflected satisfaction with the newly instituted Inter-institutional Task Force at which folks from each institution – including the president of Haskell and the provost at KU – met once each semester. When I talked to the folks at Haskell, they indicated that things weren't very good at all and that there wasn't really any collaboration at all between the two institutions.*

Both of these responses indicate that while some members of the KU community thought the relationship functioned well, the Haskell side experienced the relationship in a distinctly different way. The respondent saw that a change in intercampus relations was necessary to fulfill her role with regards to American Indians.

Because this administrator had prior experience with federal funding, she was able to use her knowledge to change the relationship between the two schools in a methodical way. This administrator indicated that the manager she brought on board, a faculty member was not only key to establishing the grant program but ensuring its long-term success

> *When I asked myself how I could improve things (and thus meeting my charge) my answer was "bring money." I decided on a baby grant, the Bridges to the Baccalaureate . I found a partner, O2 who I had met once but was impressed with. He agreed to be the Primary Investigator (PI) on the grant with me as the Co-I*

(Investigator). My rationale for not being the PI was that I was "very old" and expected to retire in about two years. This arrangement made sense because you really don't want to change PI unless you have to.

This beginning helped to establish a regular mechanism to find the appropriate funding for the institutions' relationship to continue.

The importance of individual involvement in establishing the grant relationship is evident in the response of one of the administrators. The key information that arises from his comment is that the individual tasked with establishing the programs possessed strong knowledge of federal grant-funding activities.

Well, the initiative, at least on my part, arose when Dr. M1 arrived on campus – this is the KU campus – and was appointed as the director of American Indian outreach. And that appointment, that position, was in the p[rovost office. So Dr. M1, who had previously worked at ASU [Arizona State University], had some interest and understanding of federally supported programs in the STEM fields that provided opportunities for students from underrepresented groups. Since Dr. M1 herself is American Indian, she was familiar with the Haskell campus and the tribal college and presented me with the opportunity to work with her to develop some projects and in particular to write some grants to the NIH that partnered with Haskell. So it was Dr. M1's initiative. And from there I became familiar with the people at Haskell and the collaborations grew. And now, even though Dr. M1 is retired from the university, she continues to consult with us, and the collaborations fortunately are strong enough that they can continue without her day-to-day involvement.

The interviewee's recognition of the importance of knowledge of both the American Indian community and the federal grant-funding system for education stresses how important one individual can be to developing a system. As he points out, the director both provided technical knowledge and – as an American Indian herself – could bridge cultural differences between the two institutions.

The key to the origin of the partnership, therefore, is that individual actors got the programs off the ground, corrected some negative patterns from the past, and ensured that the relationship could continue to function without their direct involvement. Some of the individuals had knowledge that could bring funding into the two campuses, while others had knowledge of the scientific disciplines that the programs would be centered upon. From an institutional theory perspective, the role of individuals is to ensure that some type of institutional logic develops from their ability to convince others of the importance of doing certain acts. In essence, the individuals helped to create the "field logics" within which the partnership between the two campuses functions.

Establishing a Pipeline to the STEM Fields

To fully understand how the two institutions developed the partnership, it is necessary to understand the desire to have strong infrastructure and students for the STEM fields. In the Haskell interviews, there is frequent mention of what the campuses are doing to ensure strong student development in STEM. In the case of KU, administrators stressed that they are trying to select and train the appropriate students for the STEM fields while working with the limitations faced by Haskell. The two sets of administrators are focused on building a culture around the STEM disciplines that may or may not be inclusive of the American Indian focus of Haskell.

Haskell Administrators Focusing on STEM Fields

In the following section, the benefits that Haskell derives from the STEM curriculum focus in the relationship will be examined. The administrators note that STEM has been a priority at Haskell for a number of years:

> *Here at Haskell we've had a growing interest in preparing students for STEM careers, and there have been multiple opportunities and funding strands to support that commitment…in order to build upon our strengths and resources here and to better prepare our students in these area.*

This effort has been strongly supported by the relationship with KU; in the sense that Haskell students are able to access training that will improve their abilities to work in STEM-related research.

> *So one of the things we are doing with our grant – this is new this year with the RISE grant – We are having a summer science academy. It's for students who have taken Biology 101, because here the requirement is, even if you graduate with an associate degree, you have to have one class with a lab experience. So they can take physical science or biology. The majority take biology. Those students who excel in biology may not be aware of the opportunities out there for them. We are going to hand-select students from the Biology 101 class. We are going to have this summer academy right after school gets out, for four weeks, and do some hands-on experimenting, different activities in the morning, there may be some curriculum supplement. And then we are also going on some field trips and go to some research labs in the area – Kansas City, Lawrence, and Topeka, because there are quite a few of them in the area – just to show students that – you don't just have to be an instructor at a university to have*

a PhD in research. We want to expose them to all kinds of things that they might be able to envision themselves participating in if they stay in school and get even a master's, but hopefully a PhD because that is what our programs…are about.

A Haskell administrator noted that the selection of students to participate in the programs is driven by an intercampus committee that determines students' suitability to work within the STEM fields:

We go over applications, so…the decision of whether a student gets into one of these programs is not an individual coordinator's decision, it is a group decision. And we go around, score each of them. The better their score, the better their chance they have to get into the program. We state our concerns, if we have concerns - what we want from a student, have them reapply another semester after they have had this course, or something like that. So it is a committee decision. I really like this decision [process] because we support one another. To me this is the thing that – kind of the cement that holds us all together. We can discuss problems we are having with a particular student, and the people will give suggestions: try this student in this lab; maybe that would be more suited to what they're interested in and that kind of thing. Here is this student getting support from this group of people who don't even know them. So it's a wonderful, wonderful way of reinforcing that cooperative, collaborative nature of our relationship with KU.

To ensure Haskell provides the best STEM training (or complies with STEM disciplinary expectations), mechanisms have been established for training Haskell faculty to be more research-oriented in their classroom instruction:

Over the years, there have been multiple and on-going efforts to prepare both students and faculty in both institutions. Certainly within our university we have sought professional development opportunities for faculty, particularly as we begin to move more deeply into some of the STEM opportunities. So that's been one of the areas we've had grant funding – to ensure that all of our faculty have terminal degrees in that area. That's been one set of initiatives that we've had for quite some time. And that has certainly provided some success in the program so we've also had opportunities to connect our faculty with colleagues at other institutions just so that we can be aware of what [the] focus in other programs is centered [on]. So that type of collaboration and cross-pollination of ideas and approaches and strategies and such. We've sought opportunities for faculty to attend and present at professional conferences, another area of professional development. I suppose all three of those can be categorized as professional development opportunities. So that's what we have done with all of our faculty. Another thing we have done is looked for opportunities to expand the quality of our labs and equipment used in our science labs and expanded the opportunities in our curriculum to include GIS [Geographical Information Systems] and other STEM-based activities and approaches.

Based upon this information about how Haskell is trying to improve its curriculum in the STEM partnership, it is possible to infer a desire to be more of a research institution, with students and faculty who have higher developed skills in the science disciplines.

KU Administrators Focusing on STEM Disciplines

The interview responses in this area indicate that the KU administrators want to ensure that their institution's status in the STEM fields remains strong. Therefore they select

students who are able to work at the same level as KU students in the partnership. They expressed concerns about Haskell student preparation for the rigors of STEM studies at KU. As one KU administrator stated:

> *We are dependent upon the Haskell faculty to point out to our staff students that could possibly participate in the program. For example, Dr. B2 teaches chemistry on the Haskell campus. He's the only chemistry teacher, so every student in the sciences who takes chemistry would go through Dr. B2's class. And he would be able to point out to us, "Well, this is a good student: this student is motivated, attends class regularly." All of the things you look for in a good student. And he would say, "Well, perhaps you should speak to this individual." So recruitment is a big issue.*

The KU administrator expressed his concern about the lack of student preparation, which he attributed to the limited resources available at Haskell:

> *The preparation of students that attend Haskell isn't always as – doesn't have the depth that one would always hope for. In some cases, the opportunity these students have had to take science courses or math classes is simply not as great [as] the majority of students at KU. There are students at KU that aren't prepared always when they come to college. I would say that situation occurs at Haskell simply because a lot of the students haven't had the opportunity to take advance classes.*

Another administrator pointed out the disparity in preparation between Haskell and KU, wherein the Haskell students did not have sufficient background in mathematics to successfully tackle more advanced work.

> *At some point at Haskell, they did a lot of work in their classes to improve because they take college algebra. But then college algebra was completely different, whoever*

was the instructor. It was not coordinated at all. Now they've changed that. So they realized also their college algebra did not correspond at all to our college algebra; it's more like our intermediate algebra. So there was a lot of work done. I think lots of things have improved in that. The same thing happened with all community colleges, not just something from Haskell.

KU administrators' concern about the selection of students and their preparation for the disciplines indicates an extrinsic motivation to have only the best and brightest from Haskell participate in the program. They want both schools to meet the generally accepted curriculum standards of specific STEM disciplines at a research institution. In this case, power in the partnership is tipped toward KU; Haskell faculty and students must adapt to the demands of KU programs. It was interesting that Haskell, while nominally a university, was placed in the same status as community colleges in this regard by at least one KU administrator.

The KU administrators noted that given limited resources, Haskell tries very hard to prepare students for the STEM fields. Another administrator explained the significant differences in faculty between Haskell and KU.

Just to contrast the two universities, on our campus, many of our science classes have a laboratory that's either required for the students to take or they can take it elective with a lecture course. We have graduate students who are assigned to teach those laboratories; we have staff who manage those laboratories. By manage, I mean manage the enrollment, manage the procurement or the purchase of supplies, set up the labs, take down the labs. As faculty we're responsible for teaching the lecture, but we are typically aren't that involved with the laboratory instruction. At Haskell, there's none of that infrastructure of TAs or staff or even facilities to offer as many

laboratory experiences I'm sure as they would like to. They do a great job of offering – I'm not, please don't think I'm saying they don't offer labs; they do. But I'm just saying that they have to do it all on their own – by they, I mean the faculty – have to provide all these laboratory experiences on their own. It's quite a difference.

The substantial resource variance and the differences in instructional responsibility between the two campuses may explain why KU has specific requirements of the Haskell students. They see deficiencies in experience and knowledge base that they try to mitigate through the training they provide Haskell students in the partnership. Given the resource disparities, the KU administrators also have been working with the Haskell administrators to provide professional training opportunities for Haskell faculty to ensure they have strong content knowledge training in the STEM fields.

Haskell faculty are given the opportunity through our grant funding to attend meetings or travel to research facilities or perhaps even take a class on what one might call professional development type activities. So our collaborations would allow those types of things to occur.

The efforts of the KU administration to ensure proper disciplinary preparation for Haskell students and faculty demonstrate a strong desire to maintain their high-level academic reputation.

Federal Compliance and the Partnership

Another concern of the administrators in the partnership is federal compliance. For the two institutions to effectively function as partnership, two levels of federal compliance are addressed continuously. The first level of federal compliance arises from Haskell's placement as a part of the federal bureaucracy. As one of the two federally funded American

Indian universities governed by the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), Haskell must work within the bureaucracy to meet its mission to serve the greater American Indian community. The second level of federal compliance that must be fulfilled is the partnership's ability to meet the particular requirements of the federal grant-funding agencies. The efforts of the two campuses to comply with both types of federal compliance has compelled them to establish specific mechanisms within the partnership.

Haskell Administrators and Federal Compliance

The Haskell administrators are ever aware of the influence of the BIA on their institution:

> *I think we have a lot of bureaucratic problems here…. Haskell is a part of the federal governmental system. There aren't many colleges part of something as large as the Bureau of Indian Affairs/Bureau of Indian Education. It really gets challenging sometimes when we need to do simple things like students pay, work out staffing. We have a whole set of regulations that typically other universities don't [have]. So that's been a challenge of learning how to negotiate the federal system to make these sort of joint initiatives really work smoothly. Quite often we get frustrated here because there [are] so many levels of bureaucracy to go through, but we usually get it done. We just get creative trying to figure out ways to do that. I'd say the working relationship [with KU] has been a good one. The biggest frustration that is probably felt by everyone is sometimes it seems, "My gosh, why is it so difficult to get things done?" Some of it is – like on a lot of purchasing, even personnel things, we literally go through offices not on our campuses to make things happen. That can be kind of awkward if you're waiting on [the BIA office in] Reston to get checks done for students for students or waiting on [the BIA office in]*

Memphis to help us with a contract for an instructor. It just means you really have to be constantly thinking ahead of when you want things done and how you've got to do them.

In the above response, it is possible to sense the fatigue on the part of the Haskell administrator in dealing with the BIA administrative processes. Because the Haskell administration constantly deals with bureaucracy, the interviewees expressed the frustration they have with the BIA. However, the interviews also revealed their perspective of the grant partnership as a tool to work around these obstacles:

Hiring in the federal government is much more difficult than through the state. We had a person – our grant RISE was managed by KUCR [University of Kansas Center for Research] initially. Last year we got it at Haskell. The person who had been working in our RISE lab, where we do our remediation work with students. We're trying to get more students to be STEM majors. The only way we can do that is to bring the math and English skills up to speed quickly. We've got this lab that we have been running for six years on the original grant. We had four years and two years of extension. I could not get him hired through the federal system for the Bureau of Indian Affairs because he's white. …There is this guy and we can't hire him because he is not Indian….What we did is put him on contract with KU and he's a state employee again, which is what he was before. That is what we had to do. That's what I'm talking about. The complications of doing business in a federal framework versus a state framework are very different, very different. Now most HBCUs and TCUs wouldn't have this issue.

According to this administrator, it took KU's position in the partnership as a state institution that does not directly report to the BIA, to assist with developing a work-around that helped Haskell fulfill its mission to effectively educate students.

Another federal intrusion that an administrator noted is how the structure of the academic year. This administrator explained the structure negatively affects Haskell's effort to hire highly qualified faculty and interferes with Haskell's intent to become a university in a vein similar to KU.

> *We also go on furlough in the summer. Federal employees – lack of work, which is a hoot, because we have so much to do and no time to do it in, but it's a money issue. So there is another money thing. KU has to work with our furlough system. For example, I'm [working] right now because of the grant. The grant is paying my salary and otherwise I would be on furlough probably. The next two weeks, the last two weeks of July, I'm on furlough. You have to have at least two weeks furlough every year. I think it's institutionally mandated. Furlough could be up to 12 weeks. So faculty can laid off up to 12 weeks. So that's one fourth of their salary gone. Very bright. That's why it's tough to attract Native teachers. I mean, if you got your PhD, why would you come to institution that paid okay starting salary but we don't have tenure, we don't have what most institutions do. And then you get one fourth of your salary taken away. Then they're sitting there going, "I'm not going there." Which is too bad, because I'm not obviously Native, but I really advocate for getting good Native teachers here. But because it's not an attractive deal for somebody with a PhD.*

The limitations the Haskell administrators face while operating within the BIA structure appear to be more of a hindrance than an assistance to the partnership. The responses indicated that these processes may induce fatigue for some of the Haskell administrators who must consistently cope with them.

The second type of federal compliance involves working with the grant-funding agencies. In this case, both Haskell and KU need to meet the requirements of the agencies that oversee the grants and ensure that the funding flow continues. Complying with federal grant requirements has led to some fatigue here as well. For example, one administrator noted that some agencies are more difficult to work with than others.

> *NSF and USDA (U.S. Department of Agriculture) are, I'm not going to say that they are more laid back. They have a different approach to research than NIH does. If…these minority-serving institutions hadn't experienced working with NIH before, it can be kind of threatening. I think if you have people going through similar experiences to what you're going through, you can maybe resolve issues or even foretell problems. And maybe the agencies can be more understanding and receptive to what the minority institutions are dealing with. When I was working with USDA stuff, our majority schools had been active for a hundred years, and they had all the infrastructure and all these years of experience. And [only] here are all these tribal colleges coming in with minimal budgets, minimal infrastructure, and a year or two of being a university.*

Even though the tenor of the statement expresses the desire for some equivalence in process among the funding agencies, it is clear that Haskell administrators are willing to comply with the requirements set by differing federal entities.

KU Administrators and Haskell's Federal Status

The KU administrators are aware of and seem to comprehend the federal compliance issues with which Haskell must work. In KU's efforts to recruit minority students to

participate in the grant programs, they assist Haskell's dealings within the bureaucratic structure of the BIA and provide administrative support on the grants.

The response of one KU administrator demonstrates her awareness of the difficulties Haskell has with the federal bureaucracy:

> *I understand the motivations of the whole federal [government]. You know how the pay system works. It's very different….I think that [Haskell] different than other tribal colleges because they have all the bureaucracy of the federal government. So I think more people at Haskell, they really work hard for their students and they try to do the best at the same time. Sometimes they can be pragmatic (about the things that) can be changed and the things that cannot be changed.*

Her response indicates that KU administrators need to be cognizant of Haskell's obligation to comply with federal requirements.

Another KU administrator noted that coping with federal compliance is not a simple task, especially when the federal bureaucracy can be unpredictable:

> *There's always things changing at Haskell all the time. They have [a] federal administrative structure. And they have all these issues with the president coming and going. It's hard for faculty to survive that. I could say I have good relationship with faculty. We talk about all things. I expect them to call me whenever we have to navigate bureaucracy.*

The KU administrators' understanding of Haskell's federal compliance issues reveals how much KU values the relationship with Haskell, as well as KU's willingness to work through bureaucratic complications.

At a research institution such as KU, multiple offices and many staff people are available to support grant-funded research. At Haskell, administrators fulfill numerous roles and have much less support staff to rely upon.

A KU administrator made a number of comments about the partnership as being solidified by KU's dedication of time and resources to the grant writing process.

> *Because the[grant] folks at NIH made a visit to KU/Haskell to see us, I told O2 that this meant that they wanted us to apply for another grant. Folks at both institutions seemed pretty pleased with BRIDGES – it met a need. The next grant that KU might get was the IMSD. But I thought that Haskell would think that we were taking advantage of them if we got all the grants. So I got permission to write a proposal, the RISE for Haskell. This is really [a] pretty big deal, and it took me over a year to write this proposal (all paid for by KU). Grant writers often ask $30,000 or more to perform such a service. Writing the IMSD took a matter of months. The RISE proposal missed deadline after deadline as I worked with the Haskell faculty to develop the ideas. During this time, the Haskell Foundation went belly up (someone swindled a million dollars) and they couldn't receive federal grants. My husband was, at the time, Vice Chancellor for Research at KU and headed an organization that could handle the money. This was very complicated, and difficult but ultimately for the next five or six years KU's Center for Research handled Haskell's RISE grant. This was very expensive for KU, but it solidified the partnership.*

This response indicates that the KU administrators see the relationship between the campuses as part of their commitment to both science education and the Haskell campus as a whole.

Congruence in the Partnership

Examination of the administrator responses concerning the relationship between Haskell and KU suggests a convergence of views and a sense that this really is a "partnership." From the perspective of institutional theory, the administrators' responses indicate that the partnership has led to the development of field logic about their collaborative actions.

The administrators evidenced a general agreement in their examination of how the two institutions collaborated in the development of a pipeline for American Indian students into the STEM fields, the role individuals played in the formation of the partnership and the institution's respective actions with regards to federal compliance. The results show a tendency of the administrators to have the same views of what they are doing within the construction and implementation of the grant infrastructure.

The comments regarding Haskell's mission transformation within the framework of the partnership indicate that both sets of administrators acknowledge Haskell's core mission and operate on the idea of increasing Haskell's ability to service the American Indian community through the STEM efforts. In this aspect of this relationship, it is possible to see the efforts by both institutions to improve the status of Haskell's curriculum.

One of the primary findings of this set of interviews is how influential the STEM sub-disciplines are in establishing parameters for institutional change. Throughout the responses, Haskell has expressed a desire to improve faculty qualifications and curricula in STEM subjects. The level of assistance offered to Haskell by KU, as the much stronger STEM partner, also indicates a significant effort to meet the guidelines for good STEM education as dictated by the standards of the disciplines at research extensive institutions. Another

significant finding of this questions set is the fact that some of the Haskell administrators are KU graduates. This information, combined with the interviewee's responses suggests that these Haskell administrators may be more likely to look to their alma mater for solutions to their institutional development questions.

An analysis through the lens of institutional theory would suggest that these administrators might not view the relationship critically. The partnership is perceived overall as being beneficial to both campuses. An analysis through tribal critical race theory does not result in any obvious difference from the institutional analysis. The one area of concern, in which the power in the partnership tips toward KU, is the prevalent perspective that Haskell faculty and students may not be prepared for the "rigors" of KU's STEM programs. However, Haskell administrators seemed to also recognize this as an issue to be addressed in their hiring and curricula, and they did not express any indication of feeling a lack of respect from KU toward Haskell.

Chapter 6

Faculties and the Grants

In the special relationship between Haskell and KU in the STEM grant-funded programs, the role of faculty is to provide instruction in topics associated with these disciplines, mentor students in laboratory settings and assist students in their investigation of the STEM fields. This chapter will share the findings from the faculty interviews. These findings will be presented in this order:

- collaboration
- perceptions of what each partner brings to the relationship
- intercampus trust

Under each heading, the faculty will be parsed further. The Haskell faculty interviewees, all have served as instructors and mentors in some capacity. The KU faculty will be separated into three different categories: instructor, mentor, and IRACDA post-doc. Finally, one respondent is an independent faculty person who has been affiliated with both campuses through an assignment with a federal agency who will be considered part of the KU faculty for the purposes of this analysis.

For the purpose of this study, faculty is defined as a person who has instructional duties within the grant structure. On either campus, these faculty may also have the following responsibilities within the grant structure: primary investigator, co-primary investigator, and mentor to students.

The interview questions for faculty (see Appendix B) were divided into specific areas of interest. These questions were intended to ascertain their roles within the cooperative relationship between the institutions and to assess their perceptions of the programs'

functioning. The first question was a biographical sketch in which they had an opportunity to explain why they entered a STEM field. The second question asked how they became involved with the grant programs between the two institutions. The third, fourth, and fifth questions gauged their general understanding of how the programs worked together and their evaluations of those programs. The next set of questions was designed to determine faculty awareness of student participation and perspectives about the collaborative programs. The final interview question provided the faculty an opportunity to add any further information pertinent to the study.

Collaboration

As part of the relationship between the two campuses, a committee of administrators and faculty who oversee the grant programs; including student recruitment and enrollment, faculty selection and training, and grant management and compliance. The extent to which faculty know of and are affected by this steering committee is highly variable. In the following responses, the Haskell and KU faculty tell of their experience with this oversight committee.

Haskell Faculty Perspectives on the Steering Committee

The Haskell faculty experience with the steering committee is variable. Some of the Haskell faculty express little awareness of the steering committee, while others seem to have very strong intimate knowledge. The comments about the committee's efficacy also reflect the amount of effort that the administrators put into communicating the committee's functions and decisions to the faculty.

One faculty member stated that she has not seen any results out of this committee.

The administration has a joint committee. I haven't heard they've met in recent years. However, at both schools, the administrators tend to do their thing and it's on a totally different level – the faculty never hear about it. And there's no input back and forth whatsoever. So the faculty are still doing their own thing. It's a Haskell-KU joint committee of some sort. And I don't even know if it is active right now. But in all the years it did exist, we never heard anything about it.

Additionally, this same faculty member was asked a follow-up question as to whether any administrative efforts have been made to get together the faculty of both institutions within the grant programs' structure. Her answer suggests that any such interaction is strictly initiated at the faculty level with no administrative effort.

No, I don't think there are at the administrative level. I think there are at the faculty level. I'm not sure we would want the administration to try to structure it. Because it is just not the same thing. I mean, when I call up somebody in the department at KU, it's because I know them. What administrators could do is create some kind of incentive. There is no incentive to interact.

Another faculty member noted that the joint committee was initially was established by a KU administrator. Some of the discussions within the joint committee focused on identifying the students who would be eligible for participation in the different grant programs.

We have a number of grants that involve both schools, so because of that M1 started what she called the NIH steering committee. And so the faculty involved in the administration of these grants get together once a month, and we talk [about] what's going on, and we select students for the different programs – or talk about them, anyway. Even though IMSD has got nothing to do with Haskell – these are all KU

students – we give our opinion about do we think this person will do well, as we do with the RISE students and the BRIDGE students.

The selection of the students also includes discussion of laboratory placements. One faculty member indicated that American Indian students are given a degree of special consideration for the appropriate placement. However, discussions between respective faculties about the placement may not be extensive.

We have done that a little bit with PREP, especially if they are Indian students. So anyway, we're coordinated that way, I hardly ever talk to the people in the labs where the students are working. I know one or two of them, but I don't in general don't have much contact with [laboratory mentors].

The structured contact seems to be very limited, according to the above faculty member's answer.

Another faculty member attributes to KU a good portion of credit in maintaining the relationship and ensuring the Haskell students are making the transition between the schools successful.

There are advisors on KU campus that their entire job is working with Haskell transfer students [to] make certain that they transfer successfully.… KU puts a lot of effort into making sure Haskell students transfer successfully and that they're communicating with Haskell and communicating with KU. I do know that our registrar department works together. They've got a KU exchange, a KU-Haskell exchange program. If a class is not available at one university, then they can take it at the other. There has to be a balanced exchange.

As described by the respondent, this support network appears to be a coordination of multiple functions, including the campus registrars. The same faculty member observed that this coordinated work goes into the writing of the grants and that there are cooperative primary investigators on both campuses.

> *In the writing of these programs and the administration of them with external advisory committees, sometimes money goes to both places and you have co-project directors and co-PI's [at] both universities.*

Another faculty member commented that this relationship has helped to alleviate Haskell's problems with chronic understaffing. In his opinion, the steering committee has allowed Haskell to take advantage of more grant opportunities than it could on its own.

> *There's been a lot of sustained cooperation between Haskell and KU…The STEM faculty here at Haskell are understaffed. There are lots of grant opportunities, cooperative grant opportunities that pass us by, because we don't have time to write them….It takes a lot of work. We have to liaison with the folks up on the hill. Putting them together makes so much time.*

Sharing resources to obtain grants has enabled Haskell to become more of an equal in the partnership with KU. The remarks above indicate that the steering committee operates as a communication tool that provides the Haskell campus with access to services that would not normally be available.

KU Faculty Perspectives on the Joint Committee

As with Haskell, the responses of KU faculty concerning the steering committee indicated that some faculty members are cognizant of its presence while others are not.

The first interviewee revealed a lack of knowledge about not only the steering committee but of any facilitated relationships between the KU and Haskell faculty. His sole source of information about any of the grant program activities is the Office of Diversity in Science Training.

> *There are one or two faculty at Haskell that I know socially through non-KU contexts. I don't know, or I would doubt any of them happens to have involvement in this program. I don't know anyone at Haskell who does have involvement with this program. I basically ask Professor O2 what he needs and I do it.*

The next KU faculty member's response indicated that her experience with intercampus communication is through direct contact with Haskell faculty. Specifically, she meets with Haskell faculty to discuss placement of Haskell students in her laboratory. These meetings may involve a coordinator from either who oversees student performance and evaluation, as well as be a member of the steering committee.

> *We actually had several meetings, so C3 [a faculty member at Haskell] came over. This last student I had, they [Haskell] had someone who would come over…that was in charge of the connection between the two programs. And [it] was apparent to me that she was someone the student could contact whether she was having difficulties with either side of the program…. I mean, O2 would say, "Do you want – there's a student," and the person would come over and we would started to get them involved with the work and stuff. That could be partly because I know O2 really well and he sent a lot, he's funded a lot of undergraduates in my program through a lot of different mechanisms. Within the last year, they [KU] set up something more of a transition team. But there's definitely a staff member that's helping. Because actually,*

if I remember correctly, they keep track of their [Haskell student] hours and everything. They keep track of how many hours a week they work, and they have to turn in time sheets and things like that. If that doesn't happen then they know there is something going wrong and they can fix it before it gets too bad.

According to the commentary of the faculty member from a federal environmental agency who has had instructional responsibilities on both campuses, the communication between the campuses is not highly effective. He suggested that there is strong resistance by the Haskell faculty to participate in any dialogue over the curriculum. Furthermore, he observed that the joint committee has little to no impact on Haskell faculty's resistance to the cooperative work with KU.

If anything, I would describe what you have on the Haskell side as mild resistance to interact with people on the outside. Now, if you try to involve KU faculty in things – like for example, I used to be the host for the seminar series on campus. And I used to use some of KU's lands for ecology labs and that kind of stuff. If you ask a KU faculty person to in some way help with things, I have never heard anybody to hesitate to open up their lab or give you whatever it is you need or show up and give lectures. So it's not like there is reluctance on the side of KU to actually become more involved here, but this is one faculty to another. There is no organized conduit between the two places. And the people who run these programs, by and large, are not really prepared to do that.

Additionally, this respondent indicated that the connections that do exist between the campuses are limited and ineffectual.

So you don't even have people at a high enough level that they can easily make connections between the two campuses to have the faculty. I do want to emphasize that most of the blame is with the Haskell faculty; they're like turtles pulling their heads into a shell.

This independent faculty member expressed the opinion that individual Haskell faculty disinterest in communication is dysfunctional and may actually be obstructive to any positive relationship between the two campuses.

There were a number of people who worked at [Haskell] that were BRIDGE or RISE employees, and some of them got fired for reasons I didn't agree with…. At one point, B2 was the PI, grant coordinator at Haskell, and I felt like he was creating more obstacles to good work happening than actually encouraging it. At some point, you look at your time and say, I only have so much time to work with the students. if I'm going to spend it all dealing with overcoming obstacles, it's not worth it. I don't want to give any more.

In contrast, another faculty member opined that the previously identified individual, rather than being obstructive to good communication between the campuses, he is actually helpful.

Now there are faculty down there at Haskell, B2, who is now the chair of [a] department. In fact, he oversees the BRIDGE program down there now. He's always one to show up for the appropriate BRIDGE things. He comes up here for the administrative aspects of those grants. He's great on those issues.

Based upon the responses of the KU faculty involved with the grant programs, administrative efforts to maintain any sort of communication at the faculty level are limited and not highly visible. Furthermore, even if KU faculty members are aware of these efforts, they may not

necessarily see the efficacy of the communication as extending beyond individual student cases. The comments of the KU faculty with regards Haskell faculty indicate that they perceive Haskell as operating on a sub-par level. Their statements indicate that Haskell makes due with what they have, but cannot meet the performance level of the KU faculty or facilities.

Perceptions of Institutional Capabilities

The ways in which the partners in this relationship view each other can be determined by an examination their responses concerning institutional capabilities that affect the joint programs, including those related to infrastructure or subject content knowledge. Prior to the interviews, I also postulated that the various views of institutional capability might involve perceptions of Haskell students or faculty as being inferior to those at KU due to ethnicity.

Haskell Faculty Institutional Perceptions

One striking finding that arose from the Haskell faculty interviews was the perception that KU entered the partnership without a full understanding of the TCU's limited resources. According to the respondents, while they could offer STEM knowledge and minority students who would enhance KU's diversity efforts, they were limited in ways that their peers at KU were not. Furthermore, they communicated their perception that KU personnel did not comprehend the differences between Haskell's resources and their own. In the following response, a faculty stated that the variance in institutional capabilities sometimes led KU to underestimate the level of scientific work being done at Haskell.

> *We started getting together with the science. The first grant that was written that I am familiar with is PRISM. It's polar research ice sheet measurement. It is an NSF full research grant. And our vice president wrote it with someone out of KU office, M1.*

Then we got this e-mail saying that we were going to participate in this grant. The dean got us all together. I read the grant, and it had a lot of stuff about polar research and had a paragraph in it. That paragraph included a laundry list [of] everything we did at Haskell. So it was literally tokenism. (Laughs.) We all sat around trying to figure out what we were going to do with it. And mostly people were anxious to get money for their programs, but they didn't know how to fit in. But we had been experimenting with the help of USGS (U.S. Geological Service) and EPA (Environmental Protection Agency) with GIS (geographical information systems) technology and that seemed to fly. It was something new to KU…because the PRISM grant was written by physicists, and they were not familiar with that technology.

Another faculty member expressed the opinion that KU's primary motivation in the partnership is a desire to increase its minority student representation for its own benefit. Through his unique faculty position, where his class acts as a gateway to science knowledge, he is able to identify potential participants to the programs. However, he stated his belief that he must be very careful in his selection of student lest KU blames all American Indians for the failings of one.

I've been very careful with the programs I'm involved in to promote students that I've had in my class….I only promote those, push those students on to other opportunities who've turned in all their homework, who've shown that they're responsible, who've come to class every day. If a student is not responsible, I don't want to support their opportunities outside of Haskell. If somebody, and this happened before, if somebody goes to a program – they're always looking for minorities – if somebody goes to a

program and performs badly, then the next year, they're saying we don't want anymore Haskell students.

According to another Haskell faculty member, Haskell's capability to develop stronger scientific education programs is hampered by the additional burdens that the faculty must cope with due to a chronic lack of resources. Instead of dedicating most of his attention to teaching, he has to do laboratory and administrative tasks that are time-consuming.

Trouble is, it's very hard to do research out here. We have fairly full teaching loads, and we don't have things like lab assistants. So I teach Chemistry 1 and Chemistry 2, General Chemistry 1 and 2, every semester. And I do the labs. I don't have a graduate student who does the labs. And I prepare the chemicals. I make the students wash their own dishes, but the dishes in the lab room, I wash, or in the stock room, I do that. I do all the ordering and planning, etc. Anyway, it's not like it's terribly hard, but those things are time-consuming. One of the things I'm doing this summer, I'm running some labs with equipment we got on grants but have never had the chance to use it or work it into the curriculum…We don't have lots of time, and so it's kind of iffy if you're trying to do research.

This Haskell faculty member further noted that even though Haskell administration likes to announce a commitment to research, limited resources make it difficult to handle much beyond the basic curriculum.

The institution says they would like to do things like more research. They don't support it when you get it. We had an Indian professor here, Native American, many years ago who was able to get research money, but eventually he just quit even trying to get it because the school would never give him any release time to do the research.

It wasn't valued, so he just gave it up. Now, the school likes to say it would be valued, but it's only valued only if you do it on your own time. And I mean the school has their issues, etc. You talk about what would be a perfect school, but there are lots of issues when you're dealing with the grants. We don't really have a good – the school's trying, but we don't have a good grants office, for example. So if you get grants, you end up doing most of the administration for it yourself, things people at other schools wouldn't be doing.

In the opinion of another faculty member, institutional capabilities are reflected in the educational progress of students. He remarked that Haskell students may not have the best scientific aptitude, not due to their own shortcomings but rather due to the nature of the school's limited resources.

Often our students don't get into math and science at a college level until their sophomore year. So there's a lot of pressure to place students in labs before the students are really ready. And like with CERL [Construction Engineering Research Laboratory at the University of Illinois], we were sending students up there who may be juniors, but they're juniors from Haskell. Haskell is really kind of a liberal arts school. We don't call ourselves that, but that's really what we are in my mind compared to other schools I've seen of our size. But anyway, say you have a student from here going up to CERL run by the army. They're giving our students a chance. The other students they're bringing in, like from the University of Illinois and other places are juniors in a science major like chemistry, so they had more chemistry courses than our students had. That really puts our students at a disadvantage. Some of these opportunities are good; sometimes I think the students starts feeling like,

"Oh, man, I'm not getting what these other ones are getting." They would if they were at the same size school originally.

Overall, the Haskell faculty perceptions of their institutional capabilities within the grant programs indicates some concerns about performance. They acknowledge that Haskell may be a gatekeeper for students to access the more advanced opportunities at KU.

Haskell Perspectives on Federal Compliance

The difficulties Haskell faculty face maintaining equality within the partnership are impacted to significant degree by the role the federal government plays in the daily operations of the institution. During the interviews, Haskell faculty pointed out that the federal government greatly influenced hiring practices and the development of support systems for students. Faculty also expressed a sense of having very little in the way of control over their own actions.

In one interview exchange, a Haskell faculty member responded to a set of clarification questions about how the BIA determines Haskell's hiring and staffing practices. The parenthetical remarks are my clarification questions.

They write our job descriptions. They are involved with hiring. Sometimes we don't get a say in the hiring.

(You mean your faculty committee, when you're interviewing individuals, they override your decisions?)

We never even see the applications.

(How do you make decisions on curriculum development as a department?)

It's a pretty scary thing. We've got a math position and they advertised it. They required an education degree [a master's in education], but they didn't require [an

advanced] math degree. And so we went and talked to our dean, who understood our issue and sent them all back. We never saw them.

(Given that sort of intrusive oversight, are there any avenues by which you as a faculty, other than talking to the dean, can interact with the BIA to change any of their policies with regards your faculty?)

Well, we notified the union that we were not happy with the position descriptions, and we rewrote it and gave it to both the union and the administration.

Later in this set of clarification questions, the same faculty member goes on to express the perception that this difficulty is rooted in the BIA's concentration on elementary education.

There is no oversight of curriculum except here at Haskell because most of the bureau is into elementary education, which is why they don't understand our problems. I don't think we have bureau [BIA] high schools anymore, do we?

(I think no)

It's just grade schools. When they write job descriptions [for Haskell instructor positions], they think an education degree is going to do it.

This faculty member also discussed BIA's efforts to intrude into Haskell's grant programs.

(Since I'm not aware of interaction, about interaction between federal agencies – if you get a federal grant, what sort of level of understanding does the BIA educational wing have of what you are trying accomplish?)

None.

(Do they interfere with the process at all?)

Yes.

(To what degree and how?)

At one point, they realized there was a lot of money involved. They announced that they were going to take 23 percent of each our grants.

(As overhead cost? Without talking to you?)

Or the granting agency. The granting agencies took that in hand and dealt with it. We fight constant roadblocks in procurement, hiring, all kinds of stuff. I'm not even sure if what they're doing is up to snuff, but that's the way the bureau does it. I'm glad you are not putting my name on this. Well, the last grant we had awarded was a follow-up to one we had written, a TCUP [Tribal Colleges and Universities Program grant with NSF. That one was directly on Haskell. And the follow-up TCUP grant, we were awarded in August and we still cannot use the money.

(It is now January 2011. Why can't you use the money?)

Because all of the sudden we required [by the BIA] to do a memorandum of agreement. We had to redo it three, four times because nobody understood what to do or who should even sign it. And we are now trying to get the contracting off the ground because you can't just hire somebody, you have to contract them. We're just in that phase now.

From the above exchange on the influence of the BIA on Haskell, it is possible to see the level of frustration expressed by the faculty member. Another faculty member also noted his exasperation with the BIA in his response.

I really don't like the BIA. The BIA is heavily bureaucratic, not – makes a lot of nonsense at times. Yet I understand rules and regs. This is kind of like the twilight zone here because even though the BIA supports this school, the tribes have a say in running it. It's kind of a twilight zone what we're doing here. And when I first came

here, the Stone Age, nobody had computers. Just even to write a grant to get a computer was a major thing, to get a computer lab. Everything to try to build the capacity in the infrastructure of the school is tremendously hard. It simply did not have the academic structure here to be supportive to faculty, sometimes be supportive to students. Because since we're a federal institution, you would have to see all the rule books that the students have to go through.

The faculty member clearly perceives Haskell's capabilities as being hindered by BIA interference. Moreover, he believes Haskell's work toward improving its infrastructure has been a challenge because of how the BIA operates.

KU Faculty Perceptions of Institutional Capabilities

In the responses of the KU faculty about capabilities in the partnership, they tended to concentrate upon their perceptions of Haskell students preparedness for instructional or laboratory work.

One faculty member, when considering his perception of how well Haskell prepares students to perform academically in his course, indicated that he did not any fundamental difference in the quality of instruction between the two schools.

I would just say that as far as I can tell, they prepare students just as well as KU does because I didn't notice any difference in my course that made me think, what's going on here, there's this sub-class of students who is not adequately prepared.

Another KU faculty observed that Haskell students in laboratory settings initially seem unfamiliar with the equipment, which she believes is due to the limited resources available at Haskell.

When they come in, I usually assign them with mentors when they work on experiments. Most students that come from Haskell have not been actually not been exposed to a lot of the state-of-the-art instrumentation, or even actually decent chemical equipment and stuff. So there is always sort of a learning curve, and getting them even up to the speed where an equivalent person here would be with regards chemistry. Because they…can't afford really expensive balances and all the equipment, so the students have not been exposed to any of this. So initially, I think, I just want them to feel comfortable with the lab environment. We try to get them working with somebody and then they start progressing with the project, picking up little parts of it as they become a little more confident and becoming a little more familiar.

According to this faculty member, as the Haskell students become more knowledgeable with the equipment, they develop confidence in their knowledge and appear to be as capable as any other students she supervises in her laboratories.

We do a lot of a lab on a chip and micro-fluidic. We have a clean room and all this stuff. In general I think they get the overall picture pretty well on the biological significance with disease state we are trying to target. But I think the learning the equipment and how to run things takes a little longer. It always – if I've teamed them up with a good person in the lab, it definitely happens, and they become comfortable with that and they take the project as their own and they can give a poster and talk about it.

The above responses indicate that some KU faculty generally have either a neutral or positive opinion of the Haskell students they encounter.

In marked contrast, the following KU faculty member was very critical of the academic preparation that the Haskell students have received.

> *I'll be honest with you. I think, given what I see of the student preparedness [at Haskell]. If you have anything but the lowest of expectations, you're bound to be disappointed. So I don't start by assuming that they know certain skills, I don't start by assuming they have [a] certain background. I don't even start by assuming that they know how to show up every day on time. And so you teach them all those things. You make sure they realize why certain things are important to do and why some things are less critical. You build from ground zero. I don't have many expectations. On the other hand, I've always been surprised and pleased with the outcome.*

His remarks continued to be highly critical later on, touching upon not only study skills, but also life skills.

> *In general, my impression is that they are not as nearly as well prepared as students I've taught at other places, including…at KU. Not just academically information prepared, but they typically don't have the study skills, the maturity to actually sit down and work at something until they are actually successful at it. I think some of them are critically in need of remedial help…..I would also hazard to guess that at some level they go through the process [at Haskell] finding that expectations are lowered for them, and when you do ask them to do what would be considered appropriate level work at any other institution, many of them will complain about it, because they end up being pampered too much. So there's lack of preparedness and sometimes a sense of entitlement. There also is often general lack of focus, not just*

short -term, but long-term. If you ask them what their aspirations are or their goals, you get a lot more blank stares than you might at other places.

Another KU faculty member who has provided instruction at both Haskell and KU had a different take on classroom instruction maintaining that the smaller class sizes at Haskell allowed him to do more interesting work than he is able to with KU students.

First of all, the courses are different here [at Haskell]. I'll give you an example. I taught General Ecology one semester here and at KU at the same time. At KU, I had a hundred and twelve students. At Haskell, I had seven. I don't think I've ever taught a course here that had more than twelve students. Very intimate. You know your students after two days. You can do all sorts of things that are more time intensive here because you're not splitting your time between dozens of students; you're splitting it between maybe a half-dozen students. I actually on this campus will give more elaborate projects to the students because I can expect to be able to help them with things. Every course that I teach here…requires an original research project, whether it's an Ecology course, an animal behavior or …math courses here. For all those things, we can be primarily project-oriented. Can't do that at other places.

In the above faculty member's opinion, Haskell's intimacy is a positive capability that he is denied in the large class settings at KU.

A number of remarks about capabilities in the partnership centered around Haskell faculty ability to provide sufficient academic preparation to the students. Much of the commentary was highly critical of the Haskell faculty. For example, one KU faculty member who has taught on both campuses attributed Haskell students' lackluster performance poor faculty capabilities.

I think that [at Haskell] we do a terrible job with preparing students for higher-level courses and life outside of this campus. I think our science program is critically ill – thought-out and primarily structured around people's strengths and interests and not student needs. I think that our faculty like to say that it's all about the student, but we have too many faculty [for whom], it's all about minimizing effort. So when you combine students who may arrive in need [of] remedial help, then you give them a curriculum that's constantly morphing with little quality control and faculty who…run the whole range from very good to less than poor, [it's] only by sheer luck that some students manage to leave here prepared [and] able to take the next step.

Another KU faculty acknowledged that Haskell has the potential to be a strong campus, but alludes to structural problems that prevent this from happening.

Haskell should be the elite tribal college in the country….I would argue that it's not….Things will progress down there, in one way or another. I think the potential is really untapped. Despite all this money and these resources going into the relationship, there's some structural problems down there at Haskell that I think are limiting and some things about KU's expectations that can't be met.

In support of an earlier assessment of the levels of academic preparation of Haskell students, another KU faculty member stated that Haskell students present with very different skill levels and this variance makes teaching difficult.

I feel like I have a pretty objective perspective on what the capabilities are down at Haskell versus the relationships here. I know most of the administrators that oversee those four programs. I know the KU faculty, a fair number of KU faculty people involved at both campuses, so they kind of help me realize strengths and

weaknesses…of how things tend to work, how people tend to communicate between the two institutions. I'll go back to first principles. As far as my perspective as regarding students at Haskell is, when I taught down there previously. I typically found in a class of twenty students, five students could've been at any university in the country – they were that talented. They had their, for lack of a better word, shit together. I mean they were just dynamite. There was another ten to seventeen…that were okay, not great. They were going to struggle through at Haskell or make it some. There was five to seven, depending on your class, they had no business being there. And the academic mission down at Haskell is different than most universities in that they often have to spend a fair amount of time training students up. A huge amount of resources go into just getting math up to snuff, to college level.

The KU faculty perspectives on capabilities within the relationship suggest that they make judgments about Haskell faculty and student performance using criteria that may be influenced by their relative ease of access to resources at KU. The comments show that these faculty members are cognizant of the limitations the Haskell campus faces, they still complain about how much effort is required to improve the capabilities required to bring Haskell students up to the disciplinary skill levels necessary to thrive in the KU environment.

Intercampus Trust

One aspect of the faculty interviews that was markedly different from the administration findings was area of intercampus trust. Whereas the administrators on both campuses tended to agree on their evaluation of the intentions of each campus, the opinions of the Haskell and KU faculty were widely divergent.

Haskell Faculty Views on Intercampus Trust

Overall, the Haskell faculty view KU's intentions in the relationship with a great deal of suspicion. The distrust communicated by Haskell faulty members could be related to the differences between a minority and a majority institution, including a fear of paternalism. The disparity in size between the two campuses also appeared to play a role in the wariness of Haskell faculty toward KU. The Haskell faculty, due to these two factors, may question the general intentions of the KU grant administrators.

One faculty member stated that she was familiar with the trouble that other PWIs have had in working with HBCUs. In these other partnerships, she noted, the majority institutions seemed to be primarily interested in increasing their minority enrollment numbers to meet NSF expectations.

> *I went to an NSF meeting that was all minority institutions. And I heard other people talking about their science and technology center grants, which were humongous grants. Especially the Black universities, they were complaining about the way they were treated. And basically, the majority institution wanted the numbers. They had no support system and no follow-through, no way of actually making the transition for the students.*

The above faculty member mentioned later on that, in her view, KU's approach to Haskell in the partnership followed the same attitude – simply a place from which KU could draw strong minority students and to count toward its efforts to diversify, without regard for the mission of Haskell. She related that her past conversations with KU faculty and administrators have often involved checking their desires with the reality about Haskell's situation.

The second grant, we had actually introduced the GIS and they were beginning to find it useful. But it took a lot of honest exchange with a comfort level to do so. They would say things like "We need [American Indian] students to go into graduate school." I said, "Wait a minute, have you looked at Haskell's catalog? We don't even have a calculus course." And I invited them down here; I said, "This is what we've got. Now to think they're going to get excited about drilling ice cores next week is not realistic." So I was being very frank with them. And then they would say, "This is what NSF wants; we have to produce." So we just kept this dialogue going. And I said "When you wrote the grant, you talked about education [in] elementary school, you talked about it in high school, then you skipped to grad school research." I said, "You totally left out the undergrad environment, especially for people who are behind." And I insisted [on] that, and they were fine with that. They were very supportive.

Some Haskell faculty see as problematic KU's efforts to identify and recruit the most academically prepared Haskell students. The following faculty member pointed out that some of the Haskell students who will not succeed due to KU's failure to provide sufficient support to the minority students.

Now, this is the dilemma in our connection with KU. KU, being the smart institution that it is, decides to cherry pick our students. The ones who are really outstanding, they'll grab up and take up there right away. Typically what has happened when they do that, [the KU administrators] put them in a different environment and [the Haskell students] fail. Here, [American Indian students] have a fairly supportive environment – more, much more community connections, family connections, cultural connections.

Comfortableness in terms of going to school, because kids are very aware of their image….There's so many times that I've heard from KU faculty that they didn't think the Indian students were any good. Those who have succeeded [at KU] were very, very good. They had to go beyond the typical academic standards that are in coursework or even research. So they had to overprove themselves, just to stick it out up there.

Later in the interview, this Haskell professor related the experience of one of his former students who completed the grant programs at KU and went on to attend dental school elsewhere. In this instance, he maintained that the overall environment at KU was not supportive for the student. In fact, he strongly implied that she succeeded in spite of the problems she faced at KU.

I just had a young lady who graduated from the dental school at UMKC [University of Missouri-Kansas City], and she got her environmental science degree here. She was Shoshone, Shoshone-Paiute from Nevada. She was an excellent student, one of the best I've ever seen. I've taught at KU and I've taught senior level microbiology up there. I mean this young lady was [National] Merit Scholar material. She had the skills. But she had to go around and shop herself to UMKC because, number one, she's a woman. Number two, more importantly, she's Native American. Number three, that puts a mindset for that dental school class she starts out in as the identified Native American, the token – however you want to put it. Even with this excellent student – I don't think she ever made anything below an A – she struggled with that one issue, the cultural identification, and struggled with the racism that she found in her peers, that she was going to school with. You have to figure out, in terms of her,

she was close enough to home where she commuted. With many of these kids here, they live in Florida, New York, Washington, Alaska. So when [they] transfer to…KU, the only support they have is here at Haskell.

The degree of mistrust that some Haskell faculty have toward KU is based in large part upon what they have heard in conversations with KU administrators and faculty over the years. One faculty noted that some individuals at KU may hold discriminatory prejudices against Haskell students, although they may not express them overtly.

I'm not trying to be negative with KU; I'm just talking about their attitude. Because I've been in meetings. I know what they say behind closed doors. Because I worked on a lab up there that my graduate mentor was – she had been acting chancellor and acting vice chancellor, was executive vice chancellor for the campus up here for five or six years and then acting chancellor. I had access to conversations and discussions that went beyond the norm in terms of trying to figure out how to best fit KU and Haskell together.

According to this faculty member, his experience in the conversations have raised concerns about the treatment that Haskell students may receive from KU faculty and administrators.

I would say a majority of the kids have a very bumpy road. Very bumpy road. Especially in writing skills and in just talking with their faculty sponsor. So it's a different social process when you come from a different cultural group. It's just different. You have an old white boy network up there that could be hardcore, very racist, very sexist.

Another Haskell faculty member expressed the opinion that KU takes the partnership for granted.

KU is complacent when it comes to this, in terms of, it's got a rich fat cow here that can beef up its [minority student] numbers. They don't do anything special for us, though, in terms of that type of interaction. Even though they say they do – you can read some of their reports. It's not true.

KU Faculty Views of Intercampus Trust

The KU faculty's perspective is vastly different from the Haskell faculty. In the interview responses, the KU faculty members did not identify any general problems of trust between the two campuses, although there was some indication that KU faculty members are aware of the cautiousness with which the Haskell faculty approach the relationship. While the KU faculty acknowledge that Haskell is continually wary of exploitive attempts by other campuses, they typically do not view their own institution as having similar intentions.

One faculty member stressed that KU's participation in the joint partnership is sincere, unlike other institutions who have approached Haskell.

I think they get picked on a lot. I know that they get angry when people try to put them on grants [without permission] just put them on grants. They get asked quite a bit…. The relationship that exists is real and helps both campuses. But they are reluctant to throw their name in the hat for any old grant. Someone puts an R01 or R21 [NIH research grants] and wants a minority component that doesn't work. A lot of people try it. So I'm sure it gets old after awhile over there.

Another KU faculty member noted that the level of intercampus trust is really determined by the interaction between the administrators.

And how things can go positive or negative in these relationships – I can see…the interest of the KU funding source and also Haskell, they don't want to bullied by

these big dollars. You're dictating how our teaching is going to go down there – they don't want that, either. So that interplay between the two institutions,…that the relationship between the people – the administrators for both institutions can really facilitate a lot of that.

Another faculty member, who has served on both the Haskell and KU campuses, observed that KU appears to have issues with faculty affiliations.

I've directed, I've mentored students in research for RISE, BRIDGE, IMSD (which I think is the one that is based at KU), for all those programs, primarily because I've never fully dropped my KU affiliation. So I've always been allowed to do it, because I'm somehow also a KU person. They actually seem reluctant to let you do it if you are just a Haskell person. I don't know why.

This same faculty member expressed his misgivings that KU may not be entirely altruistic and honest about the relationship.

I do want to make a point to describe [an] aspect of all these programs that I think often frustrates me but doesn't get talked about all that much. That is, that while you can easily get individual faculty at KU to help you if you are a faculty person or to step forward and mentor our students, I'm not always left with the feeling that this is an incredibly altruistic thing they're doing. You hear about students being mentored up there, and sometimes you're left with the feeling that the student's not really being mentored. Some are simply trying to say they mentored diversity students….You definitely rarely hear of a person up at KU who is willing to put in what I think is necessary time to actually mentor a student up to the next level. You can teach them a couple of techniques, you can make them look busy, but that is not the same as really

educating the student. And when you talk to the people who write these grants and run these programs from KU's point of view, too often for my tastes does the conversation revolve [around] money and how much you can pull in and how much they spin it, how much they make things look incredibly successful. If you actually know the students and you know what happens and you know the full story behind it, you're sometimes left thinking they're lying. They are just fabricating because they have to turn in big numbers to get big dollars the next time around. So I think these programs are useful for Haskell students because at least right now, they are the only show in town. If there was a way for Haskell to have faculty that were involved in research and to have things done right here by faculty that care for the students and were going make the time for it, and if we could do that, I would just as soon see these KU programs go away. They're better than nothing, but that doesn't make them great.

The above comments by this faculty member were the only assessments from the KU side that portrayed KU in less than a flattering light. The dual appointment status this individual possesses, may explain why his assessment corresponded more closely to those of the Haskell faculty.

Divergence of Views

Unlike the convergence of views that arose in the administrative interviews, there appears to be a significant divergence between how the faculties of Haskell and KU perceive the institutional relationship. The divergence is most recognizable in the faculty responses concerning the perceptions of capabilities and intercampus trust. One area of convergence was identified, however, in the case of the joint taskforce. At both Haskell and KU, the

faculty respondents expressed agreement that the steering committee established at the administrative level has little impact. Faculty members on both campuses appeared to have little contact with or knowledge about this entity. The two faculties do agree on two components of the steering committee: that the coordinated efforts within the grant relationship are student-centered and that the faculty themselves arrange most of the interaction without much intervention of a coordinating committee of any sort.

In examining the role of the steering committee in the Haskell-KU partnership, institutional theory suggests that this mechanism provides the organization a means to convey messages between different actors in the partnership and to establish rituals in which both groups may participate. The efforts to coordinate the programs through ODST demonstrate that participants have established communication between the two campuses, even when the existence of a coordinating body is minimal to the operation.

In all other respects, the faculty at Haskell and KU have greatly differing views. Concerning institutional perceptions, Haskell faculty stressed that they bring to the partnership an understanding of American Indian culture that the KU faculty does not seem to possess. Additionally, they emphasized their efforts to improve Haskell's academic capabilities. From the tribal critical race theory perspective, the Haskell faculty's statements that are always mindful of their mission to the American Indian community. From the institutional theory perspective, they demonstrate a concerted effort to establish equitability with KU in the relationship.

Federal compliance with BIA requirements also surfaced as an important issue to the Haskell faculty. This aspect of the interview findings can be considered from both institutional theory and tribal critical race theory in a similar vein. The efforts by the Haskell

faculty to comply with BIA regulations demonstrate that they are trying to conform to the will of bureaucratic mechanisms to which they must report (institutional theory) and that they are still operating within a colonialized mindset (tribal critical race theory).

The KU interviewees indicate some knowledge of Haskell's activities within the partnership, but their responses primarily focus on the unequal levels of instruction and research at the two universities. In particular, the KU respondents criticize Haskell facilities and faculty as not having the capabilities to provide appropriate research experiences for their students. Through the lens of institutional theory, the KU faculty statements reveal a desire to ensure students meet the disciplinary requirements of the STEM field. Under tribal critical race theory, there would be little to support the view that KU's faculty had decolonized their thinking in the implementation of the curriculum.

The Disconnect over Intercampus Trust

Perhaps the most telling divergence in the interviews was the disconnect between Haskell and KU over the level of intercampus trust. The Haskell faculty seems to look upon the relationship with a jaundiced eye. A number of Haskell respondents reported patronizing attitudes, maintaining that KU administration and faculty think of Haskell as unworthy of respect due to its inferior status in the national educational hierarchy (i.e., a TCU versus a PWI flagship). From the aspect of institutional theory, the article by Townsend's Community College Organizational Climate for Minorities and Women greatly explains the perception of the Haskell faculty members, that the partnership does little to account for their institutional needs. In essence, they feel that they are being exploited for the commodity (American Indian college students) they can provide to KU. From the tribal critical race theory perspective, the KU intentions are at worse exploitive and at best token efforts to assist

Haskell. In either case, the Haskell faculty perceives the partnership as one that needs constant review to ensure Haskell does not become too marginalized.

In stark contrast, the KU faculty responses indicate that they do not experience any degree of mistrust between the two campuses. In fact, the faculty members who did discuss their reliance on the actions of Haskell administrators and faculty seemed to have a high degree of collegial regard for them. Institutional theory may suggest that KU is approaching this relationship from a position of power and therefore does not need to make large efforts to placate their junior partner.

Chapter 7

Discussion

The relationship between Haskell and KU in the STEM disciplines is multi- layered. Based upon the interviews with the administrators and faculty from both institutions, the behind-the-scenes operations require coordination to run smoothly. The value of this case study is how it brings to light some practices that could have applicability to other academic partnerships between minority-serving institutions and predominantly White institutions.

In this final chapter, I will discuss how both institutional theory and tribal critical race theory can explain how the partnership functions in the view of the administrators and faculty who participated in the interviews. I will discuss implications of this case study for American Indian higher education partnerships and minority pipelines policy for the STEM fields. Finally, this study will close with some ideas for future research into American Indian higher education.

Overview of Study

This examination of the collaboration between Haskell and KU in the STEM grant programs was intended to create an understanding of how such a relationship can inform policy development to foster stronger partnerships between minority-serving institutions and PWIs. The study was meant to determine those practices that enable effective partnership development and to elucidate the influence of internal institutional mechanisms and external agencies on this development.

The study sought to answer the following research questions:

1. How were the STEM programs developed between Haskell and Kansas over the last decade?

2. According to administrators and faculty at both institutions, what were the explicit intentions for the partnership?

3. According to administrators and faculty at both institutions, how does the partnership operate? What are the points of tension?

Implementing the Study

Because the study involved two other universities, I was required to work with both Haskell and KU to obtain the appropriate human subjects permissions. Haskell required letters from both the University of Missouri Institutional Research Board and the University of Kansas Human Subjects Committee at Lawrence before I could commence the interview process. Both Haskell and KU required that I find campus research sponsors as well before submitting human subjects research applications. This process spanned five months to obtain all the required permissions.

Upon receiving the final approval from Haskell and the BIA, I scheduled interviews with administrators and faculty. I identified interview subjects through a snowball method, in which I incorporated an interview question asking the subject to identify other individuals who would be helpful for the study. I was able to interview four administrators and four faculty from Haskell and four administrators and four faculty from KU. The total number of subjects who participated in the study was sixteen.

Rationale for the Study

The idea for this study had its beginning in my research internship in which I assisted Dr. Cockrell, Dr. C. Pewewardy, and Dr. N. Pewewardy in a campus climate study about American Indian college students in the Big XII conference. The overall goal of this study was to be an extension of the work I assisted with and to examine a small part of the larger Big XII. In my initial proposal, the goal was to conduct in-depth interviews with

administrators and faculty members from both Haskell and KU. The intention of the study was to examine the partnership from these two populations' perspectives.

To develop an analysis of this unique partnership, it was necessary to employ two different theoretical frameworks: institutional theory and tribal critical race theory. Institutional theory was used to examine the different actors' explanations of how the partnership was formed and implemented between the two campuses. This theory helped to illuminate the types of behaviors and the efficacy of the mechanisms in the partnership.

For the tribal critical race theory analysis, I examined how Haskell preserves its unique mission within the context of the partnership. To truly decolonize the study (Mihesuah, 2004), tribal critical race theory was used to analyze the statements of the Haskell side of the partnership, where most of the actors were not American Indian, but do have a sensitivity to Native issues. In addition, the theory allowed the development of a critique of the motivations of each institution and degree to which American Indian populations are served by the partnership.

Addressing the Research Questions through Institutional Theory

Institutional theory is a strong lens through which to answer the research questions. In the responses of both sets of administrators and both sets of faculty, institutional theory provided the means to fully understand how the actors worked together, what types of structures had been developed, how outside forces influenced decisions, and what types of behaviors maintained the relationship.

Based primarily upon the responses of the administrators, the partnership arose as a convergence of administrative efforts to help both institutions. Various individuals were involved in the establishment of the grant partnerships, and each set of actors brought to the

table skills necessary to improve the status of both institutions internally and in their interactions with outside agencies. Specific skills – grant-writing and project management – allowed both campuses to improve components of their operations through complementary functions that each provided the other. For example, Haskell was able to provide their students with KU's state-of-the-art facilities and research. The partnership enabled KU to gain access to a population (American Indian college students) who would improve their institutional numbers in the eyes of upper administration and outside bodies that are trying to develop pipelines for minority students in the STEM fields. From the perspective of institutional theory, the administrative efforts fell in line with Kezar's and Eckel's model (2002), in which senior administrators framed a partnership to ensure the development of formal structures to enhance both institutions.

The administrator perspectives further reinforced Meyer and Rowan's work (1977), because both sets of administrators noted that there was a strong desire to maintain the partnership to gain access to grant funding. To ensure that the outside agencies continued to provide this funding, the administrators tried very hard to comply with the requirements of these grant sources. A final aspect of this convergence was how both institutions worked in concert to ensure that Haskell maintained some type of practical training aspect to its curriculum (a carryover from when it was a junior college). This fits with Townsend's (2009) examination of the trend for community colleges to develop programs that lead to baccalaureate-level education.

From the faculty side, on the other hand, the relationship was one of tension and divergence. According to Morphew's (2002) perspective on institutional theory and evolutionary change in mission, the Haskell faculty members were trying to ensure their

institution continues to place primary emphasis on support for American Indian students. Additionally, they want to ensure that Haskell and the students are treated in a respectful manner within the context of the partnership (Townsend, 2009).

In answer to the second part of the question, the respondents addressed explicit intentions with reflections about prior and current treatment. One consistent statement throughout the responses of the administrators and faculty was the need to respect the mission of Haskell to serve the American Indian population. The Haskell faculty expressed caution about how in the past Haskell had been treated as a token by other institutions that wanted to partner with the campus. A number of KU faculty mentioned their awareness of the need to respect the relationship with Haskell; they noted that Haskell does what it can with the resources available. If both sets of statements are taken together, it is possible to see an attempt by both campuses to move beyond tokenism and utilize a new language that better defines their explicit goals. As described in the work of Meyer and Rowan, the Haskell-KU collaboration comprises an attempt to develop inter-institutional relations that fundamentally change the status of Haskell from a subordinate institution to one of equal status to KU.

The final research question examined the operations of the partnership. Using institutional theory to address this question, it is appears that the convergence of the administrations was primarily responsible for making the collaboration work. This was done through the establishment of the steering committee, the grant writing, and the transfer processes that have been set up. The STEM grants program have developed from this initial beginning into an infrastructure dedicated to student support and grant compliance, interactions at the co-curricular level and collaborative responses to outside influences.

As Haskell and KU have developed the STEM partnership over time, it is possible to think of the relationship from Haskell's perspective as analogous to Townsend's (2009) concept of a community college applied baccalaureate degree. Even though Haskell has been a university for a number of years, the orientation of the classes still revealed a practical orientation. (For example, not only should the students understand concepts of geography, but they should be able to apply that knowledge through skills developed in geographical information science.) Haskell's partnership with KU met this applied baccalaureate concept, where practical laboratory skills were developed simultaneously to learning disciplinary subject knowledge.

The structure of the grants provided a pathway into the disciplines. Built into the grants was a transfer program from Haskell to KU that American Indian students could participate in if they so desired. If an academically strong student was accepted into the programs, it was possible for that individual to progress all the way through graduate school. This was similar to Townsend and Wilson's (2009) description of community colleges partnering with four-year universities to shore up their academic offerings. The potential for Haskell students to either transfer to as an undergraduate with the BRIDGES to the Baccalaureate grant or to prepare for graduate education through the PREP grant enabled Haskell to provide stronger academic opportunities to the students.

Using institutional theory from the faculty perspective did not result in the convergence that was seen in the responses of the administrators. It is possible to argue that a form of exploitation of student minority status was taking place to improve the ethnic minority numbers reported by the KU administration (Townsend, 2009). Some Haskell and KU faculty indicated that they did not believe KU was operating in the best interests of

American Indian students, but instead was using the partnership to shore up KU's reputation with outside agencies. One faculty member went so far as to imply that KU might be manipulating numbers to make the university appear more diverse than it really is. Therefore, institutional theory provides a critique of the relationship that puts some faculty comments in direct opposition to the administrators' convergence perspective.

One final point that bears consideration from the institutional perspective is an examination of how the language used to describe the relationship unconsciously perpetuates a hierarchy in the partnership. As noted in Thornton's and Ocasio's (1999) work on field logics, the use of the 'up/down' terminology suggests that a subconscious ordering of the two campuses is taking place with all actors in the partnership. KU has access to resources, so it is "up"; Haskell lacks resources, so it is "down." The repetition of this terminology by the faculty in particular may provide insight into how difficult it is for administrators to move the campuses to an egalitarian footing.

Examination of the Data through the Lens of Tribal Critical Race Theory

Two facets of tribal critical race theory were evident in the data: persistence of colonized thought (in which the actors may establish behaviors or mechanisms that are supportive of majority perspectives) and decolonized methodologies (in which an indigenous-centric view is used in the operations of the partnership). Though this may sound like a blunt use of the theory, it provides an added basis for analyzing the motivations of the actors in response to the research questions.

Utilizing tribal critical race theory to assess perspectives of the different actors within the relationship, it was evident that the development of the partnership fits with the evolution of the curriculum as Haskell has grown to meet the needs of the national tribal communities.

Haskell's efforts to become an intertribal institution that can broadly address the needs of the different American Indian nations fit with tribal critical race theory in which the goals of the tribes are the motivating factor for institutional evolution. The implementation of this evolution is embodied in the institutional mission as described Chapter One (Grande, 2004).

The use of tribal critical race theory to answer the research questions from the administration perspective leads to a different interpretation. Because the Haskell administrators were very interested in following activities focused on academic disciplines and outside agencies, in which they were trying to emulate the KU model of operation, there was a move toward colonized thought patterns (in which non-indigenous perspectives are used to judge the efficacy of the partnership). In contrast, the perspectives of the Haskell faculty and some KU faculty suggested that, in actuality, the faculty behavior in the partnership generally was decolonizing. These individuals were motivated first by care for the students and service to tribal entities with disciplinary judgment coming second. The faculty tended to work for the preservation of the indigenous-centric mission that Haskell has developed over the past two decades (Cavender Wilson, 2004). Therefore, in answer to the first set of research questions, tribal critical race theory provided a mixed interpretation of established behaviors within the partnership.

Using tribal critical race theory to analyze the degree of collaboration between the two campuses, a mixed message emerged. The administrators were tending toward convergence between the two campuses, but the KU perspective generally dominated the relationship. In such a situation, tribal critical race theory suggests that the partnership only provides a modicum of support for the students to keep their American Indian culture alive within the disciplines. Even though KU relied on Haskell to be cultural brokers within the

relationship, Haskell tried very hard to emulate KU's infrastructure to comply with the directions of both the grant-funding agencies and the BIA. The Haskell administration was primarily concerned with meeting the pipeline goals outlined by the outside agencies (Jensen, 1984).

From the faculty perspective, the Haskell faculty perceived themselves to be the primary support for their American Indian students. They acted as surrogate parents, cultural brokers, and a general safety net for the students as they were 'cherry picked' by KU to enroll in the partnership. Because the Haskell faculty was focused on the well-being of the students, some of them did not fear criticizing KU's motivations (Mihesuah, 2004).

Implications for Further Research

This study tried to address the needs of American Indian college students in a single relationship between a TCU and PWI. Over the course of data collection and analysis, it became evident to me that this relationship could add to the literature in three areas of higher education research: collaborations between minority-serving and predominantly White institutions, federal bureaucracy and higher education, and American Indian higher education.

One potential strand of research that can be pursued in the future is an examination of how similar partnerships have developed and how the Haskell-KU model might inform the functioning of other partnership infrastructures. Another potential implication for research into such partnerships is how these collaborations cross both institutional culture and racial culture communication; how are the collaborators talking with each other and past each other?

Another area that this study identified is how federal bureaucracy interacts with higher education, both the through grant process and institutional governance. Haskell and KU faculty discussed how dealing with both processes required perseverance and patience. A number of future research strands come to mind as a result of this study. First would be a further examination of how federal grant-funding priorities affect how higher education institutions of all types structure their curriculum. One of the Haskell interviewees mentioned the partnership between Haskell and KU in social work, but did not clarify whether federal funding existed for this discipline. In the interviews, both Haskell and KU faculty pointed out that these grants are specifically targeted to increasing racial minority representation in the STEM fields. Some Haskell faculty members were critical of this funding priority because they felt ignored the mission of Haskell. A study to determine how federal funding influences the curriculum would be an interesting follow-up.

In the case of federal influence on institutional governance, it would be interesting to do a comparison of how the federal government directs Haskell Indian Nations University and the Southwestern Indian Polytechnic Institute's operations. Is the Bureau of Indian Education (BIE) equally intrusive at both campuses? What role does the BIE have with the tribally governed colleges? Is the relationship significantly different? To take this a step further, another research strand could examine how the federal government handles all of its higher education institutions (Haskell, Southwestern Indian Polytechnic, and the service academies).

Another potential area for further research would be an examination of how American Indian higher education is currently developing. In Chapter Two, Boyer's work explaining the origin of the American Indian Higher Education Consortium (AIHEC) provides the

background into the founding of many American Indian institutions. The question that now arises is: How are they currently operating? How are the different tribal colleges and universities meeting the educational expectations of American Indians? Do partnerships like that of Haskell and KU serve as a model for other American Indian institutions to emulate? Haskell has expanded its curriculum in response to the changing needs of the American Indian community. It would be interesting to learn whether the other members of AIHEC have taken similar steps.

Implications for Policy

One influence on the Haskell-KU partnership is a desire by both institutions to provide a pathway for American Indian students into the STEM disciplines. An implication for policy discussion is how this pathway effort actually manifests itself in increasing minority representation of all types in the disciplines. Through the literature and the interviews, I learned that TCUs and HBCUs are being looked to by the NSF to help produce more minority students majoring in scientific subjects. What policy makers may have to examine is: What mechanisms are working? And are these culturally sensitive? The Haskell faculty expressed a desire to see more respect given to American Indian cultures as these students are entering the STEM fields. In examining the current activities, policy makers may have to ask about cultural sensitivity in these programs. Then they have to determine if these programs are successful only based upon numbers, or determine what other assessment criteria could be used to develop policy recommendations.

The other policy issue that this study raises is what mechanisms work in partnerships between minority-serving institutions and predominantly White campuses? Are intercampus governance committees effective? Just how much faculty interaction is necessary to ensure a

successful partnership? Some minority-serving institutions are actually predominantly White, as in the case of Hispanic serving institutions such as the University of Houston-Downtown. Are these institutions therefore exempt from discussions on partnerships between minority-serving institutions and predominantly White institutions? Policy makers will have to determine along which lines to develop policies supporting partnerships such as the one between Haskell and KU.

Conclusion

This study is an extension of the work on campus climate for American Indians on predominantly White campuses. The study examined a unique relationship between Haskell Indian Nations University and the University of Kansas in only one segment of their interaction, the science/technology/engineering/mathematics disciplines. Throughout the data collection process, the complexity of this partnership's structure provided a sense of possibilities such collaborations might attain.

The lenses of institutional theory and tribal critical race theory provided insight into how the various actors construct interpretations of the partnership's efficacy. Generally speaking, the administrations from both campuses had convergent perspectives on the partnership's efficacy based upon their desire to meet the criteria set for them by grant agencies and the STEM disciplines. Conversely, the faculties from both campuses expressed divergent perspectives in the sense that both institutional theory and tribal critical race theory supported Haskell faculty interpretations of the partnership as being exploitive of the Haskell campus to improve KU's minority-serving status.

To generalize about the relationship, the efforts put forth by the two institutions within the partnership do provide the students with access to resources and instruction that

will prepare them to move onto graduate work and careers in the sciences. What is unclear is the degree to which the partnership sacrifices the Haskell institutional mission to attain the KU disciplinary-focused mission. In the end, the partnership appears to favor KU's disciplinary focus while Haskell tolerates its unequal status in order to help American Indian students gain access to resources that the school is currently unable to provide on its own.

Appendix A

HINU-KU Cooperative STEM Program Study Date/Interview

Number_____/_____

Faculty Interview Questions

1 Please tell me about yourself. Why did you enter into the STEM fields?

2 How did you come to participate in the joint Science/Technology/Engineering/Mathematics program between Haskell and KU?

3 How does the program prepare you for working with American Indian students?

4 What were your expectations of the American Indian students participating in the program?

5 What have been your observations of Haskell students in your classroom?

6 How do Haskell students respond to the subject matter?

7 Have you done anything differently for Haskell students?

8 How does Haskell prepare students to participate in the program?

9 Do you have any contact with faculty at (HINU/KU) as you participate in the program?

10 Are there any community building efforts between the two faculties?

11 Is there anything you would like to share that you feel I have missed in my earlier questions?

Appendix B

HINU-KU Cooperative STEM Program Study Date/Interview

Number_____/_____

Administration Interview Questions

1 What were the reasons for the establishment of the co-curricular STEM program between HINU and KU?

2 How do you think the STEM program functions between the two schools?

3 How does Haskell prepare the students and faculty for the program?

4 How does KU prepare the students and faculty for the program?

5 How do you think the Haskell students participating in the joint program perceive the program?

6 Are there any Haskell faculty involved with the program?

7 Is there anything you would like to share that you feel I have missed in my earlier questions?

References

Adams, D. W. (1995). *Education for extinction: American Indians and the boarding school experience, 1875-1928*. (pp. 5-27, 97-135). Lawrence: University of Kansas Press.

AhNee-Benham, M. K. P. (2003). The journey of Native American higher education. In M. K. P. AhNee-Benham & W. J. Stein (Ends). *The renaissance of American Indian Higher Education: Capturing the dream*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Akers, C.R., Gilliland, L., Stanley, J. and Appelson, W.B. (evaluators) (1989). *Report of a visit to HIJC*. Lawrence, KS: Commission on Institutions of Higher Education of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools.

Alfred, T. (2004). Warrior scholarship: Seeing the university as a ground of contention. In D. A. Mihesuah & A. C. Wilson (Eds.). *Indigenizing the academy: Transforming scholarship and empowering communities.* (pp. 88-99). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

American Indian Higher Education Consortium. (2008). *American Indian measures for success: Sustaining tribal colleges and universities and the tribal college movement: Highlights and profiles.* Alexandria, VA: Systemic Research.

Axtell, J. (1981). *The European and the Indian: Essays in the ethnohistory of colonial North America.* (pp. 87-109). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Barden, J. (2003). Tribal colleges and universities building community; Education, social, cultural, and economic development. In M. K. P. AhNee-Benham & W. J. Stein (Eds.), *The renaissance of American Indian higher education: Capturing the dream*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Black Alumni Organization (1994). *The African American experience at the University of Missouri, 1950--1994.* Columbia: University of Missouri Alumni Association.

Blackmar, F. W. (Ed.). (1912). *Kansas: A cyclopedia of state history, embracing events, institutions, industries, counties, cities, towns, prominent persons, etc.* (Vol. I). Chicago: Standard.

Blandin, D. M. (1994). Three realities: Minority life in the United States: The struggle for economic equity. In M. J. Justiz, R. Wilson, & L. G. Bjork (Eds.), *Minorities in higher education*. Phoenix, AZ: American Council on Education/Oryx Press.

Bogdan, R.C. & Biklen, S.K. (2003). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theories and methods* (4th ed.).(pp. 66-68.) Boston, MA: Allen & Bacon.

Bowen, W. G. & Bok, D. (1998). *The shape of the river.* (pp. 1-15). Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Boyer, P. (1997). *Native American Colleges: Progress and prospects.* (pp. 19-26). Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Brayboy, B. M. J. (2006). Toward a tribal critical race theory in education. *The Urban Review*, *37*(5), 425-445).

Buckley, A. (2004). Does becoming a professional mean I have to become White? *Journal of American Indian Education, 42* (2), 19-32.

Carney, C. M. (1999) *Native American higher education in the United States*. (pp. 13–42, 95–120). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.

Cavender Wilson, A. (2004). Reclaiming our humanity: Decolonization and the recovery of Indian knowledge. In D. A. Mihesuah & A. C. Wilson (Eds.). *Indigenizing the*

academy: Transforming scholarship and empowering communities. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

Child, B.J. (1998). *Boarding school seasons : American Indian families, 1900-1940.* Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

Clarkin, T. (2001). *Federal Indian policy in the Kennedy and Johnson administrations 1961-1969.* (pp. 187-225). Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

Connell-Szasz, M. (1988). *Indian education in the American colonies, 1607-1783*. (pp. 191-217). Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.

Cook, S. F. (1943). The conflict between the California Indian and white civilizations: The Indian versus the Spanish mission. In C.S. Larsen (Ed.) (1991). *Native American Demography in the Spanish Borderlands.* (pp. 399-497).New York: Garland.

Dartmouth Charter (1769). Retrieved from http://www.dartmouth.edu/~govdocs/case/charter.htm

DeJong, D. H. (1993). *Promises of the past: A history of Indian education in the United States.* (pp. 34-56). Golden, CO: North American Press.

DeLoria, V. (2006). Comfortable fictions and the struggle for turf: An essay review of The Invented Indian: Cultural fictions and government policies. In D. A. Mihesuah (Ed.). *Natives and academics: Researching and writing about American Indians*. (pp. 65-82). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Department of the Interior Office of Indian Affairs (1915). *Tentative course of study for United States Indian schools.* Washington D.C.

Donaldson, J.F. & Kozoll, C.E. (1999) *Collaborative program planning: Principles, practices and strategies*. (p. 1-27). Malabar, FL: Krieger publishers.

Donaldson, J.F. & Petersen, G. (2007) *Cohort doctoral preparation programs: Neo-institutional perspectives.* Version 1.1, 11 May 2007. Retrieved from (http://cnx.org/content/M14518/latest)

Drewry, H. N. & Doermann, H. (2001). *Stand and prosper: Private black colleges and their students.* (pp. 32-41). Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Elsner, W. (2012). The theory of institutional change revisited: The institutional dichotomy, its dynamic, and its policy implications in a more formal analysis. Journal of Economic Issues 46 (1).

Fagan, M. (2010). Linda Warner out as Haskell president; search to begin for successor. Lawrence Journal World. Retrieved from http://www2.ljworld.com/news /2010/nov/02/linda-warner-out-haskell-president-search-begin-su/.

Freire, Paulo. (2006)*Pedagogy of the Oppressed, 30th Anniversary ed.* New York: Continuum.

Gee, J. P. (1999). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method.* (pp. 58-79). London: Routledge.

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory*. (pp. 21-117). Hawthorne, NY: Aldine de Gruyter.

Glazer, J. S. (1997). Affirmative action and the status of women in the academy. In C. Marshall (Ed.). *Feminist critical policy analysis II: A perspective from post-secondary education.* (pp. 60-73). London: Falmer Press.

Goodner, J., Woods, R.G. & Harkins, A.M. (1970). *Characteristics and attitudes of 1968*

Haskell Institute Students. Training center for community programs in coordination with Office of community programs center for urban and regional affairs. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota.

Grande, S. (2004). *Red pedagogy: Native American social and political thought*. (pp. 31-62). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Griffin, C.S. (1966). The University of Kansas and the years of frustration, 1854-64. *Kansas Historical Quarterlies*, 32 (1),Spring, 1-32. Topeka: Kansas State Historical Society.

Gunaratnam, Y. (2003). *Researching 'race' and ethnicity: Methods, knowledge and power.* (pp. 136-156). London: Sage Publications.

Gur-Ze'ev, I. (2003). Critical theory, critical pedagogy and the possibility of counter-education. In M. Peters, C. Lankshear, & M. Olssen (Eds.). *Critical theory and the human condition: Founders and praxis.* (pp. 17-35). New York: Peter Lang.

Gutierrez-Jones, C. (2001). *Critical race narratives: A study of race, rhetoric, and injury.* (pp. 1-46). New York: New York University Press.

Hale, L. (2002). *Native American education: A reference handbook*. (pp. 21-39). Santa Barbara, CA: ABC CLIO.

Hammond, P. V. & Davis, B. L. (2005). From idea to graduation: The evolution of the first PhD program in a HBCU. In the *Association of Black Nursing Faculty Journal*, November/December 2005. (pp. 112-117).

Haskell Institute (1912). In Blackmar, F. W. (Ed). *Kansas: a cyclopedia of state history, embracing events, institutions, industries, counties, cities, towns, prominent persons, etc.* (Vol. I, pp. 828-830). Chicago: Standard Publishing Co.

Haskell Indian Junior College (1978). Self-study report for the North Central Association

of Colleges and Secondary Schools.: Lawrence, KS: Haskell Indian Junior College.

Haskell Indian Junior College (1988). Self-study report for the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. Lawrence, KS: Haskell Indian Junior College.

Haskell University (2007). Retrieve from http://www.haskell.edu/haskell/about.asp.

Hatch, J.A. (2002). *Doing qualitative research in education settings*. (pp. 16-17). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Jackson, C.E. & Galli, M.J. (1977). *A history of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and its activities among Indians*. (pp. 26-32). San Francisco: R & E Research Associates.

Jensen, K. (1984). Civilization and assimilation in the colonized schooling of Native Americans. In Altbach, P.G. & Kelly, G.P. (1984) (Eds.). *Education and the colonial experience* (2nd Rev. Ed.). (pp. 155-180). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.

Johnston, B. H. (1989). *Indian School Days*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma.

Kennedy, C. H. (2005). Single-case designs for educational research. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Kezar, A. & Eckel, P.D. (2002) The effect of institutional culture on change strategies in higher education: Universal principles or culturally responsive concepts. In the *Journal of Higher Education*. *73*(4).

Kimmel, A. J. (1988). Ethics and values in applied social research. *Applied Social Research Method Series 12*, 66-83. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

King, D. F. M. (1988). *Haskell institute: Understanding its establishment and studying its development from 1884 to 1894*.Unpublished master's thesis, University of Missouri Kansas City: Kansas City, MO.

Lam, P. C., Doverspike, D. & Mawasha, P.R. (1997). Increasing diversity in engineering academics (IDEAs): Development of a program for improving African American Representation. *Journal of Career Development, 24* (1), 55-70.

Lewis, D. R. & Hearn, J. (2003). Overview of a public research university. In D. R. Lewis & J. Hearn (Eds). *The public research university: Serving the public good in new times*. (pp. 1-18). Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Lincoln, Y.S. & Guba, E.G. (1985). *Naturalistic Inquiry*. (pp. 221-249). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Lucas, C.J. (1994). *American Higher Education*. (pp. 146-153, 204-210, 223-155). New York: St. Martin's Griffin.

Luke, C. (1997). Feminist pedagogy theory in higher education: Reflections on power and authority. In C. Marshall (Ed.). *Feminist critical policy analysis II: A perspective from post-secondary education*. (pp. 189-210). London: Falmer Press.

Martin, C., Jolly, E., Christensen, R., & Noley, G. (2002). Evaluation issues relating to the academic achievement of Native American Students. *The cultural context of educational evaluation: a Native American perspective*. (NSF 03-032, pp. 13-38). Arlington, VA: National Science Foundation.

Merriam, S. B. (1988). *Case study research in education: A qualitative approach*. (pp. 22-34). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Meyer, J., Ramirez, F., Frank, D. and Schofer, E. (2007). Higher Education as an Institution. In Gumport, P. (Ed). *The Sociology of Higher Education*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Meyer, J.W. & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations: Formal structures as

myth and ceremony. In *American Journal of Sociology*. Vol. 83, No. 2., pp. 304-363.

Mihesuah, D.A. (2004). Academic Gatekeepers. In D.A. Mihesuah & A.C. Wilson, (Eds.). *Indigenizing the academy: Transforming scholarship and empowering communities*. (pp. 31-47). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Miles, M. B. & Huberman, A. M. (1984). *Qualitative data analysis: A sourcebook for new methods.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Mills, M. R. & Bettis, P. J. (2006). Organizational identity and identification during a departmental reorganization. In V. A. Anfara & N. T. Mertz (Eds.).*Theoretical Frameworks in Qualitative Research*. (pp. 73-84). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Morphew, C.C. (2002) "A rose by any other name": Which colleges become universities. In the *Review of Higher Education*. *25* (2) 207-233.

Murchison, K. (1901). Digest of decisions relating to Indian affairs. (pp. 84-139). Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

Ness, J. E. (2002). Crossing the finish line: American Indian completers and non-completers in a tribal college. *Tribal College Journal*, *13*(4), 36-40.

Nichols, R. & Monette, G. C. (2003) Linking tribal colleges and mainstream institutions: Fundamental tensions and lessons learned. In M. K. AhNee-Benham & W. J. Stein (Eds). *The renaissance of American Indian higher education: Capturing the dream*. (pp. 121-136). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Office of Diversity in Science Training (2006). NIH Opportunities in Research Programs Newsletter, 6. Retrieved from http://www2.ku.edu/~odst/PDF/Newsletter2006.pdf

Okagaki, L., Helling, M. K. & Bingham, G. E. (2009). American Indian college students' ethnic identity and beliefs about education. *Journal of College Student Development 50*(2), 157-176.

Oppelt, N.T. (1990). *The tribally controlled Indian colleges: The beginnings of self determination in American Indian education*. (pp. 116-126). Tsaile, AZ: Navajo Community College Press.

Parker, L. (2003). Critical race theory in education: Possibilities and problems. In M. Peters, C. Lankshear, & M. Olssen (Eds.). *Critical theory and the human condition: Founders and praxis*. (pp. 184-199). New York: Peter Lang.

Parry, J. H. (1966). Spanish Indian Policy in colonial America: The ordering of society. In TePaske, J. J.(Ed.). *Three American Empires*. (pp. 109-126). New York: Harper & Row.

Perna, L., Lundy-Wagner, V., Drezner, N. D., Gasman, M., Yoon, S., Bose, E., & Gray, S. (2009). The contribution of HBCUs to the preparation of African American women for STEM careers: A case study. In *Research in Higher Education, 50* (1), 1-23.

Peters, M., Lankshear, C. & Olssen, M. (2003). Critical theory and the human condition. In M. Peters, C. Lankshear, & M. Olssen (Eds.) *Critical theory and the human condition: Founders and praxis.* (pp. 1-16). New York: Peter Lang.

Peterson, M.W. & White, T.H. (1992). Faculty and administrator perceptions of their environments: Different views or different models of organization? *Research in Higher Education,* 33(2), 177-204. DOI: 10.1007/BF00973578

Reyhner, J. & Eder, J. (2004). *American Indian education: A history*. (pp.303-330). Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Rosenstone, S. J. (2003). The idea of a university. In D. R. Lewis & J. Hearn (Eds.). *The public research university: Serving the public good in new times.* (pp. 57-86). Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Schuetz, J. (2002). *Episodes in the rhetoric of government-Indian relations.* (pp. xviii-xxii). Westport, Connecticut: Praeger.

Seidman, I (1998). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences* (pp. 9-20). New York: Teachers College Press.

The Shifting Borders of Race and Identity: A Research and Teaching Project on the Native American and African American Experience (2006). Retrieved from http://www.kuce.org/sb/.

Sieber, J. E. (1992). *Planning ethically responsible research: A guide for students and internal review boards. Applied Social Research Methods Series (31)*. (pp. 44-61). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Silverman, D. (2006). *Interpreting qualitative data* (3rd ed.). (pp. 65-108). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Smith, L. T. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples*. (pp. 123-141.). London: Zed Books.

Spring, J. (2007). *Deculturalization and the struggles for equality: A brief history of the education of dominated cultures in the United States*. (5th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Stage, F.K. (1997). Reframing research, informing policy: Another view of Women in

the Mathematics/Science Pipeline. In Marshall, C. (Ed.) *Feminist Critical policy analysis II: A post-secondary education perspective.* (pp.99-121). Falmer Press: Bristol, PA.

Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. (pp. 1-49). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Stubben, J. D. (2006). *Native Americans and political participation: A reference handbook*. (pp. 40-53). Santa Barbara, CA: ABC CLIO Inc.

Takaki, R. (1979). *Iron cages: Race and culture in nineteenth-century America*. (pp. 80-107). Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Taylor, J. S. (2001). *Through a critical lens: Native American alienation from higher education.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Seattle, Washington.

Thomas, G. (2008, Spring). Producing a vision: The evolving history of AISES. *Winds of Change*, *23*(2).

Thornton, P.H. & Ocasio, W. (2008). Institutional Logics. Retrieved from http://patriciathornton.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/02/9781412931236-Ch03.pdf

Tinto, V. (1993). *Leaving college.* (pp. 84-137). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Townsend, B.K. (2009). Community college organizational climate for minorities and women. Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 33(9), 731-744.

Townsend, B.K. (2009) The outlook for transfer programs and the direction of the community college. In *New Directions for Community Colleges*, *146*. DOI 10.1002/cc371

Townsend B.K. & Rosser, V.K. (2009) The extent and nature of scholarly activities

among community college faculty. In *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*. *33*, pp. 669-681. DOI: 10.1080/10668920902921502.

Townsend, B.K. & Wilson, K.B. (2009) The transfer mission: Tried and true, but troubled. In *New Directions for Community Colleges*. *136*. DOI 10.1002/cc257.

Tuhiwai Smith, L. (2005). Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples. London: Zed Books.

United States Senate, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. (1969). *Special subcommittee report on Indian Education: A national tragedy -- A national challenge.* Report No. 91-501, 91st Congress, 1st session. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office.

University of Kansas (1912). In Blackmar, F. W. (Ed). *Kansas: a cyclopedia of state history, embracing events, institutions, industries, counties, cities, towns, prominent persons, etc.* (Vol. II, pp. 831-838). Chicago: Standard Publishing Co.

Vanis, M.I. & Baldi, H.V. (evaluators) (1991) *Report of a visit to Haskell Indian Junior College.* Commission on Institutions of Higher Education of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools.

Vuckovic, M. (2008). *Voices from Haskell: Indian student between two worlds, 1884-1928.* (pp. 11-27). Lawrence: University of Kansas Press.

Walker-Hill, H. (2006, Spring). Western University at Quindaro, Kansas (1865-1943) and its legacy of pioneering musical women. *Center for Black Music Research Journal, 26*(1).

Wechsler, S. P., Whitney, D. J., Ambos, E. L., Rodrigue, C. M., Lee, C. T., Behl, R. J., et al (2005). Enhancing diversity in the geosciences. *Journal of Geography,104* (4),

141-150.

Weiss, R. S. (1995). Learning from strangers: The art and method of qualitative interview studies. New York: The Free Press.

Wilson, R. (2000). Barriers to minority success in college science, mathematics, and engineering programs. In G. Campbell, Jr., R. Denes, & C. Morrison (Eds.). *Access denied: Race, ethnicity, and the scientific enterprise*. (pp. 193-206). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wood, S. (2003). *Transcending conquest: Nahua views of Spanish colonial Mexico*. (pp. 60-76). Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Woodcock, D. B. & Aliwiye, O. (2001). The antecedents of failure and emerging hope: American Indians and public higher education. In *Education*, 121(4) 810-820.

Yamane, D. (2001). *Student movements for multiculturalism: Challenging the curricular line in higher education.* (pp. 47-76). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Appendix A

HINU-KU Cooperative STEM Program Study Date/Interview

Number_____/_____

Faculty Interview Questions

12 Please tell me about yourself. Why did you enter into the STEM fields?

13 How did you come to participate in the joint Science/Technology/Engineering/Mathematics program between Haskell and KU?

14 How does the program prepare you for working with American Indian students?

15 What were your expectations of the American Indian students participating in the program?

16 What have been your observations of Haskell students in your classroom?

17 How do Haskell students respond to the subject matter?

18 Have you done anything differently for Haskell students?

19 How does Haskell prepare students to participate in the program?

20 Do you have any contact with faculty at (HINU/KU) as you participate in the program?

21 Are there any community building efforts between the two faculties?

22 Is there anything you would like to share that you feel I have missed in my earlier questions?

Appendix B

HINU-KU Cooperative STEM Program Study Date/Interview

Number_____/_____

Administration Interview Questions

8 What were the reasons for the establishment of the co-curricular STEM program between HINU and KU?

9 How do you think the STEM program functions between the two schools?

10 How does Haskell prepare the students and faculty for the program?

11 How does KU prepare the students and faculty for the program?

12 How do you think the Haskell students participating in the joint program perceive the program?

13 Are there any Haskell faculty involved with the program?

14 Is there anything you would like to share that you feel I have missed in my earlier questions?

VITA

Pablo Bueno Mendoza was born on 17 March 1963 in Olongapo City, Philippines. He was raised in San Diego, California, where he graduated from high school in 1981. He earned a Bachelor of Arts in Non-Western History (Modern China and Japan) from the University of San Diego in 1985. Continuing his education, he earned his Artium Magister in East Asian and Pacific Studies (Modern China) from the University of Illinois-Urbana/Champaign in 1990. He earned his Tao Shih in 1998 from the Taoist Sanctuary of San Diego. He earned his Doctor of Philosophy in Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis at the University of Missouri-Columbia in 2012.

Pablo Bueno Mendoza's professional career began in student affairs-housing at the University of Illinois-Urbana/Champaign in 1989. He continued in student affairs-housing at the University of California-Davis in 1991. He served as coordinator of student activities at the University of California-San Diego in 1994. He has served as Director of the Multicultural Center at the University of Missouri-Columbia since 1998.

Pablo Bueno Mendoza and his life partner, Brenda Stalcup, live in Columbia, Missouri.