

DEVELOPING EDUCATOR IDENTITY, PERSPECTIVE, AND PRAXIS TO ADVANCE
LEARNING FOR 'ŌIWI HAWAI'I LEARNERS

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE DIVISION OF THE UNIVERSITY
OF HAWAI'I AT MĀNOA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

IN

PROFESSIONAL EDUCATIONAL PRACTICE

AUGUST 2019

By

Ka'ulu Kana'e Gapero

Dissertation Committee:

Cathy Ikeda, Chairperson

Ronald Heck

Makalapua Alencastre

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I begin with a deep appreciation to those in my doctoral program that have supported me along this three-year effort. To my hoā papa, your spirit and energy have been refreshing and your presence has brought joy and fellowship to what otherwise might have been a very individual journey. To my kumu, mahalo for sharing your ‘ike, openly and freely, that I might challenge old assumptions and develop new perspectives. To my dissertation committee, a special mahalo for trusting me with my initial research focus and for your grace in providing me a wide berth to flesh out the big and small currents and to navigate this process in a way that was reflective of me, my interests, passions, and na‘au. Mahalo for your feedback and leo paepae, and for knowing how hard or soft to push at the appropriate times. You’ve helped me to maintain my passion for this work throughout the process. I could not have done this work without the support and commitment of my study participants, to whom I owe a great deal. Know that your contributions have had a substantive influence on my progression as an educative leader, and that the learning that you’ve enlightened me to will have immediate and ongoing application to the community that we serve.

I remain ever grateful to my ‘ohana, for their steadfast and immense support throughout this process. You have grounded me in a clear purpose for the example I hope to set for generations, those that have come before and after. You have reminded me to also balance my focus to mālama my kuleana ‘ohana in the now as lofty ambitions are pohō without loved ones to share in the journey; the joys, challenges and the celebrations. Finally, you have given of your time, energy, and your na‘au; sacrifices which have humbled and inspired me to kūlia no ka pono o kākou āpau. My sincerest mahalo and aloha to you all.

ABSTRACT

The affective benefits to learners in the presence of culturally relevant instruction are broadly supported throughout the literature; the specific academic impacts to learners, to a significantly lesser extent. Literature and the wisdom of practice indicate that one's attitudes, beliefs and behaviors are a direct function of one's identity. Rather than centralizing a study on a locus of how best to grow and socialize culturally relevant pedagogy, I am purposefully privileging a more adaptive, balcony focus on professional identity to guide ways in which we might collectively benefit ‘ōiwi learners academically (Garmston, 2009). This study seeks to explore the impact of a sustained, job-embedded system of professional development on the professional identity of educators and their ability to positively affect student learning.

The purpose therefore of this study would be to provide ‘ōiwi Hawai‘i-serving instructional leaders like myself with greater insight as to how to better support kumu in identifying as culturally relevant educators, describing their pedagogy as such, and articulating the connections between their instructional moves and the impact on learning. From a deeper, na‘au perspective, if identity influences one's behaviors, values and the surrounding environment, and as ‘ōiwi-serving educators we hope to nurture the positive ‘ōiwi identity of our learners due to the promising affective and possible academic impacts, in a parallel manner, effort should also be made to nurture the professional identity of ‘ōiwi-serving educators as culturally relevant educators.

Initial findings from this study indicate that a sustained series of professional learning opportunities that build capacity for culturally relevant practice helps to further affirm professional identities as culturally relevant educators for those kumu who already identify at least in-part as culturally relevant educators. The findings point to professional learning

experiences that align with specific themes that emerged from participant feedback as having the most impact on their self-identification as culturally relevant practitioners. Namely, a series of intentionally aligned trainings that allow for exposure to indigenous perspectives and have immediate transferable application to classroom practice helps kumu to develop their confidence as culturally relevant educators. Also supported by the data is the assertion that there are indeed affective and academic benefits to learners when culturally relevant strategies are used to evaluate learning at the classroom level. A framework of Mahi‘ai Consciousness is also offered as a way to explicate and implicate the connection between deeply intentional actions and the impacts to stakeholders as a grounding consideration for ‘ōiwi-serving leaders within and beyond education.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
ABSTRACT	iii
LIST OF TABLES	vii
LIST OF FIGURES	viii
Developing Educator Identity, Perspective, and Praxis to Advance Learning for ‘Ōiwi Hawai‘i Learners.....	1
Literature Review.....	16
Engagement.....	17
Confidence	18
Identity	19
Competitive Advantage	20
Culturally Relevant Strategies	22
Limitations	26
Methodology	27
Qualitative Approach	27
Theoretical Framework.....	29
Research Sample.....	30
Data Collection	34
Limitations	35
Findings.....	37
Phase I.....	38

Phase II	52
Pedagogical Values	57
Identifying as a Culturally Relevant Educator	62
Conclusion	67
Impact on Identity	67
Academic Benefits	69
Implications for Practice	71
Mahi‘ai Consciousness as a Framework for Advancing Kaiāulu	74
References	77
Appendix A. Participant Consent Form	84
Appendix B. Phase I Questionnaire	87
Appendix C. Post-Observation Guiding Questions	89

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: School Year '18 - '19 Training Received by Kumu.....	31
Table 2: Study Participant Demographics	38
Table 3: Categories from Phase I Questionnaire	39
Table 4: Themes from Phase I Questionnaire.....	41
Table 5: Data Inputs that Informed the Learning Outcomes for the Kumu.....	49
Table 6: Culturally Relevant Instructional Strategies Modeled.....	51
Table 7: Categories and Codes from Phase II Data Analysis	53
Table 8: Themes from Phase II Data Analysis	53
Table 9: Culturally Relevant Instructional Strategies Used by Kumu.....	55

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1	45
----------------	----

Developing Educator Identity, Perspective, and Praxis to Advance Learning for ‘Ōiwi Hawai‘i Learners

This work is a milestone in the evolution of what has become my life’s journey in the pursuit of excellence in the service of learning and learners. On this path I bring and honor my kūpuna, their ‘ike, and their hopes and dreams for their mo‘o to ulu, to one day become the kupuna that my mo‘o will need. I am but a part of a “mo‘okū‘auhau of intellectual traditions,” from which I directly benefit and to which I bear the responsibility to mālama and ho‘oulu in pono ways (Silva, 2017, p. 6). Those in this space are described as “kahu of knowledge,” responsible to kūpuna, ‘āina, and lāhui Hawai‘i for shaping and transferring knowledge (hoomanawanui, 2014, p. xiv). I also bring my kuana‘ike as a kanaka ‘ōiwi, a haumāna, a kumu, an alaka‘i, and draw extensively on these identities in this work.

I engage these identities fluidly in the course of my work as an educative leader in an ‘ōiwi Hawai‘i serving educational organization, charged with the mission of creating educational opportunities to improve the capability and well-being of ‘ōiwi Hawai‘i into perpetuity (Kamehameha Schools, 2014b). To achieve our mission, educators within the organization are expected to demonstrate mastery of our disciplines and craft, and to ultimately build and maintain a world-class Hawaiian culture-based institution (Kamehameha Schools, 2017).

Included among the various benefits to learners that have been reported in classrooms where culture-based education is present is a positive impact on learners’ socioemotional outcomes (Kana‘iaupuni, Ledward, & Jensen, 2010). Specifically, when teachers consistently use culturally relevant strategies in their classroom, the researchers found that their students display increased civic engagement, which includes demonstration of Hawaiian values like mālama ‘āina. Students similarly show significantly greater levels of trust and connection to their

places of learning. The positive relationship between the presence of culture-based education and socioemotional development appears to also serve as a contributor to individual student test scores in the areas of math and reading (Thomas & Heck, 2009).

Evidence also suggests that Hawaiian culture-based (HCB) and culturally relevant (CR) approaches promote learner engagement predicated on the idea that learning about one's culture further supports the development of ethnic identity and pride in one's heritage, which promotes self-confidence and prepares learners to address challenges in life (Kana'iaupuni, Malone, & Ishibashi, 2005). While all schools are inherently rooted in a specific worldview, a particular dominant cultural identity in which approaches to teaching and learning are based, schools that are able to adapt instruction in ways that resonate with the cultural identities of the learners and families served achieve greater success (Kana'iaupuni & Ledward, 2013). More (1989) suggests that our epistemology as learners is borne from life-long experiences as members of a home culture. Resonance with students' home cultures also correlates to positive relationships with 'ohana, which contributes to learning achievement at greater levels (Demmert, 2005; Kana'iaupuni et al., 2010). This is also supported by the notion that new learning is supported when situated in the context of prior knowledge, which from an early age, is based in the home (Cajete, Tippeconnic Fox, Lowe, & McClellan, 2005; Demmert & Towner, 2003). In addition to the benefits of increased engagement and self-confidence, the ability to identify with one's home culture also appears to have positive effects on learners in that how we identify, culturally or otherwise, influences our beliefs, values, capabilities, behaviors and environment (Dilts, 1994). Demmert (2005) further affirms the effect of one's cultural identity on his or her cognition, world view, and behavior. Therefore, having a strong cultural identity has the potential to affect one's epistemology, his or her actions, and ultimately the community in which he or she lives. If

a strong cultural identity allows an individual to impact the surrounding environment, a process of epistemic influence or positive contagion emerges in that there is a transference of desired qualities from one entity or person to another or to a group of individuals. Finally, “reframing indigenous identities as cultural advantage creates counter hegemonic opportunities by giving voice to the expertise of elders and other cultural sources of community, familial, and individual strengths” (Kana‘iaupuni, Ledward, & Malone, 2017, p. 314). As HCB practice promotes a strong identity, which affects ways of knowing and doing, learners are thereby positioned at a competitive advantage as they are equipped to “draw on the dual resources of both cultural and Western knowledge systems” (Kana‘iaupuni et al., 2017, p. 307). By prioritizing cultural identity, we promote the empowerment of learners and ‘ohana in the learning process (Kana‘iaupuni et al., 2010).

With respect to the school site and unit in which I directly serve, though communicated as foundational expectations, uniform and comprehensive incorporation of HCB and related CR research supported practices across the unit have yet to be fully socialized and standardized throughout all classrooms. There are several variables that affect this gap between current practice and actions supported by research. Kana‘iaupuni, Ledward, and Jensen (2010) found that culture-based education is not acknowledged by educators as the pervasive approach used here in Hawai‘i. They suggest that teachers may not identify their instructional strategies as specifically culture-based. Rather, these strategies tend to be thought of as being part of a larger umbrella of strategies simply referred to as best practice, or as Ladson-Billings (1995a) describes, “just good teaching” (p. 159). Penick (2005) suggests that while most educators are able to provide reasons for their choice of instructional moves, these actions are often grounded in a philosophy of education comprised of a combination of practices deemed effective by

publicized or respected educators and personal opinions regarding the interplay of teaching and learning. While common practice, pedagogy driven by a philosophy informed by intuition or prior experience risks being somewhat removed from practices supported by current or relevant research.

Despite the research-based pedagogical shifts presented in multiple, broadly implemented and handily available frameworks such as Danielson's Framework for Teaching, explicit instruction using what research has come to substantiate as best practice has taken time for schools and teacher preparation programs to prioritize (Danielson, 2013). In the context of my organization where substantive resources to support teachers in the use of tools like the Framework for Teaching have been provided, and where teachers have indeed begun to incorporate research-based practices, there continues to be a need to build capacity for applying and describing teaching and learning along a coherent through-line that clearly and consistently links student learning data to the setting of appropriate instructional goals, designing of coherent instruction using research-based practices, selection of appropriate assessments, and reflection on learning to complete the cycle and inform next steps with learners. This model of accomplished teaching practice requires teachers to make intentional decisions on what instructional strategies to employ throughout the cycle of teaching, adapt flexibly during a lesson in response to learners, and analyze a lesson for impact on learning outcomes (National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, 2018). Achieving proficiency in articulating and describing one's instructional design cycle with sufficient details as to present a clear and compelling picture of purposeful incorporation of instructional strategies rooted in research-based best practice is no small task. Danielson (2013) has been a vocal proponent of valuing the complexity of teaching

and strongly emphasizes that, “teaching is highly complex work, and describing it is also challenging” (p. 6).

Demmert, Grissmer, and Towner (2001) highlight an additional variable affecting the degree to which research-based practices become classroom-based practices citing educators’ concerns related to the amount of time used to educate on culture and traditional language and the opportunity costs associated with less time on “regular learning,” which may lead to gaps between indigenous learners and other ethnic groups (p. 8). This concern stems from prevailing discussions related to Native American education and the desire to promote revitalization of culture and language while balancing the need to prepare learners for successfully engaging, particularly economically, with the society at large. There exists an element of fear that the incorporation of CR pedagogies presents an opportunity cost to learner outcomes as they may conflict with a deeply socialized belief that Western pedagogy is indeed different and superior (Kana‘iaupuni & Ledward, 2013). An implicit dichotomy surfaces here regarding culture-based education and what may have traditionally been held as rigorous expectations for learners, the assumption being that one can either be culture-based or rigorous, but not both simultaneously. While this suggests a larger issue of philosophy and mindset, inherent in the literature related to the research to practice gap is the notion that philosophy can be shaped by connecting with research-based practices. Further exposure of educators to effective methods used in HCB education points to positive affective and academic results for ‘ōiwi Hawai‘i learners (Kamehameha Schools, 2014a).

While there is burgeoning support for the affective benefits of HCB and CR education, and to a lesser yet promising extent, the positive academic outcomes particularly in the areas of math and reading test scores, there is a paucity of research that link broader academic outcomes

of learners to culture-based practices (Kana‘iaupuni et al., 2010). Questions for future research related to the impact of HCB and CR practices on students’ academic achievement, or the nature of the relationship between HCB and CR practices and student achievement, continue to be present in the literature indicating that more must be done to understand the effects across the continuum of cultural approaches (Kana‘iaupuni & Ledward, 2013). Demmert and Towner (2003) assert that while an understanding of learners’ feelings in relation to participating in culture-based environments is of interest and importance, it is necessary that studies begin to collect data on actual student learning as an outcome. Affirmed in their work is the substantive challenge of studying the correlation between academic improvement and culture-based practices from a scientific, quantitative perspective. They suggest moving beyond conventional measures of achievement as indicators of academic improvement, to include curriculum-based measures such as reading or math fluency, which are not as easily measured by a standardized, broadly administered assessment.

The purpose therefore of this study would be to provide ‘ōiwi Hawai‘i-serving instructional leaders like myself with greater insight as to how to better support kumu in identifying as CR educators, describing their pedagogy as such, and articulating the connections between their instructional moves and the impact on learning. Informed by the research related to the importance of identity, rather than centralizing a study on a locus of how best to grow and socialize CR pedagogy, I am purposefully privileging a more adaptive, balcony focus on professional identity to guide ways in which we might collectively benefit ‘ōiwi learners academically (Garmston, 2009). The intentionality here also connects with and is inspired by what is known about the positive impacts to learners who identify culturally. From a deeper, na‘au perspective, if identity influences one’s behaviors, values and their surrounding

environment, and as ‘ōiwi-serving educators we hope to nurture the positive ‘ōiwi identity of our learners due to the promising affective and academic impacts, in a parallel manner, effort should also be made to nurture the professional identity of ‘ōiwi-serving educators as HCB and CR educators.

I serve as an educative leader new to the position of principal in an independent, ‘ōiwi-serving, elementary school context. For the period of one year prior to this study commencing I have been engaged in the designing and facilitating of professional learning for our faculty and staff with the express long-term outcome of impacting our collective identity as HCB or CR educators as an adaptive approach to aligning with organization-wide expectations for teaching and learning. This preliminary work serves as the inspiration for this study. The research questions for this study include,

- How has an evolving system of job-embedded professional support impacted teachers’ self-identification as CR educators, and
- How do teachers perceive the impact on student learning when CR pedagogies are intentionally employed?

This practical action research study applies principles of Appreciative Inquiry (AI), which seek to understand and drive an innovation through interventions informed by participants, focusing on positive attributes and strengths as opposed to negative, or critical elements, with the principal researcher included as a practitioner researcher (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2019). AI seeks to understand deeply, the positive deviants within a system that produce results in alignment with a desired direction. Data is used by practitioners within a group to inform both goals and innovations in accordance with said goals. According to Patton (2011), system interventions are a form of innovation. Given the current situation and degree to which

CR pedagogies manifest within my school, approaching the development of calibrated understanding of CR practice in the promotion of professional identity amongst kumu through varying interventions represents, at its core, innovation. Developmental Evaluation (DE) focuses on the close monitoring of innovations in environments that require adaptive rather than simply technical solutions (Patton, 2016). There is a continued need to establish CR pedagogy as universally understood and used as a central component of ‘ōiwi-serving educators’ identities. Given the embedded way in which DE prioritizes and values pilina of participants and researcher, and the importance of pilina as it relates to culture, DE serves as an appropriate methodology in this context. As Patton (2016) conveys, “the purpose of DE is developmental. Some kind of innovation is being developed” (The Development and Evaluation Principles section, para. 3). The Native Hawaiian Education Council, Gapero, Keala-Quinabo, Kiili, & Silva (2018) write that

Developmental Evaluation (DE) is appropriately suited as an evaluation methodology in new and emerging contexts, ongoing systems evaluation, as may be the case in trying to understand the collective impact of system innovations in collectively advancing Native Hawaiian education, or in evaluating systems change. DE methodology is highly correlative to ‘ōiwi epistemology as both value collaborative engagement of and pilina amongst participants in the advancement of innovations for the express benefit to the collective. (p. 40)

The inclusion of teachers in the evaluation of the innovation promotes their vested interest in the results of the work (Wenger, Trayner, & De Laat, 2011). A DE based on the lived experiences of these kumu provides insights as to if and how the development and incorporation of CR pedagogies via continuous, evolving, job-embedded professional learning helps educators

to clarify the how-to regarding CR pedagogy and whether these experiences are sufficiently compelling to mitigate issues of doubt, reluctance or other issues that contribute to the research to practice gap. The use of DE further supports the participatory, for-us-by-us approach that materially involves and values teachers in informing an innovation, how the innovation is implemented and understood, and engages teachers’ feedback in informing next steps. This is particularly useful in any school leader’s context to mitigate issues of top-down, directive leadership that is void of teacher voice and presents as tangential from the actual work within the classroom. This approach also seeks to elevate educator voice for others to bear witness to, further validating one’s mo‘olelo as a valid source of ‘ike.

In developing this study, a theme concerning intentionality, specifically regarding outcome-aligned actions began to emerge. As with many studies, a surgical focus on the research questions drives the literature reviewed and methodology selected. There are elements of this study that parallel accomplished instructional practices that we hope to realize in classrooms. That is, as school leaders might expect teachers to design instruction with great intentionality in accordance with learning needs, this study capitalizes on previous work that was implemented within the context of my division with the specific purpose of building on and calibrating effective practices for the education of ‘ōiwi Hawai‘i learners. Achieving this school’s long-term focus of building a “thriving lāhui” through “significantly increasing the success rate of Native Hawaiians in college, career, and leadership pursuits,” requires a concerted effort by stakeholders to constantly remain vision-aligned and adjust efforts in response to environmental conditions as they emerge (Kamehameha Schools, 2014b, p. 7). Mirroring expectations for long-term goal achievement and remaining vision-aligned, this study places a high priority on outcome-aligned intentional design and responsiveness to information that emerges.

The metaphor of mahi‘ai has begun to resonate as a culturally grounded way in which to situate this research. The work of farming from an ‘ōiwi Hawai‘i perspective, directly correlates to an individual’s or a community’s ability to survive, “na ke kanaka mahi‘ai ka imu ō nui; the well-filled imu belongs to the man who tills the soil” (Pukui, 1993, p. 245). The plethora of traditional, recorded ‘ōlelo no‘eau that continue to be used in contemporary vernacular regarding the topic of farming emphasizes its significance in the practical consciousness of ‘ōiwi Hawai‘i across generations, linking ancient with the modern. These ‘ōlelo no‘eau help to transfer cultural values and perspectives to generations of descendants within a culture in its most pristine form, through our ‘ōlelo ‘ōiwi. Embedded in these perspectives related to mahi‘ai is an emphasis on the value of intentionality, or purpose, founded in a clear understanding of desired outcomes. These ancestral momi encourage our people to embody values like being purposeful in aligning our intentions with our actions and often suggest the consequences that befall those who ignore the ‘ike. The metaphor of mahi‘ai has led me to create a theoretical framework that I apply in the context of this study and refer to as Mahi‘ai Consciousness. Inherent in this framework is the importance of intentionality rooted in outcomes. The interdependence of intention and aligned outcomes is a central element in our epistemology ‘ōiwi Hawai‘i, which can be defined as “the philosophy of knowledge... It is another way of saying “Indigenous ways of knowing” (Meyer, 2001, p. 146). In a later piece, Meyer (2003) writes:

Relative to epistemology: if history/culture is the dynamic energy that forms knowledge and gives us cues that help us prioritize it, and intention is how we engage in it, then function becomes the consciousness it will exist in. It slows down the process of information overload to ask the questions: "What is the purpose of this exercise? Will it serve my family? Will it benefit my community? How does it extend the quality of our

lives?" Knowledge that holds function at its center moves our students into action and a better understanding of the roles of history and intention. (p. 56)

The framework of Mahi‘ai Consciousness also helps to support continued grounding in ‘ōiwi Hawai‘i epistemology throughout this study with a very intentional purpose of ensuring that ‘ōiwi Hawai‘i interests remain dominant, from the formulation of the problem of practice, engaging research participants, analyzing of study data, and to the reporting of findings. It aligns with my positionality as a researcher and experiences as a K-12 educator and administrator that have consistently reaffirmed the importance of outcome-aligned design, whether in the classroom with students or in the facilitation of learning for adults. Mahi‘ai Consciousness will further help to inform the manner in which concepts from ancient to contemporary sources inform evolving study design, and responsiveness to environmental factors that affect the course of the study. Framing this study within Mahi‘ai Consciousness capitalizes on the framework of “cultural advantage,” which seeks to illuminate “funds of knowledge” through the creation of counterhegemonic space that privileges traditional ‘ike via ancestral voice and remaining open to receiving the ‘ike through the values inherent in that voice (Kana‘iaupuni et al., 2017).

As an ‘ōiwi Hawai‘i educator and educative leader that has served across K-12 divisions, I identify professionally and personally with multiple groups. Although currently serving as an elementary division administrator, I maintain a strong identity as an accomplished, national board-certified mathematics educator, an instructional coach, a designer and facilitator of professional learning, an ‘ōiwi researcher, and an advocate for continual growth and development for all learners, regardless of title or age. An assumption I carry in light of these identities, based on years of experience as a National Board Certified Teacher and instructional coach, is that learner outcomes are generally most effectively and efficiently achieved when

there is strong alignment with the Architecture of Accomplished Teaching (National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, 2018). The Architecture defines a clear path throughout the teaching and learning cycle, which begins with validating student learning needs and ends with a review of learner outcomes to inform the next-level learning. Although Western in origin, the Architecture reflects a fundamentally ‘ōiwi belief in that learning should be based on a need, as opposed to learning for learning’s sake (Charlot, 2005). Charlot explains that education from an ‘ōiwi Hawai‘i perspective is predicated on the idea that “knowledge was supposed to be practical and useful rather than useless and ineffective” (p. 10). Purposeful instructional design aligned with bona-fide learner needs inherently reflects kuana‘ike ‘ōiwi. As a supporter of the normalization of ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i and having committed to Hawaiian immersion education for my children since they were both three months of age, I personally connect with and recognize the value in Hawaiian language medium education as a means for nurturing a strong ‘ōiwi identity and optic in young learners (Beamer, 2014). I also recognize that there is a greater need to engage all ‘ōiwi learners including those outside the community of Hawaiian language medium education, for the collective benefit of the lāhui. It is this perspective of inclusivity and the belief that all learners, regardless of age, can learn to the benefit of the collective community that drives my interest in this work.

While the primary purpose for this study would be to provide ‘ōiwi Hawai‘i-serving instructional leaders with greater insight as to how to better support kumu in identifying as CR educators, there is an added benefit of illuminating ways in which to build educator capacity for describing instructional practice around a calibrated set of CR strategies. This study also impacts leaders in articulating clearer expectations for CR practices and in providing a system of support to align with these clearer expectations. An additional and very intentional byproduct of this

study is to emphasize the importance of educators who are able to coherently communicate the direct impact of their instructional moves. Many school leaders are committed to the practice of instructional coaching, however understanding of how best to build an effective coaching structure is often limited (Aguilar, 2019). While this study is specifically designed to engage kumu in focused conversations around the ways in which their application of CR instruction may have impacted the achievement of learner outcomes, a consequence of featuring these reflective conversations in my methods allows for the modeling of how an instructional leader might engage kumu in discussing learner outcomes as a direct function of purposefully planned instructional design that intentionally includes as part of the design, clearly articulated pedagogical moves. The methods used also help to provide a model for structuring effective coaching conversations and coaching culture within a school. There is indeed value in the day-to-day work of educators in classrooms and the myriad ways in which they impact and advance student achievement that are often not captured by a standardized test. There is a greater value to learners when “assessment for learning” is prioritized (Davies, Busick, Herbst, & Sherman, 2014, p. 568). Due to its formative nature, educators are better equipped to understand where learners are at with specific relation to what has just been taught. By placing emphasis on daily student learning as the “primary outcome variable,” we can better align and attribute the immediate effects of CR strategies on learning outcomes (Demmert & Towner, 2003, p. 35).

Throughout this text, I intentionally apply the term ‘ōiwi in the context of and to convey nativism and indigeneity, specifically Hawaiian indigeneity. It is a term from my ‘ōlelo ‘ōiwi that emphasizes my origins and privileging its use and other ‘ōlelo ‘ōiwi words helps to further affirm the presence and value of leo and mana‘o kupuna. I also purposefully choose not to translate the ‘ōlelo ‘ōiwi that I humbly draw from to further validate the inherent mana in ‘ōlelo

Hawai‘i, mo‘olelo, kuana‘ike and ‘ōiwi epistemology. Further, as the intended audience for this study comprises educative leaders that have an impact on teaching and learning as it relates to ‘ōiwi Hawai‘i learners, it is imperative that we begin to embed ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i in our pepeiao and waha to advance efforts of equity and access for our ‘ōiwi Hawai‘i learners.

The collective body of work around HCB and CR education shares a common focus on equity and access for all learners. Kana‘iaupuni and Kawai‘ae‘a (2008) refer to culture-based education as “the grounding of instruction and student learning in the values, norms, knowledge, beliefs, practices, experiences, places, and language that are the foundation of a culture, in this case Hawaiian indigenous culture” (p. 71). The Native Hawaiian Education et al., (2018) posit that HCB education “is education created, taught, learned, and assessed through the indigenous Hawaiian cultural worldview, in environments conducive to the effective transmission of indigenous Hawaiian knowledge at a pace that is appropriate for its learner” (p. 18).

Ladson-Billings (1995b) defines CR pedagogy as “a theoretical model that not only addresses student achievement but also helps students to accept and affirm their cultural identity” (p. 469). She further maintains that CR teaching is “a pedagogy of opposition, not unlike critical pedagogy but specifically committed to collective, not merely individual, empowerment” (Ladson-Billings, 1995a, p. 160). Gay (2002) writes that culturally responsive education “is defined as using the cultural characteristics, experiences, and perspectives of ethnically diverse students as conduits for teaching them more effectively” (p. 106). From a knowledge progression perspective with origins in multicultural education, culturally responsive pedagogy serves as a precursor to CR education (Aronson & Laughter, 2016; Dover, 2013). Therefore, based on that mo‘okū‘auhau, I refer herein to both in an inclusive manner as culturally relevant education.

It is important to note that though not the same, HCB and CR pedagogies both seek to value, honor, build upon and advance the cultural identity of the learners. In a study on the impact of CB teaching strategies on student achievement and socio-emotional development, the terms culture-based and culturally relevant are presented in a manner that appear to occupy the same space, whereby the importance of CR education is used to validate study on CB teaching (Kana‘iaupuni et al., 2010, p. 2). For the purposes of this study, both HCB and CR terms are valued and will be collectively referred to as simply CR to support the flow of the overall narrative. I do so with deepest respect to those who came before and have contributed of themselves so that we might benefit from the bodies of work related to HCB and CR education. It is also with respect that I make the inherent connection in these pedagogies, which becomes evident when both are positioned as essential tools for educators of ‘ōiwi learners to fluidly access based on the needs of the students we serve. In her work drawing the parallel between neuroscience and culturally responsiveness in the classroom, Hammond (2015) advocates for the use of African American and Latino students as proxies for the larger group of culturally and linguistically diverse students, including Pacific Islander and First Nations students. It is with this diverse perspective that I humbly also call upon the larger body of work related to CR education, whether rooted in ‘ōiwi Hawai‘i context or resonant thereto, to adapt and apply in the context of this research.

Literature Review

In seeking to provide ‘ōiwi Hawai‘i-serving instructional leaders with greater insight as to how to better support kumu in identifying as CR educators, it is necessary to first contextualize the various ways in which CR instructional practices have been found to benefit indigenous learners. In reviewing the benefits of CR practices to learners, four general themes emerged from the extant literature, which I use to structure the initial part of this chapter: learner engagement, confidence, identity, and competitive advantage. It is important to note that although presented as independent themes, there is also substantive overlap across themes. For example, identity is often a driver of confidence, while confidence may also explicate increased engagement or increased perceptions of possessing a competitive advantage. Some learners may benefit from reacquainting with their cultural identity, while others need more experiential learning opportunities. In accordance with the theoretical framework of Mahi‘ai Consciousness, presenting a synthesis of the literature in light of these distinct themes is done intentionally, as to provide educators and instructional leaders with clear delineations of the dimensions of CR practice to support purposeful instructional design that employs CR strategies in light of learner needs. Given that learner’s needs differ, it is incumbent on educators to judiciously and intentionally apply instructional strategies accordingly, meaning that it would be equally inappropriate to apply CR strategies in a blanket manner to all students as it would to completely ignore CR strategies in the instruction of indigenous learners (Castagno & Brayboy, 2008). As this study assumes intentionality in aligning learning outcomes to the planning of appropriate instructional moves based on learner needs, these themes further help to support educators in accomplished instructional design and articulation of practice (National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, 2018). After a brief analysis of the benefits to CR education, I draw

connections between the various CR strategies followed by a discussion on the limitations inherent in currently available literature. These gaps help to inform the need for this work, which closes out this chapter.

Engagement

Increased student engagement in the presence of CR pedagogies emerges frequently and consistently throughout the literature. Kana‘iaupuni et al. (2010) maintain the importance of CR education in the engagement and empowerment of learners and their families in the process of learning, asserting that education in itself is a reflection of societal culture. Their work in seeking to understand the impact of culture-based strategies on student achievement and socio-emotional development is rather unique due to the following variables: the study was conducted locally within the state of Hawai‘i, and the magnitude of the study in light of the scope of participants and school types included was substantive. Study results suggest positive socioemotional impacts to learners, namely through enhanced relevance, relationships, trust and connections at school, which aligns with the notion of increased learner engagement. Additionally, results from this study support the premise that student affect and CR instructional practices have a positive impact on learner outcomes in the areas of math and reading (Thomas & Heck, 2009). These results however remain largely suggestive, calling for future study to establish causality.

Indigenous teacher-to-student interactional patterns among Alaskan Natives that align verbal behavior with physical modeling invite learners into academic conversations by flattening authority structures in a manner that builds learner ownership of learning, which subsequently promotes increased student engagement (Lipka, Sharp, Brenner, Yanez, & Sharp, 2005, p. 49). In reflecting on the progress and impacts of the development of a bachelor of arts degree in mathematics education at the University of Hawai‘i-West O‘ahu, a program designed to combat

the teacher shortage in Hawai‘i at middle and secondary levels, it is noted that the alignment of CR mathematics practice and the Common Core State Standards for mathematics and intentionally designing mathematics content in light of culture and geography can be linked to the doubling of the proportion of Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islanders enrolled in University of Hawai‘i – West O‘ahu mathematics courses. The program focused on increasing the presence of contextualized curriculum for culturally diverse learners in a manner that capitalizes on ‘local funds of knowledge’ (Gonzalez, Moll, & Amanti, 2005, p. 15). The ethnomathematics focus has led to greater engagement through contextualized learning (Furuto, 2014). The increase in enrollment and engagement of students has also been linked to the overall student passing rate nearly doubling, far exceeding the average passing rate for the University of Hawai‘i system (Furuto, 2014). Although taken from different indigenous contexts, one Alaskan Native, the other from indigenous Pacifica, both experiences implicate a CR approach as a factor that positively contributes to learner engagement.

Confidence

In addition to increased learner engagement, CR approaches have been found to impact learner confidence. Engaging learners in building an understanding of their cultural heritage helps learners to develop confidence rooted in a strong ethnic identity (Kana‘iaupuni et al., 2005). Education that is CR supports the building of confidence through increased learner empowerment (Kana‘iaupuni et al., 2010). “Ancestral knowledge shapes a child’s identity and perspective and empowers the child to stand upright, showing strength and confidence as a result of having a strong cultural identity” (Kawai‘ae’a mā, 2018, p. 32). Educators that employ CR techniques allow space for deeper explorations of power balances while privileging opportunities for the emancipation and empowerment of learners, their families, and the broader community

from which they come (Kana‘iaupuni et al., 2017). The elevation of student voice through the intentional actions of CR educators also builds student empowerment (Kaiwi, 2006). In creating opportunities that support learners in engaging with issues of relevance to the indigenous community, through study and political action, we create conditions to “ho‘omana” our ‘ōiwi learners, to empower them with voice and the commensurate skills to enact positive change (Goodyear-Ka‘ōpua, 2013, p. 207). Common across these references is the idea that ‘ōiwi learners have a right to liberation from educational influences, intentional or unintentional, that do not hold their ultimate welfare and wellness, and that of the larger community as a core focus (Goodyear-Ka‘ōpua, 2008). To effectively build confidence, mindsets of empowerment, voice, ho‘omana, and liberation, efforts must be firmly grounded in a sufficient stimulus from which one might draw energy over time; strong cultural identity is such a sustaining force.

Identity

Recognizing that confidence doesn’t emerge as a disparate consequence of CR education, I turn next to the body of literature related to the importance of developing learners’ identities. One’s identity, or rather, how one identifies manifests in attitude, beliefs, values and behavior, which ultimately helps to shape surrounding environment, while conversely, one’s environment is also found to have an effect on his or her behavior, values and ultimately identity (Dilts, 1994). Culture influences epistemology, cognition, and much of how a person identifies culturally is dependent on the surrounding cultural environment, which supports the logic that one’s cultural identity should be of primary concern in the context of learning (Demmert, 2005). “The ‘āina sustains our identity and health by centering our attitudes, instincts, perceptions, values, and character within the context of our sacred environment” (Kikiloi, 2010, p. 102). Adding to the concept of environment as connected to identity, Silva (2017) posits that ‘āina, specifically the

concept of aloha ‘āina represents that environmental factor that drives our identity as ‘ōiwi Hawai‘i, and that our well-being as a people is grounded in an ability to identify culturally (p. 4). As Silva advocates for aloha ‘āina as a sustainer of ‘ōiwi identity, she further suggests that, “aloha ‘āina is a concept that must be taught. It is neither an instinctive knowledge nor an essentialist quality” (p. 5). Kaiwi (2006) corroborates this as she contends that by failing to intentionally instruct ‘ōiwi Hawai‘i learners on matters related to their identity as ‘ōiwi, we fail to honor generations of kūpuna who have come before them. The Hawaiian Indigenous Education Rubric that details what ‘ōiwi Hawai‘i-serving educators should know and be able to do, lists among its more ideal practices that ‘ōiwi-serving educators are “responsible for ensuring that students have a strong cultural identity, sense of place, and academic achievement” (Kana‘iaupuni & Kawai‘ae‘a, 2008, p. 81). An undercurrent of intentional practice emerges in these sources in that as educators, we have not only the power but the kuleana to create environments to influence learners’ ‘ōiwi identities based on their individual and collective needs. Identity becomes a greater function of ‘āina and mo‘okū‘auhau in that it helps us as ‘ōiwi in determining worthwhile knowledge, which impacts our concept of community in light of myriad other factors that bombard and impact our perspectives (Meyer, 2001).

Competitive Advantage

Amongst speakers of ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i and those who otherwise identify as or with ‘ōiwi Hawai‘i, it is quite common to maintain a general command of foundational ‘ōlelo no‘eau that can be worked eloquently into casual conversation as opportunities present themselves, “ua lehulehu a manomano ka ‘ikena a ka Hawai‘i,” one example of a very commonly used axiom (Pukui, 1993, p. 309). In our continued contemporary application of axioms to convey ‘ōiwi perspective, context or offer expertise, we regularly affirm value for traditional knowledge and

values. We also affirm a level of cultural expertise or wisdom when fluidly accessing and applying appropriate axioms to novel contexts. Kana‘iaupuni et al. (2017) advocate for the recontextualizing of ‘ōiwi identity as a “cultural advantage,” creating “counter hegemonic opportunities” through the elevation and validation of ancestral voice and the ‘ike ku‘una it carries (p. 314S). They propose that learners who are grounded in ‘ōiwi Hawai‘i epistemology possess unique skills, whether rooted in ‘ōlelo, proficiency in applying traditional practices, connecting with ‘āina, or in capitalizing on the collective power of ‘ohana supports. Equipped with a strong ‘ōiwi epistemology, learners who are also well prepared academically with what might commonly be considered competencies of Western origin are able to draw from an expanded toolkit of proficiencies that afford them advantages over others with a more singular worldview. Demmert, Grissmer, and Towner (2006) affirm this perspective furthering that CR learning environments that advance competence in native culture while preparing students to participate in the larger economy is a necessary duality that all educators of indigenous learners must consider – culture cannot come at the expense of preparing all learners for successfully engaging locally and globally, rather, a CR focus should enhance learners’ ability to do so. The competitive advantage that CR approaches seek to promote calls on educators to not only positively impact the affective, socio-emotional side of learners, but to build within them the intrinsic motivation to “choose academic excellence” as well (Kaiwi & Kahumoku III, 2006; Ladson-Billings, 1995a, p. 160). That is to say, CR education is as much about supporting and preparing learners as it is inspiring them to accept the kuleana as agents of their own learning, clearly defining a destination and engaging in appropriate, purposeful actions to arrive there. What might be distilled from these scholars connects again to the theme of intentionality. When educators purposefully build students’ capacity for critical examination of issues germane to the

equity and advancement of ‘ōiwi Hawai‘i in areas like policy, governance, economics and education in parallel to building strong ‘ōiwi identity, learners are better equipped to address issues impacting equity and well-being (Goodyear-Ka‘ōpua, 2008, 2013; Kana‘iaupuni & Kawai‘ae‘a, 2008; Ladson-Billings, 1995b). In a call to action that directly applies to ‘ōiwi Hawai‘i learners but that resonates perhaps with greater consequence with the mindset and kuleana that CR education necessitates that ‘ōiwi-serving educators assume, Benham and Heck, (1998) write:

It is time that Native Hawaiians ground their values in Hawaiian tradition and act with the skill and knowledge afforded in today's modern society. Not only must we claim our personal sovereignty that will lead to claiming our voice, our power, and our authority for self governance, but we must take responsibility to dispel the noble savage myth and, instead, identify ourselves as leaders, not children, of Hawai‘i Nei. (p. 234)

Culturally Relevant Strategies

In what amounts to landmark work along the continuum of research that seeks to better the educational conditions for ‘ōiwi Hawai‘i learners, the Hawaiian Cultural Influences in Education (HCIE) study is noteworthy for its attempt to link the use of CR pedagogy to the impact on student academic achievement (Kana‘iaupuni et al., 2010). This study employs five components of CR education identified in prior work that informed the creation of the HIER, specifically, ‘ohana and community, content, context and assessment and accountability, were validated against the Center for Research on Education, Diversity, and Excellence (CREDE) standards, specifically, use of language, creating joint learning activities, and connecting to home and community, offering greater assurances that the strategies identified in the HIER are in alignment with generally accepted standards of effective teaching (Kana‘iaupuni & Kawai‘ae‘a,

2008). The HCIE study also generated additional CR strategies based on open-ended responses from study participants. These CR strategies also correspond to what the larger field of education might describe as best practice, and include; active participation of family members in educational activities, using the community as a setting for student learning, rigorous assessments of a range of competencies and skills, place-based and service learning projects promoting community well-being, and preparation for global citizenship (Kana‘iaupuni et al., 2010, p. 10). Through a companion effort, these best practices have been further augmented with tangible examples, which provide context for how educators might experience them in action (Ledward, Takayama, & Kahumoku, 2008). The Indigenous Culture-Based Education Rubrics created in partnership with Native American and Native Hawaiian communities, offers additional considerations for evaluating the presence of CR practices at the program level around central themes that also resonate with the general components of the HIER (Demmert et al., 2008). Relatedly, the Danielson Framework also resonates with the HIER components in that teachers should be expected to acquire and design instruction informed by knowledge of students’ cultural heritages, regularly engage community and family into the educational program, and apply appropriate grouping structures to allow students to assist one another in deepening understanding (Danielson, 2013).

Yet, ‘ōiwi Hawai‘i-serving educators need merely to consult our mo‘olelo kahiko for practical examples to validate what contemporary research is now finding the words to articulate. A look at the upbringing of Kekūhaupi‘o, trusted trainer, bodyguard, warrior and advisor to Kamehameha I, reveals traditional ‘ōiwi perspectives on the interplay of teaching and learning (Frazier, 2000). Observed while at play demonstrating a proclivity for physical activities like wrestling and throwing projectiles made of balls of damp sand, and showing an overall fearless

nature, it was decided that Kekūhaupi‘o would begin training to become a warrior. Kekūhaupi‘o first receives training in physicality and the basics of war-like arts like spear hurling and running swiftly from his father, Kohapiolani, mirroring what CR research defines as pedagogy that stresses traditional cultural characteristics, and a natural starting place for learning and teaching strategies (Demmert et al., 2008; Pukui, Haertig, & Lee, 1972; Schonleber, 2007). In further observing his son’s growing proficiency with spear hurling, Kohapiolani commented that Kekūhaupi‘o was ready to begin learning how to now dodge spears that were thrust at him, and with his son’s assent, elevated the training with new spears made of hau that were thickened at the tip so as to not injure a person if struck. He observed the technique modeled by his father, beginning with simply dodging a spear, then using a spear of his own to ward off a thrust, then elevated to capturing an opponent’s spear that was hurled at him, and finally using the seized spear to strike back at the one who threw it. Observing further his son’s skill development, Kohapiolani sent his son to La‘amea, known for his skill in teaching others body strengthening for battle. After several years, it was observed that the pupil’s skill level began to exceed that of the instructor. It was then decided that a new teacher, Koai‘a, would work with Kekūhaupi‘o to learn the art of lua. Also heavily stressed throughout Kekūhaupi‘o’s training was an understanding that the skills that he had been perfecting were only for use on the battlefield with an enemy and not to be used to “rob the weak of their lives” (Frazier, 2000, p. 6). There is much to learn from this brief historical account of the progression of learning from an ‘ōiwi context. The approach begins with the child’s zone of proximal development, and based on observation of his proficiency and identification of next level of need, his father begins to seek out resources to provide appropriate instruction (Vygotsky, 1980). As Kekūhaupi‘o’s skills continued to grow and his teacher reflects on his growth through conversations with his father, decisions are made

in collaboration to secure another instructor to meet Kekūhaupi‘o’s current needs. This interplay between parent, learner and teacher models several attributes that the field of education now embraces as best practice; expert modeling, learning through and for an authentic application, involvement of parents in the learning process, and the engagement of community resources. Demmert and Towner (2003) reflect the importance of these connections offering that, “the basis of education is best built on the experience, values, and knowledge of the students and their families, both personal and community-based” (p. 9). The most important takeaway however for educators and instructional leaders is the modeling of the intentional use of ongoing assessment to evaluate the learner’s proficiency, which informs the next level of instruction, forming a perpetual cycle for teaching and learning, validating what we now understand as distinguished or accomplished teaching practices (Danielson, 2013; National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, 2018).

The fact that these strong connections across pedagogies exist, whether identified as CR or as simply “good practice,” presents interesting considerations for educational leaders who may be seeking to build their educators’ capacity for CR instruction (Ladson-Billings, 1995a). One might be easily confused in light of the labels used to describe practice, as affirmed in findings from the HCIE study (Kana‘iaupuni et al., 2010). A question we might raise is in what ways might this be perceived as an opportunity for educational leaders to build capacity for intentional instructional design and articulation of practice to include purposefully selected instructional moves, or what we otherwise know as pedagogy? If, for example, an educator chooses to engage in a huaka‘i, or employ talk structures, or invite a guest speaker, what is his or her awareness of each student’s needs that substantiates that employing a specific practice or combination thereof is the best way to achieve identified outcomes? Essentially, why is the

purposefully selected pedagogy appropriate for these learners, at this time, and at this point in their learning progression? Mahi‘ai Consciousness emerges as a related mindset that may help to privilege questions of why in situations pertaining to instructional design for the purpose of advancing learners.

Limitations

A central element found across the literature reviewed related to this topic of study was the call for greater study linking the benefits of CR education to academic outcomes. If in fact a goal of CR education is to better the learning conditions for indigenous learners, rigorous expectations for academic achievement must be a condition held sacrosanct when employing the pedagogy. Educators cannot be satisfied with simply making students “feel good,” rather, academic excellence must be held as an equally valued outcome for CR work (Ladson-Billings, 1995a, p. 160). Demmert and Towner (2003) affirm the importance of affective learner impact and advocate equally for more study on the academic impacts of CR efforts, positing that the larger issue is rooted in evidence and the ability to show causality between CR practices and academic performance. Questions remain regarding the causal relationship between CR strategies and educational achievement inspired by what is currently known regarding the positive benefits of employing these strategies (Kana‘iaupuni & Ledward, 2013; Kana‘iaupuni et al., 2010). Guided by the framework of Mahi‘ai Consciousness and its focus on intentional, outcome-aligned design, this study seeks to further contribute to the discussion related to causality with the goal of providing ‘ōiwi Hawai‘i-serving instructional leaders with greater insight as to how to better support kumu in identifying as CR educators.

Methodology

The purpose of this study is to provide ‘ōiwi Hawai‘i-serving instructional leaders with greater insight as to how to better support kumu in identifying as CR educators. The research questions include,

- How has an evolving system of job-embedded professional support impacted teachers’ self-identification as CR educators, and
- How do teachers perceive the impact on student learning when CR pedagogies are intentionally employed?

What follows is a detail on the methodology used to structure this study, beginning with a discussion on the qualitative approach used. Details regarding the research sample and design, including methods and rationale for data collection are reviewed, with limitations of the study concluding this chapter.

Qualitative Approach

This study seeks to understand deeply, the dynamics of professional identity development of elementary classroom educators from their perspective and the impact on student learning when CR pedagogies are intentionally used. Input from educators based on a reflection of their individual experiences was used in an inductive manner to develop this understanding. The engagement of participants within a system in building understanding of the effects of an intervention strategy for the larger purpose of solving an important problem is a hallmark of action research (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). Given that the intended learning resulting from this action research benefits me directly, as researcher, I am situated at the center of the research. As an educational leader that is positioned within the study site and materially involved in the professional function of the study participants, I maintain an emic perspective that is essential in

intimately understanding context, and supporting flexibility and responsivity based on information that emerges from participant voice (McNiff & Whitehead, 2010). Given the constructivist nature of this “systematic discovery of what gives a system life when the system is most effective and capable in human terms,” appreciative inquiry, a strand within the corpus of action research, emerged as an appropriate qualitative approach for this study (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2019, p. 60). The appreciative inquiry focus grounds this study from a “positive, hopeful place while still asking hard questions and engaging in serious inquiry,” which honors the wisdom of practice that participants bring to this study (Patton, 2011, p. 234).

This study created space for “systematic questioning and feedback” that is used to “design action in which the researcher and other stakeholders work together” (p. 61). The participatory nature of this study also resonated with the intent and purpose of Developmental Evaluation (DE), which is to “illuminate, inform, and support what is being developed, by identifying the nature and patterns of development, and the implications and consequences of those patterns” (Patton, 2016, p. 289). System interventions are a form of innovation (Patton, 2011). Given the current context and degree to which CR pedagogies manifest within our school, approaching the development of calibrated understanding of CR as a driver of professional identity through varying interventions represents, at its core, an innovation. The dynamic nature of the lived experiences of kumu required that space be made to allow feedback as data to surface organically. Given the complexity and uncertainty inherent in the unfolding of data in this manner, a particular focus on the emergence of data to inform the evolution of innovations in a way that is both flexible and responsive was essential. A question emerged respective to how to conduct a study that is indeed rigorous and credible in a context where absolute fidelity or the strict adherence to specific processes may be inappropriate. For this study, DE was therefore

used to inform and affirm the structure of the inquiry based on principles of purpose, rigor, utilitarian focus, innovation niche, complexity, systems perspective, co-creation, and timely feedback (Patton, 2016). In doing so, the adaptive development of the study was supported and continuously rooted in a philosophy of responsible inquiry practice.

Theoretical Framework

Central in the application of action research with underpinnings of DE as part of this qualitative study is the concept of intentionality rooted in outcomes. The theoretical framework of Mahi‘ai Consciousness serves as a constant grounding element over the course of the study that seeks to ensure consistency in adherence to purpose, from the initial design of the study to the evolution and introduction of innovations as the study progresses. The prioritization of the interdependence of intention and aligned outcomes seeks to maintain alignment with discovery that is driven by necessity, sustaining the very ‘ōiwi mindset that knowledge worth gaining should have an authentic and appreciable application, as opposed to learning for the mere sake of learning (Cajete et al., 2005; Charlot, 2005; Demmert, 2001; Kawakami & Aton, 2001; Tibbetts, Kahakalau, & Johnson, 2007). In positioning myself as an ‘ōiwi Hawai‘i researcher and leader conducting research in an ‘ōiwi Hawai‘i-serving learning organization, I am in essence “claiming a genealogical, cultural and political set of experiences” (Tuhiwai Smith, 2012, p. 469). In doing so, I assume layered kuleana. First, I must ensure that the research I conduct is rigorous, valid, and reliable by generally accepted research standards. Second, I must also consider that my research may be perceived as simply not indigenous or not sufficiently useful to ‘ōiwi Hawai‘i contexts. The grounding of this study in a theoretical framework of Mahi‘ai Consciousness serves to situate the decisions, analysis, and conclusions I make as a researcher in an ‘ōiwi epistemological perspective. In identifying and applying this theoretical framework, I seek to

affirm connections with the research and the ‘ōiwi learner-serving kumu I lead. This connectedness positions the work and those involved in a set of relationships, further supporting the concepts of wholeness, identity, and community well-being, all important and valued traits among indigenous peoples (Tuhivai Smith, 2012). This framework also privileges an ‘ōiwi Hawai‘i epistemology and seeks to ensure that ‘ōiwi Hawai‘i interests remain at the forefront.

Research Sample

The problem of practice that inspired this study emerged from a specific K-12, independent school in East Hawai‘i and while the matter of supporting ‘ōiwi-serving educators in developing their professional identities as CR educators is not unique to this context, there are organization- and context-specific variables that make this site an ideal match for this study. There has recently been a substantive push to develop a K-12 campus identity of ‘Ōiwi Edge, which is defined as,

Our campus identity unique to Kamehameha Schools Hawai‘i, which is inspired by Ke Ali‘i Pauahi’s lineage to Hawai‘i, our kūpuna, and generations of heroes and innovators who shaped our communities. ‘Ōiwi Edge requires a strong ancestral foundation, worldview, and mindset to actively shape a rapidly changing world with vision, courage, and aloha. (Kamehameha Schools Hawai‘i, 2017)

I serve as the principal and instructional leader of the elementary division, supporting a population of 256 students from grades K-5, all of whom are ‘ōiwi Hawai‘i, and am charged with aligning the work of our division with the K-12 ‘Ōiwi Edge philosophy. As such, I have personally led professional learning efforts for K-5 kumu to build shared understanding around practices that bring us as educators in closer alignment to ‘Ōiwi Edge. I have immediate responsibility for the direction of professional learning, educator practice, and workplace culture

for the elementary division. The learning that would result from conducting the study at this site would have direct implications for my work and tangentially, the work of other division and campus leaders on this K-12 campus.

As this study seeks to understand how an evolving system of job-embedded professional support impacts teachers’ self-identification as CR educators, a primary requirement for study participants was participation in employer-provided CR in-service opportunities over the course of the ’18 - ’19 school year. The Table 1 shows the trainings that all study participants received.

Table 1

School Year ’18 - ’19 Training Received by Kumu

Training	Learning Outcome
Linking elements of teaching and learning in ‘ōiwi Hawai‘i context to effective teaching practices in the Danielson Framework for Teaching (July ’18)	Outcome: develop a common understanding of and vocabulary for teaching and learning practices in an ‘ōiwi Hawai‘i context
‘Ōiwi Edge workshop day (August ’18)	Outcome: expand our toolkit of instructional strategies for ‘ōiwi-serving educators
Using the story of Kamiki and other ‘ōiwi Hawai‘i literary resources to connect with piko (October ’18)	Outcome: understand the importance of piko and connecting with ‘āina in the service of ‘ōiwi learners; expand our toolkit of literary resources for use in the elementary classroom
Understanding the ‘Whys’ of Hawaiian Culture-based education – intentional	Outcome: calibrate understanding of the benefits of HCB education and when to apply these strategies based on learner needs

Training	Learning Outcome
connections to HCBE in the classroom (January '19)	
Unpacking and applying ‘Culturally Responsive Teaching and the Brain’ (February '19)	Outcome: build shared understanding of the connections between CR pedagogy and neuroscience
Understanding the history of our Hae Hawai‘i (May '19)	Outcome: understand the role of nationalism in establishing learners’ identity as ‘ōiwi Hawai‘i and the impact and implications of denationalization efforts on Hawaiian culture, identity, and well-being

In the interest of maintaining alignment of action and intentions, core elements within the theoretical framework of Mahi‘ai Consciousness, this study prioritizes opportunities for participants to make visible their thinking about what they value (McNiff & Whitehead, 2010). Participant feedback was used to design an additional in-service for all faculty, of which the study participants are a part. Participants were asked to use learning from the in-service to design and implement a lesson. The lessons were observed by the researcher, who also conducted a post-observation reflective conversation with each kumu individually. An additional requisite condition for participation is experience with the post-observation reflective conversation process (Costa & Garmston, 2002). This structured process positions the interviewer as a mediator of thinking that invites the reflector, in this case the kumu, to summarize impressions and recall supporting information from the lesson, and to analyze causal factors; compare,

analyze, infer, and determine cause-and-effect relationships for the purposes of constructing new learning (p. 40). As part of the process, the kumu is invited to share reflections of the lesson linked to tangible events from the lesson to substantiate his or her impressions. This mediative conversation is an important aspect of valuing and maintaining kumu voice as “the sum of an individual’s constructed meaning resides internally..., and serves as the criterion for perceptions, decisions, and behavior. When these meanings are given form in language, they become accessible to both parties in a verbal transaction” (p. 61). The reflective conversation process therefore allows kumu the opportunity to articulate perspectives on causal relationships between instructional design and learner outcome achievement that may not be entirely obvious to an observer, but that is valuable in understanding the impact of CR strategies on student learning in authentic ways. These perspectives are based on his or her intimate knowledge of the lesson intent, instructional design, student engagement, and outcome evaluation criteria. By bringing these perspectives to the surface, the process also values kumu voice as valid data in a similar way that this study seeks to privilege and prioritize ‘ōiwi voice and the inherent mana that resides therein; “i ka ‘ōlelo nō ke ola, i ka ‘ōlelo nō ka make,” indeed he mana ko ka leo (Pukui, 1993, p. 129). As all of the study participants were under my direct supervision for evaluation purposes during the ‘18-‘19 school year, all have received training and have practice with the reflective conversation process. Due to the timeline for this study and to minimize time away from their core function as kumu, it was important that participants in this study did not require additional training or practice with the reflective conversation process. Finally, to avoid possible conflicts of interests, none of the study participants were under my direct supervision for evaluative purposes for the ‘19-‘20 school year in which the study occurred. The number of faculty members at the site selected for this study totaled 20. Of that amount, the number of

kumu that met all of the inclusion requirements and were therefore selected via purposeful sampling totaled six. Eligible participants were contacted via a letter that was distributed to each kumu explaining the context of the research study and inviting participation in the study. Of the six invited, all responded verbally to the invitation and completed the participant consent form (Appendix A). One kumu declined with a request to continue to be under my direct supervision for evaluative purposes citing a desire for continued professional support. The remaining five kumu accepted the invitation.

Data Collection

The data for this study were collected in two phases. Phase I involved the completion of a researcher generated questionnaire by study participants (Appendix B). This was important to establish kumu perspectives on the impact to-date of a series of job-embedded professional learning opportunities on their professional identity as CR educators. Coding of the data collected from the questionnaire was conducted manually and was used to inform the design of a professional learning in-service intervention that all study participants engaged in. The remaining faculty at the study site also participated in the in-service due to the collective benefit that could be derived from the experience. Only data from identified study participants were included for this study. This served as a tangible result of participant voice as the outcomes and content of the in-service were informed by and tailored to kumu-identified needs. Further, this process allowed for the modeling of the intentional instructional design that I expected kumu to use during the instructional design portion of the next phase. It was also essential to create a shared learning experience to introduce CR pedagogies that were sufficiently robust to allow for kumu choice yet reasonably bounded to support the emergence of common themes across the data collected in Phase II. In Phase II, participants applied learning from the in-service to design and implement a

lesson in which kumu identified one or more CR strategies from the in-service that were used to advance student learning outcomes. The lessons were observed and post-observation reflective conversations were conducted with each kumu to explore the evolution of their ability to self-identify as CR educators, and the relationship between the CR instructional moves used and achievement of learner outcomes (Appendix C). Allowing time within the post-observation conversation to talk story about kumus’ professional identity as CR educators was particularly essential to triangulate responses initially collected in the Phase I questionnaire, aligning with CR learning practices via the social construction of understanding, and with principles of quality research practice by supporting quality, rich data that will be used to understand deeply, the context under study (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2019; Hammond, 2015). The conversations were audio recorded and transcribed, and first and second cycle coding of the transcribed data was conducted manually to deductively identify categories for the data and inductively allow for the emergence of underlying themes. Coded data was extracted and grouped by category and theme to present a balcony perspective and stimulate analytic thinking based on participant voice.

Limitations

This study attempts in-part to respond to the call made by researchers in the field of indigenous education for greater study into the causal relationship between CR practices and learner achievement. While the research design has structures that allow for data to surface related to this call, a limitation exists in that learner achievement as articulated by kumu may be perceived as somewhat less valid than achievement data from standardized assessments. I offer that this is more a limitation of our current capacity for measuring and reporting of learner achievement that is more reflective of achievement over time based on the combined yet highly informative results of nominal, daily growth. If accomplished educator practices call on kumu to

base instructional design and moves on a deep understanding of learner needs as part of a continuous cycle of learner-informed instruction, this study provides an opportunity to professionally align actions with intentions by validating kumu evaluation of learner achievement at its point of centrality, in the classroom, lesson by lesson. Further affirmed here is the continued applicability of the theoretical framework of Mahi‘ai Consciousness as a guide for deeply intentional actions. The sample size may have implications for transferability beyond divisional utilization, however given that nearly 25% of the divisional faculty are represented in the study, results are likely to have appreciable implications for work as an instructional leader in this and similar contexts. Being a leader within this division and conducting research among faculty members may generate results from participants that are skewed. To accommodate for this possibility, only faculty members who do not report directly to me for evaluative purposes have been invited to participate.

Findings

Merriam and Tisdell (2016) explain action research and appreciative inquiry as inquiry conducted by people with a connection to a specific group who seek to enact change through experimentation and recording outcomes as interventions are applied (p. 4). In this chapter, I present the findings of the research conducted as an insider-researcher within this community. In seeking to provide ‘ōiwi Hawai‘i-serving instructional leaders with greater insight as to how to better support kumu in identifying as CR educators, two questions comprised the focus of this study; a) how has an evolving system of job-embedded professional support impacted teachers’ self-identification as CR educators, and b) how do teachers perceive the impact on student learning when CR pedagogies are intentionally employed? Following a summary of study participants, I begin with a presentation of the results from the participant questionnaire from Phase I of the study. I then go on to explain how the categories and themes that emerged from the data helped to inform an intervention. This is followed by a presentation of the findings from the observations and conversations that occurred in Phase II, which precedes a summary of the connections between the data and the research questions.

The requisite characteristics of study participants outlined previously resulted in a study participant cohort whose demographics are detailed in Table 2. All participants teach exclusively in upper elementary. Two work with students in grades four, two work with students in grade five, and one works with both grade levels.

Table 2*Study Participant Demographics*

Gender	Years of Experience at the Study Site	Identify as Native Hawaiian
F	13	Yes
M	2	Yes
F	5	No
F	12	No
F	4	Yes

Phase I

The questionnaire used in Phase I of the study was disseminated to participants in mid-August of 2019 (Appendix B). The qualitative data was collected and analyzed using conventional methods in a deductive manner beginning with an initial round of coding, which resulted in the identification of categories that emerged due the burgeoning correlation of the data to the specific groupings of questions asked on the questionnaire (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2019). In a second review of the data, coding was performed to further aggregate the data into themes. In continuing to align with the spirit of intentionality, a central element within Mahi‘ai Consciousness, these categories and themes provided the stimulus for the creation of an intervention that was implemented at an in-service opportunity on October 14, 2019. The initial categories and respective codes are reflected in Table 3.

Table 3*Categories from Phase I Questionnaire*

Category	Correlation to Questionnaire Questions
Perceptions of training received – PERC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What training(s) resonated most with you? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What sticks out as particularly memorable? Why?
Impact to practice – IP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In what ways have these trainings impacted your understanding of HCB / CR instructional practices? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What do you know and understand now that you might not have or not have understood as well previous to engaging in these trainings? • In what ways have these trainings affected your instructional practice? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What have you incorporated into your practice as a result of these trainings?
Development of professional identity – PI	<p>To what degree do you agree with these statements (Likert scale: 1-4; 4 = strongly agree, 1 = strongly disagree)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I am a culturally relevant educator. • Incorporating HCB/CR pedagogies is essential when instructing indigenous learners.

Category	Correlation to Questionnaire Questions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In what ways might the HCB / CR related trainings you participated in this past school year have affected your response to the previous two questions?
Future growth interests – FGI	<p>To what degree do you agree with these statements (Likert scale: 1-4; 4 = strongly agree, 1 = strongly disagree)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incorporating HCB / CR professional development in in-service days would benefit my instructional practice. Incorporating HCB / CR professional development in faculty meetings would benefit my instructional practice. What types of professional development and/or other experiences would help to increase the likelihood that you would identify as an HCB / CR educator? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How might professional development opportunities be structured to positively affect your identity as an HCB / CR educator?

Category	Correlation to Questionnaire Questions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What types of professional development would you like to see more of? Less of? ○ With what frequency would you like to engage with professional development that contributes to your capacity for HCB / CR practices?

There are three themes that emerged from the second round of coding. The themes and corresponding codes are presented in Table 4 along with subtopics to provide greater context for data included in each theme set.

Table 4

Themes from Phase I Questionnaire

Theme	Subtopics and Participant Quotes
Developing Indigenous Perspectives - DIP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Mo‘olelo ○ ‘Ōlelo no‘eau ○ Literature ○ ‘Āina <p>“Using the story of Kamiki was particularly memorable for me because Dr. Peralto’s sharing was a wonderful example for us all to help our keiki connect with their ‘āina and the</p>

Theme	Subtopics and Participant Quotes
	<p>heroes who come from their respective kulāiwi.”</p> <p>“Culturally relevant instructional practices are more than just learning about the cultural ‘content,’ ... it is more about grounding the context within the cultural values, knowledge, beliefs, etc.</p> <p>“PD that makes clear connection of cultural, educational, and spiritual with historical ties would help me to synthesize cultural evolution from past to the present.”</p>
Relevance – R	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Application to content ○ Appropriateness to population served ○ Connected to contemporary context / standards ○ Exemplar of the use of historical resources in a contemporary content

Theme	Subtopics and Participant Quotes
	<p>“The impact of the trainings was tremendous as it tied into curriculum that is relevant to the grade level that I teach.”</p> <p>“The most recent history of our hae resonates with me because I found it very relevant to what I want to imbed in my instruction. I was able to make numerous connections/parallels to concepts I am responsible for.”</p> <p>When asked what would help to increase the likelihood that he or she would identify as a CR educator, one participant responded that, “taking a few essential American History standards and developing culturally relevant lessons around them.”</p>
Intentionality – INT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Connectedness across learning experiences – (not disjointed/disparate) ○ Aligned to generally accepted determinants of quality ○ Credible sources of information (more fact, less opinion)

Theme	Subtopics and Participant Quotes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Social construction of understanding ○ Safe to learn conditions <p>“The connections from one PD to the next were relevant, useful, informative and not siloed.”</p> <p>“Participation in trainings increased my confidence to be able to provide better instruction because information was shared in a way that was NOT only opinion-based.”</p> <p>“Training was done in a way that personal opinion was take out and offered me venues to be an ‘ōiwi thinking/leader instead of just being a follower.”</p> <p>One participant responded that he or she values lessons that, “consciously incorporate into lesson plans, strategies that are culturally responsive; partner/group work, collaborative teams, games.”</p>

Note. Bulleted items in column two are subtopics that emerged under each theme. The quotes presented in this table were derived from anonymous participant responses to the Phase I Questionnaire that were collected in August 2019. Both are included to provide context to each of the themes listed.

These themes were not uniquely aligned to specific categories, rather, they spanned multiple categories and their pilina is represented in Figure 1 to show the fluid connections within and across categories, with the themes purposefully positioned at the center to highlight their importance and centrality in influencing the design of the study intervention.

Figure 1

Pilina Between Categories and Themes



The themes that emerged from the kumu feedback are consistent with elements detailed previously in the study. Grounded in a mindset of intentionality as supported through numerous ‘ōlelo no‘eau, Mahi‘ai Consciousness draws credibility from its origins in and connection to authentic historical context; from life-sustaining actions, born out of necessity, driven by deep intentionality toward a clear and desired outcome, and reactive to evolving environmental

conditions. Participants further validate their preferences for learning opportunities that are purposefully designed to capitalize on relationships and connections to context to promote learning; self to text, self to peer, self to professional context, ancient to contemporary. Feedback also indicate a preference for intentional alignment to determinants of quality, like standards-aligned instruction. Their mana‘o resonate with Mahi‘ai Consciousness based on a through line of connectedness, relationships, concepts of wholeness, identity, intentionality, outcome achievement and community. Further affirmed through participant responses is the idea that positive affective experiences with learning support the growth of learners, in this case adult learners, and the development of their professional identity. Collectively the categories and themes informed the intervention design, an in-service, that aligned with how and what participants valued in professional learning.

As part of the Phase I questionnaire, kumu were specifically asked to respond to the statements, ‘I am a culturally relevant educator,’ followed by, ‘In what ways might the culturally relevant trainings you participated in this past school year have affected your response to the previous question?’ There was a general commonality among the participants’ responses in that all identified, to varying degrees, as culturally relevant educators. One participant commented, “I have always viewed myself as a Hawaiian culture-based educator. Attending these trainings gave confirmation to what I believed was important and relevant, but these trainings also expanded my thinking and broadened my understanding.” Another participant shared, “The trainings have helped me to see that culturally relevant education is much more than being able to speak Hawaiian fluently and retell Hawaiian history or mo‘olelo.” A third participant indicated that, “(the trainings) provided a multitude of resources and I am more confident to share it,” later adding, “with many of our learners being of many cultures, these trainings helped me to

understand who they are and the importance of grounding ourselves to this ‘āina that we all call home.” Responses to companion questions indicated that kumu found value in learning about how neuroscience supports CR practices as having positive impacts to learners. One participant shared,

Unpacking and applying ‘Culturally Responsive Teaching and the Brain’ impacted my understanding of HCBE especially with the concept of understanding culture; surface culture, shallow culture, and deep culture. It is comforting to many of us that we naturally and instinctively teach in ways that are culturally responsive and at a deep level.

Intervention

Beginning with a broader perspective, I first considered the larger categories in establishing the general structure of the intervention, specifically, the intervention had to connect intentionally to each of the categories. To align the learning experience with participants’ preferences and what they value as learners, a key consideration would be the direct applicability to their professional practice; the learning had to be immediately applicable and transferable to their work with students. The learning would also have to incorporate credible expertise or sources while respecting the professionalism of the kumu and providing just-right learning given their collective and individual needs. The experience would also have to connect to the participants’ professional identities as educators and align with what they identified as growth interests. Much of my efforts here were focused on the pedagogical aspects of CR instruction and on modeling instructional design and practice that I would call on study participants to replicate in phase II. Through the modeling of practices, I would also model behaviors and mindsets that provide a context for the professional identities of kumu that I was seeking to impact.

The themes were then applied as a second lens with which to filter design elements related to the intervention. The content stimulus used to model the CR pedagogy would need to be rooted in historical text. Print and non-print text were selected as instructional resources. Conditions for social interaction around these stimuli would allow for the emergence of individual perspectives informed by the broader ideas of the group and were also designed into the activity. A deliberate attempt to connect to content standards was made to model expectations that we have of our teachers that requires they align instructional focus to standards, regardless of content. The primary focus for the in-service was for kumu to explore elements of standards-aligned instructional design in an ‘ōiwi context. The following outcomes for the experience were identified:

- Articulate elements of coherent instructional design that embody culturally relevant pedagogies for standards-aligned learning.
- Model a cycle of data-informed and standards-aligned goal setting, instructional design, assessment and reflection of learning.

Learning look-fors were also presented to the kumu to maintain focus on the intended learning. The prompt, ‘in what ways has today’s experience embodied the following:’ was provided at the beginning of the in-service in conjunction with these look-fors.

- Data-informed goal setting
- Outcome-aligned instructional design and assessment
- Reflective practice
- Culturally relevant connections (content and pedagogy)

To remain consistent in aligning with the theoretical framework of Mahi‘ai Consciousness, I wanted to ensure that the in-service I provided aligned with the professional growth needs of

participants. I modeled intentional instructional design by sharing the inputs I considered in identifying the collective participant needs, which informed the outcomes of the in-service. The data inputs that informed the creation of the learning outcomes for this in-service are included in Table 5.

Table 5

Data Inputs that Informed the Learning Outcomes for the Kumu

Data	Context
Feedback from Kumu	The categories and themes that emerged from participant feedback from the Phase I Questionnaire were essential in the design of this intervention.
Long-term Student Learning Goals (Kamehameha Schools, 2019)	At the start of the school year, each kumu was required to identify and advance a long-term student learning goal based on the collective needs of his or her students. Central themes from the study participants’ goals were drawn to ensure that the focus of the in-service remained relevant to their instructional context.
English Language Arts Standards (National Governors Association Center for Best Practices & Council of Chief State School Officers, 2010)	As all participants are expected to design standards-aligned instruction, the inclusion of English Language Arts Common Core State Standards (ELA CCSS) in the design of this

Data	Context
	<p>in-service was necessary. The standard referenced in this lesson came from the ELA College and Career Readiness Anchor Standards for Reading: Craft and Structure – Interpret words and phrases as they are used in a text, including determining technical, connotative, and figurative meanings, and analyze how specific word choices shape meaning or tone. The use of this specific standard was done intentionally due to its universal applicability to each participant’s teaching context.</p>

The modeled lesson focused on kaona as a literary device with instructional materials drawn from mele, ‘ōlelo no‘eau and mo‘olelo, in light of the ELA CCSS that spanned multiple grade levels. Culturally relevant instructional practices were also modeled and are represented in Table 6. The in-service culminated in an opportunity for participants to reflect individually and as a group, referring to the previously articulated look-fors to provide a frame for their reflection. This was an intentional opportunity for participants to consolidate their understanding, which helped me to determine that all were adequately supported for Phase II of the study.

Table 6*Culturally Relevant Instructional Strategies Modeled*

CR Instructional Strategy Modeled	How it Presented Throughout the In-service
Validating culture in light of global content (Kana‘iaupuni & Ledward, 2013)	The intentional selection and use of instructional materials, traditional and contemporary, that exemplified ‘ōiwi Hawai’i perspectives while allowing opportunities for connecting to appropriate standards for learning
Talk structures that are participatory in nature, unpacking through dialogue, social construction of understanding, cooperative learning (Hammond, 2015)	Intentional time to talk with table partners around specific discussion prompts and stimuli to guide participants in achieving the stated learning outcomes
Connecting to place/piko; using the community as a setting for student learning; original compositions imbued with a person’s experience and spirit – ma ka hana ka ‘ike (Demmert, 2001; Ledward et al., 2008; Pukui, 1993)	Engaging participants in connecting with ‘āina through personally relevant connections to either their piko or to our mauna through the creation of new ‘ōlelo no‘eau infused with kaona

CR Instructional Strategy Modeled	How it Presented Throughout the In-service
Teaching using demonstration / modeling; validating traditional ways of learning and teaching – i ka nānā nō a ‘ike (Lipka et al., 2005; Pukui, 1993; Schonleber, 2007)	Modeling a cycle of data-informed instructional design rooted in CR pedagogy and aligned to appropriate learning standards and assessments

Phase II

Phase II of the study began once participants had experienced the in-service and the type of intentional instructional design with a focus on CR instructional moves that would be expected during their upcoming lesson that I would observe. Participants were requested to implement their respective lessons by the end of November 2019, and all were able to meet that deadline. I observed each of the study participants for a period of 30 minutes and took personal field notes to serve as reminders of what I had observed. With the use of pre-determined questions to guide the conversation, Appendix C, I conducted post-observation conversations with each participant individually. For this phase of the study, participants were assigned pseudonyms of Ā, Ē, Ī, Ō and Ū. Gender neutral pronouns of they and their are used to further pale their identities.

The data from the post-observation conversations was transcribed and analyzed using the same qualitative analysis technique I used in Phase I. In this situation, I used pre-determined codes that correlated with categories derived by clustering the post-observation guiding questions. As the guiding questions were expressly designed to elicit data in light of the research

questions, it made sense to identify these categories to aid in an initial grouping of the data. The categories and related codes are presented in Table 7 and are organized by the research questions to which they apply.

Table 7

Categories and Codes from Phase II Data Analysis

Research Question 1	Research Question 2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact of exposure to CR pedagogy on one’s personal instructional practice – IP • Professional identity - PI 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Culturally relevant strategies used – CRS • Learning Outcomes – LO • Impact of CR pedagogy on student learning – SL

A second round of analysis was performed to distill themes. These themes appeared across categories and are detailed in Table 8. Allowing for the emergence of themes beyond simply using the categories was an important step in the analysis process as the inductive nature of this step created space for participant voice within what would otherwise be largely bounded by the guiding questions used and the deductive nature by which the initial analysis categories and codes were determined.

Table 8

Themes from Phase II Data Analysis

Theme	Description
Pedagogical Values – PV	Provides insights as to what kumu value in terms of pedagogy

Theme	Description
Identifying as Culturally Relevant – ICR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Factors impacting ability to identify as a CR educator • Future growth desires • Kumu beliefs about determinants to identifying as a CR educator

The CR instructional strategies modeled in the in-service were used in various combinations by study participants during their observed lesson and are reflected in Table 9. A majority of participants, four of the five, articulated that they intentionally employed two or more of the modeled CR strategies. All participants communicated using instructional materials that exemplified ‘ōiwi Hawai‘i perspectives. When asked about how CR strategies manifested in the lesson, Ā indicated,

Giving them a mo‘olelo specifically of Keonehelele‘i where we’re going to go visit in our huaka‘i later this week, was authentic for them. It allowed them to make deeper connections to Ka‘ū and really form a lot more questions to get them interested. Giving them (students) culturally relevant text, giving them opportunities to discuss and connect to their own piko contextualized everything for them, and we ultimately want them to do that with their own special place.

While participant Ī only stated intentional use of connecting to place/piko, Ī’s responses to other questions in the post-observation conversation indicated that validating culture in light of global content through the incorporation of mo‘olelo specific to place was also used in this lesson. For example, Ī commented,

I shared personal mo‘olelo in an effort to build pilina as that tends to engage students. I modeled my place of ‘Ōpihikao and I talked about gathering hā‘uke‘uke and ‘ōpihi. I used to have one spoon and my mom would say, “if you like eat, you go get your own”... and students were in awe of that story. So when we went to Ka‘ū, the kids said, “can I bring my spoon?” So, I had a couple of kids that brought a butter knife and spoons... and I’m sitting there going, wow, so I notice mo‘olelo and talking stories to them and using me as a source was really beneficial, and then adding in other stories, their own experiences really helped to enrich the learning.

This highlights that at least for participant Ī, there are moments where CR practices are intentionally employed but the kumu may not articulate their practice as such.

Table 9

Culturally Relevant Instructional Strategies Used by Kumu

CR Instructional Strategy Modeled	Kumu
Validating culture in light of global content (Kana‘iaupuni & Ledward, 2013)	Ā, Ē, Ī, Ō, Ū
Talk structures that are participatory in nature, unpacking through dialogue, social construction of understanding, cooperative learning (Hammond, 2015)	Ā, Ē, Ō, Ū
Connecting to place/piko; using the community as a setting for student learning;	Ā, Ē, Ī, Ū

CR Instructional Strategy Modeled	Kumu
original compositions imbued with a person’s experience and spirit – ma ka hana ka ‘ike (Demmert, 2001; Ledward et al., 2008; Pukui, 1993)	
Teaching using demonstration / modeling; validating traditional ways of learning and teaching – i ka nānā nō a ‘ike (Lipka et al., 2005; Pukui, 1993; Schonleber, 2007)	Ē, Ō

Having received training in the context of an in-service experience, the observation data indicated that kumu are able to intentionally design instruction that purposefully engaged CR strategies, when provided express instruction to do so. The data suggest that the incorporation of CR strategies is a skill that can be developed through the intentional modeling of desired practices via training; i ka nānā nō a ‘ike, an ‘ōiwi method of learning, further validates this finding (Lipka et al., 2005; Pukui, 1993; Schonleber, 2007). The data also show that kumu can and will demonstrate desired practices, CR pedagogy in the case of this study, under conditions where training is provided to calibrate understanding and vernacular, expectations for intentional application of learning are clearly communicated, and follow up observation of application in practice with post-observation reflective conversation occurs.

Pedagogical Values

While the data do not indicate whether intentional design to include CR pedagogy would continue beyond this cycle, participant comments reflect a general value of CR pedagogy, citing practices that they have sought to normalize in their respective classrooms. When asked how the incorporation of CR pedagogies has impacted their practice as an educator, Ā shared, “I am cognizant to constantly go back to piko, or going back to connections. They have prior knowledge, build on that.” Ī indicated, “I use ‘ōlelo no‘eau regularly as attention getters and to build lawena and provide frames of thinking to help students in directing their actions, which allows them to be more present for the learning.” Ū communicated, “incorporating participatory talk structures in particular has become a normalized part of the class as doing so allows for greater access and equity, validating personal mana‘o.” While the data suggest a general value and use of CR strategies as normalized practices, the post-observation reflective conversations helped to provide greater context between the application of CR pedagogy and the impact to student learning, which is the focus of the second research question; what is the perceived impact to student learning when CR pedagogies are intentionally employed?

In addition to the CR strategies used, participants were asked to identify learning outcomes for their lesson, how well those outcomes were achieved, and the impact the use of CR strategies had on student achievement of the outcomes. Participant Ā explicitly identified the learning outcome as “students will be able to connect to a mo‘olelo to extract deeper meaning conveyed through structured conversations.” Ā explained that, “previously, students demonstrated a tendency to just give up when they didn’t feel connected to the text,” indicating that this was an appropriate learning outcome for these students. In engaging students in deeper inquiry around the mo‘olelo of Keonehelele‘i, Ā summarized that they saw evidence of students

continuously rereading, referring back to the text, and sharing predictions, personal thoughts, and traits of characters within the story. These served as indicators for Ā that all students had accomplished the intended outcome for this lesson. Ā also shared that as a result of the CR strategy used, “students were much more interested in the text as it presented provocations for very real, appropriate questions.”

In comparison, Ē’s description of how well students met the outcomes was more detailed. Given the learning outcome, students will correctly use two patterns, *he aha kēia*, and *pehea kona ‘ano* to articulate a question and provide an appropriate answer, Ē indicated that students were assessed on a number of indicators beyond correct use of the patterns including vocabulary, pronunciation, and fluency. Given these determinants of successful outcome achievement, Ē indicated that out of 24 students, three students failed to include the subject in the first pattern, seven students were unsuccessful at successfully applying the second pattern, four tried to respond by using a pattern to convey quantity, which was not taught, and four students demonstrated issues with pronunciation. Despite Ē’s conclusion that not all students achieved the outcomes, Ē further explains that were it not for explicit modeling of the correct use of these patterns to pose questions and responses, and the use of text and *‘āina*-based connections, fewer students would have achieved the outcomes.

Ī identified a learning need for their students having discovered that students were having difficulty using words to convey a strong sense of imagery. The learning outcome that resulted was that students would be able to use concrete words, phrases and sensory details to convey experiences and events precisely through the creation of free-verse poetry. In their assessment of student learning, Ī summarized that all but two students were able to meet the learning outcome, citing “starting with students’ *piko*, what’s familiar to them, was an appropriate way to scaffold

and build an awareness of how to discern unique attributes... allowing for a deeper connection to the learning.”

Ō shared that their students were “demonstrating that there is a continued need to develop a stance with well-reasoned evidence.” They had also previously identified a year-long learning need to develop students’ metacognitive skills and had been using the TMT conflict on Mauna Kea as an ongoing focus around which to structure learning themes. This informed the lesson outcome, students will understand how to use the intellectual standards to reflect on a written piece that reflects argument or opinion writing and provide appropriate feedback. In this lesson, students used their previous argument or opinion writing pieces to provide and receive feedback. In reflecting on the students’ achievement of the outcomes, Ō indicated that, “some achieved but others showed that they need more examples and practice with the task.” Regarding the effect of having employed CR pedagogy on student learning, Ō affirmed that,

The use of CR moves helped kids to go deep, to remember, to connect in ways that seek to inspire desired academic behavior. Dialogue helped to make the learning sticky.

Focusing on global themes and patterns in ways that affirm and build identity seems to allow for transference across contexts, for example US versus Hawaiian history.

Ū recognized a need for their students to further develop their use of word choice, which informed the outcome, students will demonstrate an ability to use concrete words, phrases, and sensory details to convey experience and events precisely through the creation of a free-verse poem about Laehala. Ū indicated that 95% of their students achieved the learning outcomes. Ū commented,

Without the incorporation of the (CR) strategies, it wouldn’t have been as emotional, thoughtful, and wouldn’t have worked as well as it did – gets back to increased

engagement. It would be more tortuous if they needed to sit quietly and be sponges.

Connecting to place helped students feel with all of their senses. Students had greater access to words due to feelings that emerged from being immersed in an environment.

The data indicate that most participants grounded their learning outcomes in an identified student learning need. There was some variation in the specificity with which kumu were able to articulate how well the outcomes were achieved, ranging from broad and generalized, to specific evidence of achievement on an individual student level. Regarding how teachers perceive the impact on student learning when CR pedagogies are intentionally employed, resoundingly, all kumu affirmed that the incorporation of CR pedagogy had a positive effect on student learning. Demmert and Towner (2003) assert that it is necessary that studies begin to collect data on actual student learning as an outcome. The design of the study purposefully privileged the educator perspective on the impact of CR pedagogy on student learning as opposed to seeking students' perceptions on how the use of CR pedagogy made them feel about the learning. By placing emphasis on daily student learning as the "primary outcome variable," we can better align and attribute the immediate effects of CR strategies on learning outcomes (p. 5).

While there are elements within the data that continue to validate an affective benefit to learners, e.g. participants validating "increased engagement" in their comments, the data also suggest a deeper connection to academic benefit to learners in the way that participants qualified the impact of CR pedagogy by referencing specific academic behavioral outcomes. For example, in reference to Ē whose specific focus for the lesson was on language acquisition, it is perhaps clearer to see the direct benefit to student learning in that the use of modeling, while perhaps engaging, could reasonably be considered essential for a language learner in developing their pronunciation and fluency. Connecting to piko in Ū's lesson provided students with access to

feelings and sensory experiences that directly impacted their students’ ability to, as they state, “infuse beautiful language” into their free-verse poems. In their situation, Ū was able to articulate a direct connection between the incorporation of CR pedagogy and the students’ ability to demonstrate proficiency with the applicable standard that Ū articulated as, “using concrete words and phrases and sensory details to convey experience and events precisely.”

As a result of incorporating CR pedagogy, validating culture in light of global content through the exploration of opposing positions related to the construction of the Thirty Meter Telescope, Ō indicated that their students began to understand their kuleana as beyond simply taking a side on the issue. Rather, students discovered that it was “their kuleana to makawalu and consider different perspectives to make informed decisions.” The College and Career Readiness Anchor Standards for Writing prioritize in the form of a broad standard, the need for students to be able to “write arguments to support claims in an analysis of substantive topics or texts using valid reasoning and relevant and sufficient evidence” (National Governors Association Center for Best Practices & Council of Chief State School Officers, 2010, pp. CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.CCRAW.1). This broad standard serves as an indicator of what students should know and be able to do; a desired, long-term outcome for all students. Given this context, if through reflection on their instructional practice on the impact of incorporating CR pedagogy on students’ learning in light of student work product, Ō is able to render an assessment of students’ general proficiency toward the identified standard, then the data begins to suggest a possible opportunity for exploring the correlation between CR pedagogy and direct impact to student learning.

Identifying as a Culturally Relevant Educator

The data from Phase II of the study related to whether participants identify as CR educators are consistent with what was noted in Phase I of the study in that all participants affirmed that to varying extents, that they identify as CR educators. When asked about factors that contributed to their identification as such, participants credited perspectives gained from the previous trainings. Ē stated, “I have greater value for the importance of making connections to text, place, context, previous knowledge; scaffolding.” Ī conveyed, “(I am) being more mindful of the connection between what is taught and how it is taught.” Ō affirmed, “I can make connections if I have access to robust resources, for example, curriculum, coaches, etc.”

In looking to future growth needs that would further impact their ability to more strongly identify as a CR educator, the participants all identified professional learning opportunities as the preferred means for developing professionally. Ā indicated that they would like more experience with CR practices through workshops and opportunities to observe CR practices in action. Ē shared that they would like to be involved in a “purposefully designed CBE program,” clarifying that the entire educational program would be CBE focused. Ō articulated a desire for, “more professional learning on history, culture, ‘ōlelo.” Ē presented a slightly different perspective in that they appreciated the training received however they would simply like more time to unpack the learning from these experiences, to “think through what implementation might look like given a teacher’s current kuleana, even simply to organize notes from professional learning sessions.” In contrast, Ū affirms that they are, “more confident that their practice inherently aligns with CR practices because I’ve had time to practice it; it’s almost second nature.”

When specifically asked to qualify their response to the question, “I am a CR educator,” the data began to present insights as to additional factors that impacted their ability to identify

professionally as a CR educator. Two participants indicated that the academic content they teach was the primary determinant for whether they could identify as a CR educator. As an example, Ā indicated that, “there are pockets when I feel this way; in math, I don’t feel like a high CR educator; the content of math is not culturally relevant. I am CR, just not all day long, and I want to be.” In a similar manner, Ē said,

It is difficult to be a CR educator when we have to contend with tradition, how we were taught, and expectations like moving kids on a proficiency scale. I want to create units that connect to place. I know that’s right, but there’s pressure to show proficiency, but there’s so much more to show.

This data suggests a belief that CR education is achieved through indigenized content, and perhaps an understanding that indigenized content might in some way require different pedagogy from non-indigenized content. This data also suggests a belief that to be culturally relevant might not align with generally accepted standards of academic proficiency.

Another participant conveyed a different perspective. Ō commented that they see CR pedagogy as distinct from normal educator practice, sharing,

So, I see good teaching as separate because you can have pedagogy and you can have instructional strategies and you can be a good teacher. However, here, to be a culturally relevant teacher, you also have to open yourself up to learning that’s required to implement, to tie those two together. I feel confident in my pedagogy, but I’m mindful of and intentionally seeking to grow more and more, and every year I get a little better. If you’re not open to the cultural piece, then it’s not going to be truly effective teaching. To teach here, you need a blend of both.

Initially, this may suggest that CR practices are materially different from what widely accepted professional frameworks in education have identified as distinguished or accomplished teaching practices (Danielson, 2013; National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, 2018). Ladson-Billings (1995a) advocates that “culturally relevant teaching requires that teachers attend to students’ academic needs, not merely make them feel good” (p. 160). When probed further to clarify their previous statement, Ō reviewed their summary of the instruction that was modeled in the October in-service. In drawing connections between the larger concept of pedagogy that defines accomplished teaching, with which Ō is intimately familiar, Ō redirected,

Even as I was reading through this, when I see the importance of dialogue and the social construction of understanding and that being culturally relevant pedagogy, to me, that’s in general good teaching pedagogy. So, it’s like one in the same almost. The part then that I think teachers might continue to need more is not the content part, but the process, it’s accomplished teaching.

This shift indicated that Ō understood, after greater reflection, that CR practices align with and are not materially separate from what they had come to know as good teaching practice.

Ū presented mana‘o that one’s ethnicity had bearing on their ability to fully identify as a CR educator, saying,

I can never be (a full CR educator) because you need to have grown up immersed in that type of environment to be able to speak from expertise and experience. I can however collect and share information from experts that grew up here but I’m not a full CR educator.

This data positioned cultural relevance as a condition of biology or the result of long-term exposure to environmental conditions and reflected a belief that there may be a limit when it comes to impacting professional identity as CR.

Collectively, this data indicates a positive effect of the training provided on the participants' ability to identify as CR educators. Although all participants initially identified as CR, feedback on the Phase I questionnaire affirmed that the various trainings they had participated in was well-received and had an impact to their practice. What participants valued from previous trainings were aggregated and used to inform the October in-service intervention. Based on the CR strategies modeled, and the expectations set for study participants at the in-service, all were able to meet the expectations with fidelity, replicating intentional instructional design from goal setting, to the purposeful incorporation of CR strategies, and assessment of learning. This suggests that under certain conditions, professional learning can directly impact instructional practice. Although this study cannot affirm the longevity with which these practices remain as part of their practice, participants were able to explain further, CR practices that they independently sought to normalize and provided detail as to the CR strategies that they valued in light of the impact on student engagement and learning. This further affirmed the value of CR practice and their professional identification as CR educators. While participants conveyed that the trainings had a positive influence on their ability to identify as a CR educator, and all identify to varying degrees as such, concerns related to one's perception of the applicability or appropriateness of CR practices as specific to subject areas and not as part of a larger body of effective instructional practices, exist. Also, the issue of ethnic identity presents as a limiting factor for a minority of the participants in their ability to fully identify as a CR educator. It would

appear as though the trainings provided were insufficient in positioning CR practices in light of generally accepted standards of educator practice.

The findings support the assertion that CR professional learning opportunities help to further affirm professional identities as CR kumu for those kumu who already identify at least in-part as CR educators. Also supported is the assertion that there are affective and academic benefits when CR instructional strategies are used, when evaluating learning at the lesson level. Evaluating learning in a discrete context, is a function of instructional practice that inform one’s identity as an educator. The theoretical framework of Mahi‘ai Consciousness also emerges as a grounding and connecting element for both key findings and explicates their interdependence and application to practice moving forward, which is discussed in the next chapter.

Conclusion

The primary outcome for this study was to provide ‘ōiwi Hawai‘i-serving instructional leaders like myself with greater insight as to how to better support kumu in identifying as CR educators, describing their pedagogy as such, and articulating the connections between their instructional moves and the impact on learning. In light of this purpose, I present two relevant findings from the study followed by a discussion on the implications of the findings on praxis. I conclude with a reflection on the future application of the theoretical framework.

Impact on Identity

Regarding the impact of a system of job-embedded professional support on the participants’ self-identification as CR educators, the findings support the first assertion that CR professional learning opportunities help to further affirm professional identities as CR kumu for those kumu who already identify at least in-part as CR educators. Given that all kumu self-identified to varying degrees as CR educators during Phase I of the study, the findings implicate professional learning experiences that align with the themes that emerged from participant feedback, outlined in Table 4, as having the most impact on their self-identification as CR educators. Namely, a series of intentionally aligned trainings that allow for exposure to indigenous perspectives and have immediate transferable application to classroom practice helps kumu to develop their confidence as CR educators. This aligns with previous findings related to importance of intentionally grounding learning in a bona fide purpose (Cajete et al., 2005; Charlot, 2005; Demmert, 2001; Kawakami & Aton, 2001; Tibbetts et al., 2007).

Factors contributing to this assertion include kumu feeling equipped with credible resources that validate ‘ōiwi mindset and perspectives, and the ability to incorporate the resources and what was modeled for them via professional learning when working with students.

With greater depth of understanding of the mindsets and perspectives that our ‘ōiwi Hawai‘i students descend from and come with, kumu communicate having increased opportunities for connecting with students, and capitalizing on that pilina to engage learners. According to Hammond (2015), when learners are provided the opportunity to “process their thinking through discourse, they begin to notice and name their own competence” (p. 149). Kawai‘ae‘a mā (2018) describe maui as “the essence of who we are, and is exhibited and fostered through a cultural sense of spirituality, behavior, actions, language and traditional-based knowledge” (p. 6). They further convey that maui “is developed through social processes and interaction with (the) world around us that foster our spiritual connections, develop our behavior and actions, enrich our traditional knowledge base and enhance our language expression” (p. 6). Given time to consolidate learning and how it might apply to personal context, kumu are able to envision themselves engaging in the taught behavior. Having experienced positive results of applying the learned behavior through normalizing and sustaining behaviors, as was observed with the study participants, kumu gain competence and confidence as someone with capacity for a particular behavior, and with sufficient reinforcement through continued positive results, are able to eventually identify as someone who is proficient at applying the behavior. The normalization of CR practices among the participants, practices that have also been foci across the collection of trainings, aligns with notion that behaviors impact capability, which influences values, beliefs and finally identity (Dilts, 1994). Providing opportunities for kumu to develop behaviors through actions via social interaction has the potential for impacting who they are, ultimately, how they identify as educators.

The participants’ positive connection with the learning experiences, specifically their perceptions of the quality, credibility and relevance of the learning, does not present as

materially surprising given what contemporary literature and historical ‘ōiwi Hawai‘i context present as effective practice regarding teaching and learning (Danielson, 2007; Frazier, 2000; Kana‘iaupuni & Kawai‘ae‘a, 2008; Ladson-Billings, 1995a; National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, 2018). This study does however serve as an additional resource in support of deep intentionality driving instructional design to advance purposeful learning aligned with learner needs as a means of impacting mindset, behavior and ultimately identity.

Academic Benefits

Considering the impact on student learning when CR pedagogies are intentionally employed, the findings support a second assertion that there are affective and academic benefits when CR instructional strategies are used. The findings support what has previously been reported in the literature regarding the impact of CR instruction on student engagement (Kana‘iaupuni et al., 2010; Lipka et al., 2005). The findings also advance the discussion around impact in an important direction, which has also been affirmed within the literature as a necessary next step to understand better the direct academic benefits to CR instruction (Demmert & Towner, 2003).

When kumu engage in reflective conversations with the express intent of connecting instructional strategies with students’ achievement of learning outcomes, as in the case of this study, the connections between practices and student learning become clearer, particularly when kumu can provide evidence in their reasoning to support claims of the connections between instructional moves and impact to student learning. The concept of evaluating the effectiveness of instruction on student learning through engaging in reflective practice is not new. Costa and Garmston (2002) posit that “a cognitive coach helps another person to take action toward his or her goals while simultaneously helping that person to develop expertise in planning, reflecting,

problem solving, and decision making” (p. 13). This study however points to the need for those who support kumu in engaging in reflective conversations to structure reflective conversations in a manner that connects instructional practice to students’ proficiency with the outcomes as a way to better ensure alignment between pedagogy and student learning.

The problem with this as an accepted method for tracking the impact of CR practice on learning is the granular nature of these connections, occurring at the individual lesson level, which presents significant challenges for collecting and reporting reliable data on student proficiency and growth. There exist too many variables when considering the greater question of achievement based on standardized assessments connected to CR instructional practices, as is evidenced by the limited body of literature that has been able to definitively affirm those connections across multiple contexts over time. A concerted focus on the immediate impacts of instruction tied to student demonstration of proficiency with appropriate, data-informed, needs-aligned learning outcomes suggests a different way to look at the impact of practices on learning in general, CR or otherwise. A mahi kalo does not wait until the end of the growing cycle to assess the health of lo‘i system and the kalo therein. Daily assessments are conducted, and modifications are made to promote optimal long-term growth. It might seem equally obtuse to not apply the same logic in advancing learners in accordance with desired outcomes. Those seeking further study into the connections between CR practice and the impact on student learning may consider a repositioning of daily learning achievement as perhaps the preferred focus for validating the impact of instructional practice on student learning. Doing so would bring us closer to aligning CR instructional practices to proof points of outcome achievement among learners.

Implications for Practice

When considering implications to my future practice as an ‘ōiwi-serving educative leader in an ‘ōiwi-serving educational organization and my role in advancing the professional capabilities in accordance with school-wide expectations, the study findings affirm the importance of professional learning experiences that align with the values and expectations that kumu hold as learners as a means to impact professional identity. Ensuring that in-service opportunities support the development of ‘ōiwi Hawai‘i perspectives, in a way that is relevant to individualized educator context and builds on previous learning as part of a series of instruction serves as a reasonable, responsible practice in this specific context. To increase the effectiveness of these opportunities on inducing changes in instructional practice, a concerted effort should also be made to clearly articulate the expectation that skills gained from professional learning will manifest in one’s instructional practice. Allowing for adequate time to consolidate learning to consider meaningful and appropriate application should also be consistently embedded into the professional learning opportunities. These in-service opportunities should also be aligned with a system of individualized follow-through supports whereby each kumu receives observation when implementing what was learned and is provided the opportunity to unpack his or her experience to align instructional practices and their effectiveness with student learning results. Consolidating the learning in this manner would better support the development of proficiency in applying desired instructional behaviors, which affects confidence, attitudes, beliefs, and finally identity.

An additional consideration moving forward would be to intentionally design opportunities that position CR instruction as part of accomplished teaching practices. In light of the framework of Mahi‘ai Consciousness, instructional design, which includes planful use of

specific instructional strategies in addition to appropriate curricular resources and instructional materials, should reflect an intentional connection to what kumu have generally come to understand as effective practices. The implication would be to establish CR practices as a part of, and not materially separate from good teaching. In doing so, a concerted effort should also be made to advance the understanding that effective pedagogy is indeed effective due to the fact that it engages learners in powerful ways regardless of the content. Students’ needs, therefore, in light of the identified learning outcomes, determine what instructional strategies should be intentionally applied. This means that whether a kumu teaches English language arts, math, or science, CR pedagogies may be skillfully applied as appropriate. In a similar manner, special effort should also be made to establish that an educator’s ability to select and employ instructional strategies, whether CR or otherwise, and his or her ethnicity, are mutually exclusive. One’s ability to grow kalo, for example, is not dependent on whether he or she identifies as an ‘ōiwi Hawai‘i. Rather, effectiveness at this practice is a learned condition. One’s ability to align appropriate instructional strategies with what students need is also a learned skill, and this reality is something that I also need to reinforce.

Based on the variation with which kumu are able to speak to individual student proficiency with the identified learning outcomes, I see a need to engage kumu in ongoing conversations that allow them to describe their instructional practice in light of student learning results to affirm and align their instructional moves with desired academic behaviors and learning. To be able to speak to the specific impact of instructional decisions prioritizes the importance of remaining consistently aware of learners’ progression toward desired outcomes and the impacts of intentional instruction provided to advance those outcomes. Under conditions where this reflective practice can be supported by instructional leaders skilled at providing

coaching support, as an instructional leader, I am able to better establish expectation that “accomplished teachers think systematically about their practice and learn from experience” (National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, 2016, p. 31).

Considering implications for leadership practice that might be transferable to other leaders within schools, the findings validate the primacy of aligning actions and needs-based outcomes through purposive, intentional and credible design. Given a common belief that CR instruction is simply “good teaching” and that teachers may simply not identify their instructional strategies as such, it is also incumbent of instructional leaders to not only illuminate the intimate connection between actions and outcomes, but to also create opportunities to ensure calibrated understanding and vernacular to support kumu in clearly articulating the causal relationships between intentional actions and student learning (Kana‘iaupuni et al., 2010; Ladson-Billings, 1995a, p. 159). Application of this practice for school leaders extends beyond the context of student instruction and learning and may manifest in myriad and novel forms. Whether deciding on and implementing curricula, promulgating and ensuring the collective, systemic advancement of long-term learner outcomes for postsecondary success, or establishing and growing desired professional or learner capacities or mindsets, aligning actions and outcomes based on a deep understanding of stakeholder needs combined with the ability to articulate and connect actions in commonly understood and accepted terms with the impacts of actions on intended stakeholders or processes presents a viable framework to guide leaders on the path toward continual improvement.

As ‘ōiwi-serving leaders beyond the realm of education, grounding plans to advance lāhui in the frame of Mahi‘ai Consciousness through surgically intentional outcome-aligned design promotes forward movement in a manner that is consistent with ‘ōiwi epistemology. To

be able to pause and reflect on the questions: “what is the purpose of this exercise, will it serve my family, will it benefit my community, how does it extend the quality of our lives,” aligns with a very innately ‘ōiwi mindset that “knowledge that holds function at its center moves our students into action and a better understanding of the roles of history and intention” (Meyer, 2003, p. 57). Furthering this idea, action for action’s sake without a firm connection to a utilitarian function based on a clear need may be considered pohō. The findings and implications from this study simply align with ‘ōiwi sensibilities and understandings that may have for some, for numerous reasons, found a place just beyond our immediate periphery. This suggests that ‘ike ku‘una may simply need to be called to the forefront for ‘ōiwi-serving leaders to focus on for a moment and begin to incorporate into our leadership philosophy. The implication here is that ‘ōiwi context validates what western practices has come to understand as effective practice. By increasing our temporal awareness and application of ‘ōiwi sensibilities like being deeply utilitarian-focused in determining which outcomes to pursue and maintaining Mahi‘ai Consciousness to guide our actions to those ends through a deeply intentional focus, ‘ōiwi-serving leaders continue to build lāhui in very structured and deliberate ways while aligning with core ‘ōiwi epistemologies, further maintaining and strengthening our identity as ‘ōiwi.

Mahi‘ai Consciousness as a Framework for Advancing Kaiāulu

Ua lehulehu and manomano ka ‘ikena a ka Hawai‘i - to have thrived as a community, required concerted effort to behave, learn, and adapt in a manner that would ensure survival into perpetuity (Pukui, 1993, p. 309). Intentional steps taken daily to cultivate and secure sustenance, responding to evolving environmental conditions and needs, was essential and grounded behaviors, attitudes, beliefs and our identity as descendants of Hāloa, kānaka ‘ōiwi and aloha ‘āina. If we understand education as a vehicle to cultivate and sustain our kaiāulu into perpetuity

as an immediate and long-term outcome for our lāhui, reason suggests that applying principles of responsivity and intentionality toward a desired outcome might serve as a foundational frame around which to advance those efforts. Mahi‘ai Consciousness presents a valid frame within which to design experiences with sufficient staying power to impact identity and promote the normalization of desired practices in the advancement of lāhui lifting outcomes.

The identification of a problem of practice, a review of the extant literature, and the development of an appropriate inquiry methodology allowed for the emergence of Mahi‘ai Consciousness. Connections with the framework have occurred at multiple points throughout this work and the framework has proven quite useful in providing context for interpreting and understanding participant feedback, driving the design of the intervention, and informing next steps for my professional practice in light of the findings. Having played a central role in the evolution of this work, I humbly posit that there is value in applying the framework as a lens for designing for the advancement of need-driven outcomes in ‘ōiwi Hawai‘i-serving contexts, within and beyond education.

Davida Malo presents a very compelling perspective based on a metaphor of spatial epistemology. As an ‘ōiwi Hawai‘i, standing on the sand at a point where the kai flows and ebbs upon the feet, referred to as the ‘ae kai, my view encompasses a series of spaces expanding outward including po‘ana kai, kai helekū, kua‘au, kai‘au, kai uli, kai hī aku, kai koholā, kai kakaka, moana and eventually kahiki moe, which represents the horizon, the farthest extent of view (Malo, In press). As I move about, whether by entering the kai or perhaps traversing uka, the expanse of what I am able to see, my kahiki moe, changes. Essentially, the expanse of one’s knowledge changes in accordance with evolving perspectives. This study represents my efforts to contribute to the body of work related to the evolution, education and advancement of ‘ōiwi

Hawai‘i. I recognize my kuleana as part of a “mo‘okū‘auhau of intellectual traditions” responsible to kūpuna, ‘āina and lāhui for shaping and transferring knowledge (hoomanawanui, 2014; Silva, 2017, p. 6). I assume my role as a mahi ‘ike in a network of mahi ‘ike, continuing to mālama ‘ike that has been gifted me while cultivating greater understanding and perspectives based on an ever expanding kahiki moe. I offer my work with transparency, aloha and ha‘aha‘a and with the sincere hope that my contributions help to inspire the work of others in our shared desire to support our lāhui to kūlia i ka nu‘u (Pukui, 1993, p. 205).

References

- Aguilar, E. (2019). You can't have a coaching culture without a structure. *Educational Leadership*, 77(3), 22-28.
- Ah Nee-Benham, M., & Heck, R. H. (1998). *Culture and educational policy in Hawai'i: The silencing of native voices*. Mahwah, New Jersey: L. Erlbaum Associates.
- Beamer, K. (2014). *No mākou ka mana; Liberating the nation* Honolulu, HI: Kamehameha Schools Publishing.
- Bloomberg, L. D., & Volpe, M. (2019). *Completing your qualitative dissertation, a road map from beginning to end* (4 ed.): SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Cajete, G. A., Tippeconnic Fox, M. J., Lowe, S. C., & McClellan, G. S. (2005). American Indian epistemologies. *New Directions for Student Services*, 2005(109), 69-78.
- Castagno, A. E., & Brayboy, B. M. J. (2008). Culturally responsive schooling for indigenous youth: A review of the literature. *Review of Educational Research*, 78(4), 941-993.
- Charlot, J. (2005). *Classical Hawaiian education: Generations of Hawaiian culture*. Lā‘ie HI: The Pacific Institute, Brigham Young University-Hawai‘i.
- Costa, A. L., & Garmston, R. J. (2002). *Cognitive coaching: A foundation for renaissance schools* (2 ed.). Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon Publishers, Inc.
- Danielson, C. (2007). *Enhancing professional practice, A framework for teaching* (2 ed.). USA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Danielson, C. (2013). *The Framework for Teaching Evaluation Instrument* (13 ed.): The Danielson Group.

- Davies, A., Busick, K., Herbst, S., & Sherman, A. (2014). System leaders using assessment for learning as both the change and the change process: developing theory from practice. *Curriculum Journal*, 25(4), 567-592.
- Demmert, W. G. (2001). *Improving academic performance among Native American students: A review of the research literature*. Charleston, WV: ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools.
- Demmert, W. G. (2005). The influences of culture on learning and assessment among Native American students. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice*, 20(1), 16-23.
- Demmert, W. G., Grissmer, D., & Towner, J. (2006). A review and analysis of the research on Native American students. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 45(3), 5-23.
- Demmert, W. G., Hilberg, S., Beaulieu, D., Rawlins, N., Tharp, R., & Yap, K. (2008). Indigenous culture-based education: Five rubrics.
- Demmert, W. G., & Towner, J. C. (2003). *A review of the research literature on the influences of culturally based education on the academic performance of Native American students*. Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, Portland, OR.
- Dilts, R. (1994). *Effective presentation skills*. Capitola, CA: Meta Publications.
- Frazier, F., State of Hawai'i Historic Preservation Division DLNR (Ed.) (2000). *Kamehameha and his warrior Kekūhaupi'o*. Honolulu: Kamehameha Schools Bernice Pauahi Bishop Estate.
- Furuto, L. (2014). Pacific ethnomathematics: Pedagogy and practices in mathematics education. 33(2), 110-121.
- Garmston, R. J. (2009). *The adaptive school: Developing and facilitating collaborative groups*. Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon Publishers.

- Gay, G. (2002). Preparing for culturally responsive teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 53(106), 106-116.
- Gonzalez, N., Moll, L., & Amanti, C. (2005). *Funds of knowledge: Theorizing practices in households, communities, and classrooms*. Mahwah, New Jersey: L. Erlbaum Associates.
- Goodyear-Ka‘ōpua, N. (2008). Teaching amid U.S. occupation: sovereignty, survival, and social studies in a Native Hawaiian charter school. *Hūlili: Multidisciplinary Research on Hawaiian Well-Being*, 5.
- Goodyear-Ka‘ōpua, N. (2013). *Seeds we planted : Portraits of a Native Hawaiian charter school*. Minneapolis, United States: University of Minnesota Press.
- Hammond, Z. (2015). *Culturally responsive teaching and the brain; Promoting authentic engagement and rigor among culturally and linguistically diverse students*: Corwin.
- hoomanawanui, k. (2014). *Voices of fire: Reweaving the literary lei of Pele and Hi'iaka*: Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Kaiwi, M. (2006). Grounding Hawaiian learners - And teachers - In their indigenous identity. *Hūlili: Multidisciplinary Research on Hawaiian Well-Being*, 3(1), 27-36.
- Kaiwi, M., & Kahumoku III, W. (2006). Makawalu: standards, curriculum, and assessment for literature through an indigenous perspective. *Hūlili: Multidisciplinary Research on Hawaiian Well-Being*, 3(1), 183-206.
- Kamehameha Schools. (2014a). *Ka huaka ‘i: 2014 Native Hawaiian educational assessment*. Retrieved from Honolulu:
- Kamehameha Schools. (2014b). *Kūhanauna a nation on the rise: Kamehameha Schools strategic plan 2015-2020*.
- Kamehameha Schools. (2017). Teacher job profile.

Kamehameha Schools. (2019). Long-term student learning goals.

Kamehameha Schools Hawai'i. (2017). 'Ōiwi Edge definition.

Kana'iaupuni, S. M., & Kawai'ae'a, K. (2008). E lauhoe mai nā wa'a: Toward a Hawaiian indigenous education teaching framework. *Hūlili: Multidisciplinary Research on Hawaiian Well-Being*, 5, 67-90.

Kana'iaupuni, S. M., & Ledward, B. (2013). Ho'opilina: The call for cultural relevance in education. *Hūlili: Multidisciplinary Research on Hawaiian Well-Being*, 9, 153-204.

Kana'iaupuni, S. M., Ledward, B., & Jensen, U. (2010). *Culture-based education and its relationship to student outcomes*. Honolulu: Kamehameha Schools, Research & Evaluation.

Kana'iaupuni, S. M., Ledward, B., & Malone, N. (2017). Mohala i ka wai: Cultural Advantage as a Framework for Indigenous Culture-Based Education and Student Outcomes. *American Educational Research Journal*, 54(1_suppl), 311S-339S.

Kana'iaupuni, S. M., Malone, N., & Ishibashi, K. (2005). *Ka huaka'i: 2005 Native Hawaiian educational assessment*. Honolulu, HI: Pauahi Foundation.

Kawai'ae'a mā, K. (2018). *Nā honua mau li ola: Hawaiian cultural pathways for healthy and responsive learning environments* (2 ed.). Hilo, HI: Hale Kuamo'o.

Kawakami, A., & Aton, K. K. (2001). Ke a'o Hawai'i (critical elements for Hawaiian learning): Perceptions of successful Hawaiian educators. *Pacific Education Research Journal*, 11(1), 53-66.

Kikiloi, K. (2010). Rebirth of an archipelago: sustaining a Hawaiian cultural identity for people and homeland. *Hūlili: Multidisciplinary Research on Hawaiian Well-Being*, 6.

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

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995b). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 32(3), 465-491.

Ledward, B., Takayama, B., & Kahumoku, W. (2008). *Kikī nā wai: Swiftly flowing streams. Examples of ‘ohana and community integration in culture-based education*. Honolulu: Kamehameha Schools, Research & Evaluation Division.

Lipka, J., Sharp, N., Brenner, B., Yanez, E., & Sharp, F. (2005). The relevance of culturally based curriculum and instruction: The case of Nancy Sharp. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 44(3), 31-54.

Malo, D. (In press). *Ka mo ‘olelo Hawai‘i a Davida Malo, volume 2: Text and translation*. University of Hawai‘i Press. Honolulu.

McNiff, J., & Whitehead, J. (2010). *You and your action research project* (3 ed.). USA: Routledge.

Merriam, S., & Tisdell, E. (2016). *Qualitative Research: A guide to Design and Implementation* (4 ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publications.

Meyer, M. (2001). Our own liberation: Reflections on Hawaiian Epistemology. *The Contemporary Pacific*, 13(1), 124-148.

Meyer, M. (2003). *Ho ‘oulu: Our time of becoming*. Honolulu, HI: ‘Ai Pōhaku Press.

More, A. (1989). Native Indian learning styles: A review for researchers and teachers. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 27(1), 15-28.

National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. (2016). *What teachers should know and be able to do*. National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, Arlington, VA.

- National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. (2018). Architecture of accomplished teaching. Retrieved from <http://www.nbpts.org/the-architecture-of-accomplished-teaching-of-teachers/>
- National Governors Association Center for Best Practices & Council of Chief State School Officers. (2010). Common core state standards for English language arts and literacy in history/social studies, science, and technical subjects. Washington, DC.
- Native Hawaiian Education Council, Gapero, K., Keala-Quinabo, K., Kiili, R., & Silva, J. (2018). *Native Hawaiian education evaluation framework*. Native Hawaiian Education council.
- Patton, M. Q. (2011). *Developmental evaluation, Applying complexity concepts to enhance innovation and use*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Patton, M. Q. (2016). *Developmental evaluation exemplars; Principles in practice*. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
- Penick, J. E. (2005). *Teaching with purpose: closing the research-practice gap*. Arlington, VA: National Science Teachers Association.
- Pukui, M. K. (1993). *‘Ōlelo no ‘eau: Hawaiian proverbs and poetical sayings*. Honolulu, HI: Bishop Museum Press.
- Pukui, M. K., Haertig, E. W., & Lee, C. L. (1972). *Nānā i ke kumu: Look to the source* (Vol. 2). Honolulu, HI: Hui Hānai.
- Schonleber, N. (2007). Culturally congruent teaching strategies: Voices from the field. *Hūlili: Multidisciplinary Research on Hawaiian Well-Being*, 4(1), 239-264.
- Silva, N. (2017). *The power of the steel-tipped pen: Reconstructing Native Hawaiian intellectual history*. Duke University Press.

- Thomas, S., & Heck, R. H. (2009). *Hawaiian cultural influences in education multilevel statistical analyses*. Kamehameha Schools. Honolulu.
- Tibbetts, K. A., Kahakalau, K., & Johnson, Z. (2007). Education with aloha and student assets. *Hūlili: Multidisciplinary Research on Hawaiian Well-Being*, 4(1), 147-181.
- Tuhiwai Smith, L. (2012). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples* (2 ed.). London: Zed Books Ltd.
- Vygotsky, L. (1980). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. London: Harvard University Press.
- Wenger, E., Trayner, B., & De Laat, M. (2011). Promoting and assessing value creation in communities and networks: A conceptual framework. Retrieved from https://www.weadapt.org/sites/weadapt.org/files/2017/november/11-04-wenger_trayner_delaat_value_creation_framework.pdf

Appendix A. Participant Consent Form

Aloha nō! My name is Ka‘ulu Gapero and I am a graduate student at the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa Department of Education. You are invited to take part in a research study that I am conducting as part of the requirements for earning my Ed.D in professional practice.

Purpose: The purpose of my project is to understand the perceptions of teachers, namely whether they identify as Hawaiian culture-based (HCB) or culturally relevant (CR) educators, having been provided with HCB and CR aligned professional learning as part of a comprehensive system of job-embedded support. I am also seeking to understand teachers’ perceptions of the academic impact on learners when HCB or CR pedagogies are employed. I am asking you to participate in this project because of your experience as an educator of Native Hawaiian youth, your prior participation in HCB- and CR-focused job-embedded professional learning, and your experience in engaging in reflective conversations that link educator practice to student learning outcomes.

Project Description - Activities and Time Commitment: If you participate in this project, you will be asked to participate in two phases; 1) complete a questionnaire, and 2) participate in a classroom observation of your practice as you incorporate an HCB/CR pedagogy followed by a one-on-one post-observation conversation (POC) with me. The two stages of the project are outlined below.

Phase 1: I will provide you with a brief questionnaire regarding whether and to what degree you identify as an HCB or CR educator given the related professional learning experiences you have engaged in throughout the ’18-’19 school year. You will also be asked to share recommendations you might have regarding future HCB or CR related professional learning that you would find valuable. Your recommendations will inform the development of the professional learning efforts already scheduled for all teachers in your division to occur in the fall of the ’19-’20 school year. The survey should take about 20 minutes to complete. An example of the type of question you will be asked is, “In what ways have you grown as an HCB or CR educator as a result of the professional learning you engaged in throughout the ’18-’19 school year?”

Phase 2: I will observe your implementation of HCB/CR pedagogy in your classroom on a day and time of your choosing. We will then conduct a POC, during which you will be asked to reflect on the students’ learning outcomes and the instructional moves that you made that likely caused the student learning outcomes to occur. The observation will last between 20-30 minutes and the POC approximately 30 minutes. I will record the POC using a digital audio-recorder so that I can later produce a transcript – a written record of what we discussed so that I may be able to analyze the information gathered. An example of the type of question you will be asked is, “In what ways might the HCB or CR related instructional moves you employed in relation to the lesson that generated the student work product have influenced the degree to which students have met the intended learning outcomes?”

Benefits and Risks: There may be no direct benefit to participation, however, I believe that the benefit to you in participating in my research project is that you will be given an opportunity to self-reflect on your current and future practices as an HCB and CR educator and your

recommendations may help to inform the development of related professional learning that is in greater alignment with your professional learning needs. The results of this project may also help me and other instructional leaders learn more about the ways in which we help to build educators’ capacity for HCB and CR practices. I believe there is little or no risk to you in participating in this project. If, however, you are uncomfortable or stressed by any questions on the questionnaire or the POC, you are free to skip the question, take a break, stop responding to the questionnaire or discussion, or withdraw from the project altogether.

Confidentiality and Privacy: During this research project, I will keep all data from the questionnaire and POC in a secure location. Only I will have access to the data, although legally authorized agencies, including the University of Hawai‘i Human Studies Program, have the right to review research records. After I transcribe the interviews, I will erase audio-recordings. When I report the results of my research project, and in my typed transcripts, I will not use your name or any other personally identifying information. Instead, I will use a pseudonym (fake name) for your name. Once the research findings have been reported, the transcripts will also be deleted. If you would like a summary of the findings from my final report, please contact me at the number listed near the end of this consent form.

Voluntary Participation: Your participation in this project is completely voluntary and any data collected will not be used to evaluate your performance as a teacher. You may stop participating at any time. If you stop being in the study, there will be no penalty or loss to you. Your choice to participate or not participate will not affect your rights and benefits as an employee of Kamehameha Schools. Doing this or not doing this project will not affect your career standing at the school.

Future Research Studies: Even after removing identifiers, the data from this study will not be used or distributed for future research studies.

Questions: If you have any questions about this project, please contact me via phone or email at (808) 756-0717 or kaulug@hawaii.edu. You may also contact my faculty advisor, Dr. Cathy Ikeda, at (808) 937-8363 or e-mail (cathyi@hawaii.edu). If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant in this project, you can contact the University of Hawai‘i, Human Studies Program, by phone at (808) 956-5007 or by e-mail at uhirb@hawaii.edu to discuss problems, concerns and questions, obtain information, or offer input with an informed individual who is unaffiliated with this specific research protocol. Please visit <http://go.hawaii.edu/iRd> for more information on your rights as a research participant.

Keep a copy of the informed consent form for your records.

If you agree to participate in this project, please sign the following signature portion of this consent form and return it to Ka‘ulu Gaperō.

Signature for Consent:

I agree to participate in the research project being conducted by Ka‘ulu Gaperō as part of his Ed.D requirements. I understand that I can change my mind about participating in this project at any time by notifying the researcher.

Please initial next to either “Yes” or “No” to the following:

_____ Yes _____ No I consent to participate in the questionnaire as part of phase 1.

_____ Yes _____ No I consent to participate in the observation and POC.

_____ Yes _____ No I consent to having the POC audio recorded and transcribed.

Name of Participant: _____

Your signature: _____

Date: _____

Name of person obtaining consent: _Ka‘ulu Gapero_____

Signature of person obtaining consent: _____

Appendix B. Phase I Questionnaire

Reflecting on the various Hawaiian culture-based (HCB) or culturally relevant (CR) in-service opportunities conducted here at the elementary school during the '18-'19 school year, please answer questions 1-3 (the trainings are listed below)

In-service Opportunities:

- Linking the story of Kekūhaupi‘o to the Danielson Framework for Teaching – July ‘18
 - ‘Ōiwi Edge workshop day – August ‘18
 - Using the story of Kamiki and other resources to help students engage with their piko – October ‘18
 - Understanding the ‘whys’ of HCBE, intentional connections to HCBE in the classroom – Faculty meeting, January ‘19
 - Unpacking and applying Culturally Relevant Teaching and the Brain – February ‘19
 - Unpacking the history of our Hae Hawai‘i – May ‘19
1. What training(s) resonated most with you?
 - a. What sticks out as particularly memorable, good or bad?
 - b. Why?
 2. In what ways have these trainings impacted your understanding of HCB / CR instructional practices?
 - a. What do you know and understand now that you might not have or not have understood as well previous to engaging in these trainings?
 3. In what ways have these trainings affected your instructional practice?
 - a. What have you incorporated into your practice as a result of these trainings?

To what degree do you agree with the statements in questions 4 - 8?

(Likert scale: 1-4; 4 = strongly agree, 1 = strongly disagree)

4. I am a Hawaiian culture-based educator?
5. I am a culturally relevant educator?
6. Incorporating HCB / CR pedagogies is essential when instructing indigenous learners.
 - a. Explain your response to question 6.
7. Incorporating HCB / CR professional development in in-service days would benefit my instructional practice.
8. Incorporating HCB / CR professional development in faculty meetings would benefit my instructional practice.
9. In what ways might the HCB /CR related trainings you participated in this past school year have affected your response to question 4 and 5?
10. What types of professional development and/or other experiences would help to increase the likelihood that you would identify as an HCB / CR educator?
 - a. How might professional development opportunities be structured to positively affect your identity as an HCB / CR educator?
 - b. What types of professional development would you like to see more of? Less of?

- c. With what frequency would you like to engage with professional development that contributes to your capacity for HCB / CR practices?

Appendix C. Post-Observation Guiding Questions

1. How do you feel the lesson went?
2. What were a few of the inherent strengths of the lesson?
3. Describe the HCB / CR instructional moves that you incorporated.
4. What were the learning outcomes that you intended for your learners – content and process outcomes if applicable?
5. How well did students achieve the intended learning outcomes?
 - a. What were your determinants of success?
 - b. How did you assess the learning outcomes?
 - c. How many students achieved the learning outcomes?
 - d. How many have yet to demonstrate achievement of the outcomes?
6. What instructional decisions did you make that likely had an impact on the extent to which students met the learning outcomes?
7. What is the correlation between the HCB / CR instructional moves you made and the extent to which students met the learning outcomes?
 - a. Would you describe the correlation as positive?
8. If you had the opportunity to teach this lesson again to these students, what might you do differently?
9. In general, what effect does incorporating HCB / CR instructional moves have on your students and the extent to which they are able to meet their learning outcomes beyond just this lesson?
 - a. Please share a few examples.
10. With what frequency have you incorporated HCB / CR instructional moves into your instruction?
 - a. What motivates/hinders you in doing so?
 - b. Please elaborate on your response.
11. How has your use of HCB / CR pedagogies impacted your practice as an educator?
12. To what extent has your identity as an HCB / CR educator evolved?
 - a. To what factors might you attribute this?
 - b. What would help to further strengthen your identity as an HCB / CR educator?

To what degree do you agree with these statements?

(Likert scale: 1-4; 4 = strongly agree, 1 = strongly disagree)

13. I am a Hawaiian culture-based educator?
14. I am a culturally relevant educator?
15. Incorporating HCB / CR pedagogies is essential when instructing indigenous learners.
 - a. Explain your response to question 15.