

A collaborative development of workshops for teachers of Great Basin languages using principles of decolonization and language reclamation

Ignacio L. Montoya
University of Nevada, Reno

Debra Harry
University of Nevada, Reno

Jennie Burns
Reno-Sparks Indian Colony

The project described in this paper adopts a decolonization-oriented, reclamation-based approach to language maintenance and revitalization. Designed and implemented collaboratively with members of the local university and tribal communities, the project involves a series of five two-hour professional development workshops for teachers of Great Basin Indigenous languages spoken in and around Northern Nevada: Numu (Northern Paiute), Wašiw (Washo), and Newe (Western Shoshone). The primary goal of the project was building capacity to support language teachers by facilitating presentations, discussions, and activities that contribute to the sharing of ideas and best practices for the promotion of local languages. These workshops were preceded by an information-gathering session to determine the interests and needs of language teachers, which resulted in the selection of workshop topics: decolonization, teaching techniques, linguistics, Great Basin history and culture, and media/recording. A diverse set of facilitators and participants were involved with the project, most of whom were members of local tribal communities. Throughout the project, the organizers remained mindfully focused on the notions of decolonization, capacity-building, and respect for Indigenous knowledge.

1. Introduction¹ This paper discusses the development and implementation of a series of workshops for teachers of Indigenous languages using decolonial, reclamation-

¹We would like to gratefully acknowledge the Reno-Sparks Indian Colony Language and Culture Program, and especially Stacey Burns, the Coordinator of the program, who served as a collaborator on this project along with the authors (but who preferred not to be listed as a co-author). Along with the first author, Ignacio Montoya, she was actively involved throughout the entire duration of the project, providing valuable expertise and knowledge on all aspects of the project. Though the use of ‘we’ in this paper generally refers to the authors specifically, it can be assumed that Stacey was involved in the all aspects of decision-making. We would also like to acknowledge all of the facilitators (mentioned in their respective sections in this paper) and the participants of the workshops. In addition, this project was made possible by the Sven

based principles. Professional development is an important part of the language reclamation process (McCarty & Nicholas 2014; Fitzgerald 2018; Poetsch et al. 2019). These workshops exemplify how a conventional professional development format (i.e., that of the teacher-training workshop) can be designed with the explicit goal of furthering ideas about and practices of decolonization. Our hope is that insights gained through this endeavor can support other decolonizing educational projects that aim to use education and language to begin to reverse some of the devastating effects of assimilatory educational agendas.

This project took place in the northwestern part of the Great Basin, in and around the Reno, NV area. In §2, we offer cultural and historical background connected to this region. In particular, this section situates language diversity and precarity in the Great Basin in a history of colonial practices that disenfranchised Indigenous peoples from their lands and cultural practices through assimilationist education practices designed to forcibly eliminate Indigenous languages and cultures. Though some characteristics of the current and past linguistic and educational context of the Great Basin are particular to this region, the issues we discuss are connected to broader trends of colonization and displacement in the United States in general.

We then proceed to offer the intellectual basis for the present project. §3 discusses the notions of decolonization and reclamation-based language work, notions which served as the basis of our decisions involving this project. Our own work draws from and speaks to other action-oriented endeavors that aim to mindfully and actively counter the destructive effects of colonization by building meaningful collaborations with communities that lead to local empowerment.

§4 transitions to the concrete application of the intellectual principles discussed in §3. Specifically, this section presents guiding principles of the development and implementation of the teacher workshops, which were community-driven at all levels, encouraged broad participation, and focused on building capacity. In addition, this section describes the process by which the workshops were developed organically, starting from an idea brought forth by a University of Nevada, Reno student who is also a member of the Reno-Sparks Indian Colony after a discussion she had with a University of Nevada, Reno faculty member regarding language revitalization. Finally, this section also discusses the basic logistical details of the workshops, which were realized as a series of five teacher-training sessions preceded by an information-gathering session.

§5 describes the implementation of each of the workshops and the initial information-gathering session. In this section, we detail the specific ideas that arose from both the facilitators and participants in those workshops. The topics of each of the workshops, determined on the basis of the ideas brought forth during the information-gathering session, are as follows: decolonization, teaching techniques, linguistics, Great Basin history and culture, and media/recording. After the specific descriptions of the workshops themselves are presented, we then proceed to §6, which offers a discussion of insights gained from from these workshops. §7 concludes the paper.

and Astrid Liljeblad Endowment Fund whose generosity through a Grant in Great Basin Studies made this project possible. We would also like to thank our anonymous reviewers for their very helpful comments and suggestions.

2. Language diversity and precarity in the Great Basin The languages indigenous to the northwestern Great Basin, in what is now referred to as Northern Nevada, are Numu (Northern Paiute), Wašiw (Washo), and Newe (Western Shoshone).^{2,3} As a result of the multiple policies and practices of colonialism, these languages have experienced a precipitous decline in the number of fluent speakers. The present paper discusses a project whose goal is to reverse this decline through a series of organically- and locally-developed teacher-training workshops for teachers of Indigenous languages. Cognizant of the importance of remembering the legacies of colonialism that led to the present state of the languages, the workshop organizers explicitly adopted a decolonization framework in the design and implementation of the workshops.

All three of the above-mentioned languages, like other Indigenous languages of North America, are considered endangered. Estimates for the number of speakers of each of the languages are from over a decade ago, and the numbers are expected to be significantly lower today. In 2007, the number of fluent Numu speakers was estimated to be 700, with approximately 400 people who are not fluent speakers but who have varying degrees of fluency in the language. The majority of fluent speakers are in Fort McDermitt, which is where intergenerational transmission of the language can still be found, with approximately 20% to 30% of children acquiring it as a first language. Outside of McDermitt, all fluent speakers are elders (Golla et al. 2007). For Wašiw, the number of speakers in 2008 was estimated at 20, all of whom were middle-aged or elders (Golla 2011). In the case of Newe, the estimated number of fluent speakers is 1,000, with another 1,000 speakers that are not considered fully fluent. These numbers include all of the dialects in the Shoshone dialect chain. The majority of speakers are elders, though intergenerational transmission can be found in the Duck Valley and Goshute communities (Golla et al. 2007). Though the situation is distinct for the three languages, the limited number of fluent speakers in the communities raises significant concerns about the long-term vitality of the languages.

In a decolonial framework, the local context and histories are of prime importance in addressing the concerns of a particular community (e.g., Smith 2012; Leonard 2017; Stebbins et al. 2017; McKinley & Smith 2019). Indeed, the work of the present project was firmly grounded in communities of the area. To understand the precarity of Indigenous languages in the Great Basin, it is also useful to understand the wider policies and practices that contributed to the decline of Indigenous languages throughout North America. Among these policies and practices are war and displacement (e.g., the Pyramid Lake War of 1850 and its after-effects), appropriation of land and natural resources (e.g., through the Morrill Act of 1862), and broken treaties (e.g., the Treaty of Ruby Valley of 1863). In addition, a major assault on Native American languages and cultures came from the educational system. In particular, the estab-

²In general, endonyms will be preferred to exonyms, though an exonym is used in instances when, for example, that is the term used by the individual or when the exonym is well-established or preferred by the community.

³Another Indigenous language of what is now the state of Nevada is Nuwu or Nuwavi (Southern Paiute). Since this project was based in the greater Reno area, our participants did not include speakers of Nuwu/Nuwavi, though workshops were not by design limited to teachers of Northern Nevada languages.

lishment of boarding schools presented an explicit assault on Indigenous languages and cultures. The Carlisle Indian Industrial School, established in 1879, served as the model for other such institutions that followed and continued to operate in a similar manner through the mid 20th century.

The boarding school that most directly affected Great Basin tribes was the Stewart Indian School, located just southwest of Carson City, NV, about 40 miles from Reno. It was in operation from 1890 until 1980. The school initially focused on children from Great Basin tribes but it later expanded to also include other tribes, particularly from the Southwest (Thompson-Hardin 2019). Many members of local communities, including several of our participants and facilitators, were either students of the Stewart Indian School themselves or descendants of students.

The explicit aim of these institutions was to take Native children from their families – sometimes voluntarily, but also often through kidnapping – in order to eliminate Native traditions and lifeways through assimilation into the mainstream Euro-American culture (Adams 1995). In the words of the founder of the Carlisle School, Richard Pratt, the goal of these schools was to educate a Native child in such a manner to “kill the Indian in him, and save the man” (1973/1892). In order to achieve this aim, boarding school staff stripped Native children of markers of traditional identity, including clothing, hairstyle, and names. In addition, school officials actively suppressed the speaking of children’s native languages (Adams 1995). Such a practice had the effect not only of limiting the native language fluency of those students and their descendants; it also resulted in the association of those languages with shame and trauma.

By design, therefore, the educational system played an integral role in the process of colonization (Pihama & Lee-Morgan 2019). The ideology of assimilation that drove education of Native American students led to the wresting of control from Native families over the education and rearing of several generations of children, which resulted in the disruption of intergenerational transmission of Native languages and cultural traditions. Ironically, now that the assimilatory agenda embodied by boarding schools is in its advanced stages with regard to the elimination of Native languages, schools have begun to be viewed as a vehicle for the revitalization of those languages, at least among some educators. Indeed, given the influential role that educational institutions play in the day-to-day lives of children, establishing sites of language revitalization in educational spaces can serve the greater goals of language reclamation by Indigenous communities.

The four-year university in the area is the University of Nevada, Reno (UNR). Two of the authors who served on the organizing committee of the project are faculty at UNR. The university was founded through the Morrill Act of 1862, which authorized the sale of public domain lands – including unceded Indigenous territory – for the establishment of land-grant colleges and universities (Lee & Ahtone 2020). UNR’s current mission statement explicitly refers to its land-grant status: “Inspired by its land-grant foundation, the University of Nevada, Reno provides outstanding learning, discovery, and engagement programs that serve the economic, social, environmental and cultural needs of the citizens of Nevada, the nation, and the world” (University

of Nevada, Reno 2020). With regard to the relationship of the university to the local Native communities, although there have been and continue to be efforts at making the Native American experience more visible on campus, UNR continues to struggle significantly with recruiting and retaining Native American students (Running Wolf 2020). Among the goals of projects such as ours is directly supporting the Native American communities using university resources.

As we work towards language reclamation, it is imperative to remain cognizant of the colonial legacy of the American educational system in order to guard against replicating beliefs and practices that led to the devastation of these languages (Pihama & Lee-Morgan 2019). Actively adopting a decolonial framework that is attuned to local histories, interests, needs, and priorities is one way to help ensure that language revitalization in educational settings actually works to reverse the effects of colonialism on Indigenous languages.

3. Decolonization Given the multiple ways in which colonialism has undermined Native American cultures and languages, recovering and revitalizing those languages and cultures requires actively working to undo the effects of colonialism. This process is referred to as decolonization and it requires an acknowledgement of the wide-ranging and deep damage caused by colonization. Adopting a decolonization framework involves implementing practices that value Indigenous knowledge and recognize the sovereignty of Indigenous communities.

In the context of partnerships between colonial institutions – such as universities – and tribal communities, decolonization involves elevating the needs, interests, and priorities of the tribal community. Especially given that the goals of a colonial institution are often in conflict with the goals of the tribal community (e.g., Eira 2008; Grenoble 2009; Gerds 2010; Benedicto 2018; Leonard 2018), this will involve a negotiation of priorities (Rice 2006; Czaykowska-Higgins 2009; Leonard & Haynes 2010; Stebbins et al. 2017). Often the primary goal of a university is research. Further, the goal is grounded in a particular conceptualization of research that is tied to Western epistemologies that often do not recognize, let alone incorporate, either Indigenous epistemologies or the needs and interests of Indigenous communities. As Smith (2012:2) points out, “it is surely difficult to discuss *research methodology* and *indigenous peoples* together, in the same breath, without having an analysis of imperialism, without understanding the complex ways in which the pursuit of knowledge is deeply embedded in multiple layers of imperial and colonial practices”. Indeed, scholars operating under conventional academic frameworks often are not aware that their own assumptions reflect a particular ideology that is grounded in colonialism (Eira 2008). Therefore, it is not enough that institutions such as universities partner with tribes. In order for such a partnership to be truly decolonial, the priorities of the tribe should be the primary guides in the partnership, with the role of the university side of the partnership being to provide support through whatever resources may be available to the university that may not be as readily available to the community (e.g., access to particular types of funding, certain kinds of expertise or infrastructure). Though all partners may have valuable ideas to offer with regard to designing

and executing a particular project, in the context of decolonization, the ideas of the tribal community play a leading role in the design and execution of community-based work (e.g., Eira 2008; Swadener & Mutua 2008; Czaykowska-Higgins 2009; Grenoble 2009; Rice 2011; Genee & Junker 2018; Langley et al. 2018; McKinley & Smith 2019; Poetsch et al. 2019), which is especially important given the inherent power imbalances that tend to favor the academic (e.g., Leonard & Haynes 2010; Rice 2018). This recognizing and valuing of Indigenous knowledge systems is a critical intellectual component of the undoing of the effects of colonialism. It manifests through deference in the decision-making process to members of Indigenous communities.

With regard to language work specifically, one way in which decolonization has been conceptualized is through a reclamation-based approach to “language documentation, description, teaching, advocacy, and resource development” (Leonard 2017:116). As Leonard (2012:359) describes it, language reclamation involves “a larger effort by a community to claim its right to speak a language and to set associated goals in response to community needs and perspectives”. Language reclamation thus presents a broader conceptualization than that offered by conventional approaches to language revitalization, one involving the prioritization of the concerns and aspirations of a particular community. Reframing language work in terms of reclamation rather than revitalization shifts the focus from Indigenous languages as objects in need of preservation and archiving to Indigenous languages as situated in living communities that are rooted in and actively engaged with those languages. This change in terminology affirms the agency and political and cultural sovereignty of the community and emphasizes the interconnection of the language to the culture and the community.

Working from a foundation of language reclamation entails gathering information about goals and interests directly from members of the community rather than imposing notions from outside about what the community needs. Moreover, this involves recognizing the particular circumstances of different groups and tailoring work to the historical, political, and cultural circumstances of each group. An important guiding principle of language reclamation, therefore, is self-determination, which is also foundational to decolonization (e.g., Leonard 2018; Dupris 2019; McKinley & Smith 2019). This is particularly relevant with regard to the United States context, where individual tribal governments are afforded sovereignty under the law. Supporting tribal communities’ rights to set their own goals and priorities is one way in which language work can move towards the empowerment of tribal communities (e.g., Rice 2006; Leonard & Haynes 2010; Genee & Junker 2018). The decline of Indigenous languages is a result of colonization, and reclamation efforts involving those languages are acts of decolonization.

The workshops discussed in this paper aimed to provide training for teachers of Indigenous languages in a more decolonized, reclamation-based manner. In describing the development and implementation of those workshops, we offer experiences and insights that can inform other decolonial endeavors, including intellectual efforts focused on theory and practical projects aimed at language maintenance and revital-

ization. This paper, therefore, helps address “the need for detailed reflective studies of collaboration in particular cases” (Cruz & Woodbury 2014:263).

Necessarily, given our decolonial perspective and investments, the present project adopts a community-oriented approach and the following description includes information that is important from the perspective of Indigenous ways of knowing. For instance, positionality and relationships are key components of Indigenous methodologies (Wilson 2008), and therefore this paper includes a discussion of the story of how the workshops came to be and the roles played by various individuals in that story. We offer this paper as a means of contributing to the conversation about decolonization of language revitalization. By presenting insights gained through our experiences and opening ourselves up to insights gained by others through their experiences, we aim to move the conversation forward in ways that serve communities in their language reclamation efforts.

4. Methodology (Planning of the workshops)

4.1 Overview The core of the project consisted of a series of five teacher-training workshops preceded by an information-gathering session. The target participants were teachers of Indigenous languages working in a wide range of settings. These teachers taught classes through tribal language and culture programs, in Head Start programs, and in public schools in the area. Though the workshops were not necessarily restricted to particular tribes, the fact that the workshops were held in the Reno area meant that participants worked with Numu, Wašiw, and Newe languages, a fact that guided the planning of the workshops. The organizers of the workshops represented the University of Nevada, Reno (UNR) and the Reno-Sparks Indian Colony (RSIC) Language and Culture Program (LCP), and both of these venues served as the location of the workshops. As discussed below in §4.3, the motivation for these workshops came from an enrolled member of RSIC who was also a UNR student at the time, a fact that highlights the reclamation-based nature of the project from the outset. From that initial idea developed a series of conversations that led to an application for a Grant in Great Basin Studies offered through the Liljeblad Endowment Fund. After the awarding of the grant, these workshops were then organized by partners from UNR and RSIC-LCP.

This section focuses on a description of the process of developing the workshops. The details of the workshops themselves (i.e., the format and content chosen by the facilitators and the responses of the participants to those choices) are described in §5. Though separating the development and the implementation of the workshops in this way facilitates organization of the paper, we should note that this is a somewhat arbitrary distinction. After all, the guiding principles of the project are embedded throughout all components of the project. Furthermore, the planning and the implementation of the workshops are entwined chronologically: Early workshops provided insights into the planning of subsequent workshops. Therefore, though the content of §4 can be thought of as the methodology and the content of §5 as the

outcomes, there is not necessarily a clear distinction between these two nor is there a straightforward trajectory from one to the other.

4.2 Guiding principles Given that this project followed a decolonization framework and was based on a reclamation-based approach to language work, certain key principles guided all components of the teacher-training workshops. These principles were grounded in the notion of self-determination and in the prioritization of Indigenous practices and concerns.

Therefore, the goals and interests of the tribal community functioned as a driving force (Stebbins et al. 2017; Grenoble 2009; McKinley & Smith 2019). As a result, one guiding principle of this project was that it be community-driven at all levels (Eira 2008; Rice 2011; Genee & Junker 2018; Gerdts 2017; Poetsch et al. 2019). Indeed, as mentioned above and discussed in greater detail below, the initial idea for the project came from a community member, and from that point on, all decisions – whether about overarching guidelines of the project or logistics – were made collaboratively. Related to this, another principle that drove this work was an openness to being organically responsive to community needs that arose throughout the process (Cruz & Woodbury 2014). As we learned more about needs and priorities of community members, we remained open to changing the project along the way as early expectations were challenged and as new needs became apparent. This was particularly important given the inherent power imbalances in the relationships. Given that this project was associated with the university and given that university students and faculty were members of the organizing committee, it was critical that we remain aware of ways in which community needs could potentially be sidelined. We therefore consciously remained attuned to the preferences of community members.

In addition, though there was a core planning committee that directed most of the overall structure, one of the aims of the project was to have as broad participation as possible, in order to support as many individuals as possible and to benefit from as many different strengths as possible (Poetsch et al. 2019). We therefore sought to include facilitators and participants from a range of ages, tribal affiliations, and relationships to the languages. Finally, given that the project as a whole was intended to be an exercise in decolonization, another guiding principle of the project was an explicit focus on that idea and on capacity-building (Rice 2006; Gerdts 2017; Fitzgerald 2018; Dupris 2019). The intention was to support participants in developing knowledge and skills that contribute to empowerment and self-determination. This overall framework was a consistent theme that we incorporated into planning meetings, that we returned to throughout the process, and that we explicitly discussed with facilitators of the workshops.

4.3 Development of the workshops The idea for the project arose from conversations in February 2018 that Ignacio Montoya, an assistant professor of linguistics at UNR, had with Christina Thomas, a member of RSIC and a student at UNR. In those conversations, Ignacio had mentioned that he had participated in two summer workshops organized by the Navajo Language Academy. These three-week workshops

bring together Diné Bizaad (Navajo) language teachers and linguists who work on the Diné language for learning about and discussing, among other topics, Diné linguistics and the teaching of the language.⁴ Christina felt that a collaborative project of this kind would be worth exploring in order to develop this kind of project locally with tribes in the area. She brought the idea to the RSIC-LCP and set up a meeting in which we discussed the feasibility of such a project and what it might look like. The idea that arose that seemed the most suitable for our context was to have a series of professional development workshops for language teachers of Indigenous languages. Based on these discussions, Ignacio submitted a grant application in April 2018 for a Grant in Great Basin Studies through the Liljeblad Endowment Fund to fund these workshops, which we received. A key component of the initiation of the project was an investment of time to build relationships and mutual understanding (Pérez Báez 2018). From the outset, therefore, in keeping with the decolonization and reclamation-based principles discussed above, the project involved organic, collaborative engagement between representatives from the university and from the tribal community in a way that leveraged different types of expertise and attended to different needs and interests (Leonard & Haynes 2010; Fitzgerald 2018).

The organizing committee consisted of four people, though there was a change in who constituted the committee that occurred when the new academic year started. The organizers had all worked on language and culture projects in the area and knew each other prior to the present project. We also continued to interact in between sessions (through language classes at RSIC and other professional connections). The two people on the organizing committee who were present throughout the duration of the project were Ignacio Montoya and Stacey Burns (Numu), the Coordinator of RSIC-LCP. During the first few months – when the initial ideas for the project were developed – the organizing committee also included Christina Thomas (Numu, Newe, Hopi) and Jamie Astor (Wašiw), the then Language Specialist at RSIC-LCP. By the beginning of the academic year – after the information-gathering session but before the planning and implementation of the workshops – they were replaced by Debra Harry (Numu), who started as a continuing lecturer at UNR, and Jennie Burns (Numu, Newe), the new Language Specialist at RSIC-LCP. Thus, the final organizing committee consisted of the three authors and Stacey Burns.

The original vision of the workshops was for them to all be facilitated by Ignacio, with assistance from others as co-instructors or guest presenters. However, this structure soon changed such that each of the workshops was to have different facilitators based on the topics of the workshops and the expertise of members of the community. This flexibility with regard to the tasks carried out by members of the organizing committee is one example of the “plasticity of collaborative roles” (Cruz & Woodbury 2014:284) that characterized the project. The topics of the workshops were established based on the information-gathering session (discussed in greater detail below) held in late May 2018. During the summer, Stacey developed a list of potential facilitators, which we then refined in our initial planning meetings in the fall. Stacey

⁴For additional information on the Navajo Language Academy, see <http://navajolanguageacademy.org/nla.htm>.

reached out personally to invite potential participants and facilitators. The invitation included a formal letter on RSIC letterhead introducing the partnership, stating that the person is being asked to participate because of their skills and contributions to the community, and describing the details of the workshops. In addition to formal invitations, people were also invited informally and through word-of-mouth.

In general, we met with facilitators (either in person or via phone) about three weeks before the workshop they were to facilitate. In these discussions, we reiterated the goal of capacity-building, the guiding principle of decolonization, the acquisition of teaching methodologies, and the overarching trajectory of the workshops. We suggested a combination of presenting useful information and having participants doing hands-on activities and discussions. In the course of these meetings, the facilitators discussed an overall vision for the structure of the workshop, but ultimately the details were worked out by facilitators on their own. Though the organizers did offer suggestions based on the vision of the project, facilitators were given the freedom to develop their workshops as they saw fit and to invite any co-facilitators as they saw fit. After each workshop, we checked in with facilitators to get their impressions of the session.

4.4 Logistic details of the workshops As mentioned in §4.3, we determined at our first meeting that our project would consist of a series of teacher-training workshops occurring throughout the academic year. Though in the future we might consider a different format (e.g., a more concentrated workshop over the summer), given that this was a new undertaking the present format seemed a more effective way of accommodating potential participants' varied schedules. The series of workshops was the main component of the project, though two other components were also considered: an information-gathering session before the workshops and a handbook of materials compiled after. The logistics of each of these is discussed in this section.

Following a reclamation-based approach wherein the needs and interests of the community are prioritized, it was important for us to offer potential participants a forum for expressing whether and how such workshops would be useful for them. Such a meeting, therefore, would need to precede the planning of the workshops. Since the timeframe associated with the grant was July 2018 to June 2019 (which coincided well with the academic year of teachers as well), we decided to hold the information gathering session in the early part of the summer of 2018. Stacey Burns, Christina Thomas, and Jamie Astor were responsible for inviting participants to the information-gathering session. One goal of the session was to determine whether there was interest in such workshops; another goal was to determine what topics would be of interest and what structure would work best for participants. We wanted to offer as convenient a time as possible for participants, and we determined that it would be best to host it in late May after the Paiute Language Bowl at UNR, an event which we knew would be attended by many of our potential participants. The Paiute Language Bowl is a competition among local high schools in which Numu is taught. Many community members attend, including teachers of the high school classes, other language teachers, and native speaker elders who serve as judges. It

therefore seemed ideal to host our information-gathering immediately following the Paiute Language Bowl as this would likely maximize participation in the session and minimize inconvenience for participants.

In addition to generating ideas for topics of each workshop (discussed further in §5), we also determined the overall structure of the workshop series during the information-gathering session. Based on the preferences of participants in the information-gathering session, we decided to hold five workshops, each two hours in duration. The original plan was to hold these sessions bimonthly starting in September. However, when we began planning the workshops, we decided we needed more time for planning, in part because we wanted to ensure we had a cohesive vision for the workshops as a whole before any individual workshop was planned. As a result, we settled on November for our first workshop and decided to hold the workshops monthly rather than bimonthly.

The workshops were developed by the facilitators of each session, though the organizing committee discussed the overarching vision of the workshops (e.g., by articulating the themes of decolonization and capacity-building) and offered guidance. As a result, the content and structure of the workshops reflected the perspectives and preferences of the individual facilitators. We offer below what facilitators presented and what participants expressed. It should be noted that these viewpoints do not necessarily represent those of the community at large or those of other participants, facilitators, or organizers (though by and large we all agreed on the broad principles discussed at all of the workshops).

With regard to the format of the workshops, facilitators chose a range of approaches for delivery of information and discussion of key concepts. Workshops variously involved slide show presentations, discussions, hands-on activities, brainstorming, and reflections. Based on needs determined by the information-gathering session (see §5.1), workshop sessions were held on Fridays (except for one session held on Thursday) in the afternoon, since that was the time that participants (who included teachers following a conventional K–12 schedule) told us was the most convenient. Our first two sessions were from 5–7pm. After these two, we changed the session time to 4–6pm after participants told us that they preferred an earlier ending time.

One of the goals of the organizing committee was to create an environment that supported community-building and that acknowledged the connection between learning and attention to the state of one's mind, body, and spirit. To that end, we decided that all sessions and the information-gathering session would all be preceded by a meet-and-greet period, with coffee, water, fruit, vegetables, crackers with cheese and meats, and usually a dessert of some kind. In addition, we wanted to acknowledge in some way that participants were sharing their time and expertise with us. Therefore, participants were given an honorarium in the form of a \$25 gift card per session, and an additional \$10 gift card for parking if the workshop session occurred at UNR. The information-gathering session and the first workshop were held at UNR, and the rest at RSIC at two different locations. The decision to have sessions at both the university and on tribal lands reflected the collaborative nature of the enterprise.

In the early stages of the planning of the project, we had discussed developing a handbook built out of the materials used in the various workshops that could serve as a resource for teachers in the future, either as a refresher for participants that had attended the sessions or as a source of new ideas for people who had not. The idea behind this was to collect the materials that had been generated for each session and to then modify them based on the how each session had gone. In the end, though, we did not end up pursuing the plan to develop a handbook. One reason for this decision was that interest for such a resource did not arise, and another reason is that the idea of a cohesive handbook became less feasible when we moved from having a single facilitator to having multiple facilitators with autonomy to design their sessions as they saw fit. Therefore, in keeping with this idea of decolonization and reclamation and the principle stated earlier of openness to modifying any aspect of the project that did not suit the needs of the community, this particular component of the project was dropped.

5. Outcomes (Implementation of the workshops)

5.1 Information-gathering session The goal of the information-gathering session was to collect information about the interests, needs, and preferences of potential participants. We had 12 participants in this session, ranging in age from college students to elders. Three of those elders included fluent speakers of Numu. The format of the session was a relatively open discussion, guided by a few questions that the organizers posed to generate discussion. The session started with an introduction of the organizers, the story of how the grant came to be, and a description of the vision and goals for the grant. We then opened up discussion by asking for participants' thoughts on whether such an endeavor seemed worthwhile to them. This prompt readily led into the question of what topics would be covered. Participants appreciated the fact that the topics of the workshops would be determined based on their preferences. There was general consensus that the participants in the information-gathering session would be interested in participating in these workshops. Given this positive response, we also inquired about logistical preferences, such as preferred day of week, preferred time of day, ideal amount of time for workshops, etc. Our proposed notion of two-hour workshops was well-received, with additional preferences for an afternoon session expressed.

Based on the conversations about topics of interest collected in the information-gathering session, Stacey Burns developed in the later part of the summer a master list of 15 specific topics that would guide our planning of the workshops:

- Immersion style teaching
- Total Physical Response (TPR)
- Assessment tools
- Decolonization

- Media/recording
- Oral history/storytelling
- Digital storytelling
- Master apprenticeship
- Early education language nest teaching techniques
- Great Basin history
- Creative teaching aids/handouts
- Teaching tools/apps
- Linguistic terms, perspective
- Great Basin songs & dances
- Teaching techniques
- Traditional Ecological Knowledge

In the fall, we then took this list and synthesized the specific topics into five general topics that would then serve as the focus for each of the workshops: decolonization, teaching techniques, linguistics, Great Basin history/culture, and media/recording.

Overall, the information-gathering session served several purposes. For one, it affirmed for us that these workshops would be a useful undertaking on our part. In addition, the information we received from participants was critical in our planning of the sessions. Furthermore, having these discussions early on in the planning process allowed potential participants to be more invested in the workshops since they played a role in shaping the content and form of the workshops.

5.2 Workshop 1: Decolonization The topic of the first teacher-training workshop, held at UNR in November 2018, was decolonization. The first session was intentionally chosen to be directly focused on this topic as a means of establishing decolonization as an overarching theme of the workshops as a whole. The workshop was facilitated by Dr. Debra Harry (Numu), a lecturer at UNR who became one of the members of the organizing committee for the workshop series (and is one of the authors). A member of the local community, Debra has also worked extensively with Indigenous communities worldwide. Having received her doctorate in Aotearoa (New Zealand) under Dr. Linda Tuhiwai Smith, a founding scholar of decolonization, Debra has engaged extensively with broader issues of decolonization throughout the world.

Debra's presentation was entitled "Decolonizing Methodologies in Language Revitalization". The format of the workshop included a slide show presentation of key information regarding decolonization as well as small group reflections that led to

whole-group discussions. One topic that we engaged with was the impact of colonization and ways in which an Indigenous research agenda can serve as a recovery from some of these impacts. We also reflected on the contrast between Western and Indigenous epistemologies, considering the ways we could incorporate Indigenous knowledge systems into language and culture classes. In particular, we identified the centrality of Indigenous views of identity and education to framing our efforts. An idea that emerged from these discussions was the importance of taking a locally-oriented approach to work with Indigenous languages and cultures, paying particular attention to the historical, political, and cultural context of the communities involved. Thus, in teaching languages of the Great Basin, the culture specific to Great Basin communities should play a prominent role in shaping the content of what is taught in language classes.

Another key idea that emerged was that of adopting a relationally-oriented approach, whereby connections among people and between people and the land would infuse endeavors to transmit language and culture to future generations. Emerging from our discussion about this kind of relationality, participants expressed that one reason for valuing immersion and orality in language teaching was that doing so helps to strengthen relationships between teachers and learners and between modern people and their ancestors. According to participants, because these languages have been transmitted orally for generations and because relying on writing to transmit a language is a result of adoption of Western methods, teaching languages in a more immersive, less writing-focused manner feels more Indigenously-oriented. And, as this workshop reinforced to participants, adopting a more decolonized approach to language revitalization entails engaging actively with Indigenous epistemologies (see e.g., Chew 2019; Chee 2019).

5.3 Workshop 2: Teaching Techniques The topic of the second workshop in the series was teaching techniques. The workshop was held in December 2018 in the RSIC Multipurpose Room. We asked Lance West (Numu) to facilitate the workshop. He is a principal at an elementary school at the nearby Walker River Indian Reservation and has been a teacher in the Washoe County School District (the Reno-area school district). In our planning meeting with Lance, he thought to invite a co-facilitator – Esha Hoferer (Numu), who is also a language teacher at the Walker River Indian Reservation – an addition we very much supported.

Lance and Esha used a combination of tools and techniques in their facilitation of the workshop. Prior to the workshop, they had created a folder of handouts to facilitate discussion. During the workshop, they used chart paper to present questions for discussion and to record participants' responses. The activities of the workshop included individual written reflections, movement around the room to engage with questions found on chart paper, small group discussion, and whole-group discussion.

The first topic that we covered was teaching methodologies. The facilitators asked participants to reflect on our own experiences learning languages. We then categorized our own experiences according to conventional language teaching methodologies: Immersion, Total Physical Response, Listen and Repeat, Grammar Teaching,

and the Communicative Approach. Our own experiences (and those of the students we had worked with) served as the basis of our assessment of the advantages and disadvantages of each of the teaching methodologies. Our assessments of these techniques were grounded in local needs. As we considered the merits and challenges of various teaching approaches, we kept our discussion focused on potential application of these teaching approaches to the particular communities with whom we worked. A salient notion raised at various points in the discussion was that immersion is the ideal for transmitting these languages to students, regardless of the age of the students. For many participants, this preference for immersion connected to the long-standing tradition of oral transmission of the language. As elders often remark, this is the way they learned the language (cf. discussion in McCarty & Nicholas 2014 regarding Hopi being a primarily oral language). Though our experiences affirmed that all of the techniques are actually utilized in the teaching of the local Indigenous languages, participants favored a greater incorporation of immersion in at least a partial manner (e.g., through role-play activities) since full immersion is not necessarily feasible in all cases given the circumstances in which the languages are taught.

Another topic we discussed was language activism. The facilitators began by asking about the difference between a linguist and a language activist. The distinction they wanted to make was that whereas a language activist tends to be associated with revitalization, advocacy, and no formal linguistic training, a linguist tends to be associated with documentation and formal linguistic training in a university. Though this dichotomy may be problematic for a number of reasons (e.g., the fact that linguists can also be members of Indigenous communities and/or language activists, as discussed in, e.g., Cruz & Woodbury 2014; Gerds 2017; Leonard 2017; Fitzgerald 2018), the goal of the facilitators was to emphasize that formal linguistic training is not necessary to engage in language work. Through this understanding of language activism, the facilitators emphasized that participants in the room constituted language activists since they were all engaged in the teaching of Indigenous languages, which is a vital form of supporting maintenance and revitalization of a language.

In addition, the facilitators introduced the idea that the work of language revitalization is also a form of supporting the overall well-being of the community. In their experience, language learning promotes a stronger sense of self among Native people as well as a greater connection to their communities, an idea that resonated with the experiences of the participants in the workshop. Indeed, this link between language and well-being in Indigenous communities has been observed in other Indigenous communities as well (e.g., Coe et al. 2004; Hodge & Nandy 2011; Oster et al. 2014; Jenni et al. 2017). Thus, one key take-away from this workshop was the relationship of language teaching to broader community goals.

5.4 Workshop 3: Linguistics The third workshop in the series focused on linguistics and was facilitated by Dr. Ignacio Montoya (one of the authors, introduced in §4.3). It occurred in January 2019 in the RSIC Multipurpose Room. In planning the workshop, the main question Ignacio grappled with was the following: Given

that the field of Linguistics⁵ has a long colonial legacy (e.g., Errington 2008; Leonard 2018), how do we use ideas from Linguistics in a way that avoids neo-colonialism? Especially given that this session occurred in the context of teacher-training workshops that take decolonization and language-reclamation as their guiding principles, the challenge was to choose concepts from the potentially esoteric field of Linguistics that are in direct service to teachers of Indigenous languages (Eira 2008; Gerdt 2017).

In answering this question, the facilitator was guided by his experiences learning Numu through RSIC community classes and engaging with other learners of the language. The choice of topics for the workshop, therefore, was based in part on ideas that fellow learners either had expressed interest in or had found useful in their learning of the language. Another source was when his instructors had asked him about what the linguistic perspective would be for a particular pattern in the language. The three topics that were ultimately chosen were language family relationships, morphemic analysis, and teaching grammar through immersion. The workshops started with more Western-oriented notions and progressed to more reclamation-based perspectives.

The overarching theme of the linguistics workshop was connection. As Ignacio mentioned, the role of the linguist is to look for patterns in language and to find ways of describing and explaining those patterns. One way to do this is by making connections, such as among words, among parts of words, or between words and concepts. This, in fact, is also the task of language learners. For example, they learn words by associating a sequence of sounds to a concept, by noting that a particular part of a word is related to another part of a word in a predictable way, or by observing that a given phrase occurs in a limited social context. The objective of the workshop, therefore, was to practice different ways of making connections within and among the languages of the Great Basin. Given the importance of relationships in Indigenous methodologies (Wilson 2008), emphasizing the idea of making connections is a more Indigenous-oriented way of framing linguistic analysis.

The first topic – language family relationships – arose from questions that had been asked by language learners about the relationships among the languages of the area. Anecdotally, members of the community had noted that Numu and Newe exhibit lexical similarities. The relationship of the two to each other, and to Wašiw, therefore was a point of interest. In addition, many learners of Numu had heard that the language is part of the Uto-Aztecan language family (there is, for example, a map of the Uto-Aztecan languages in the RSIC library), and they wondered what this meant. To address these points of interest, Ignacio collected words that might be cognates across different languages of the Western United States – Numu, Newe, Wašiw, Hopi, Diné Bizaad (Navajo), and N̄um̄ Tekwap̄ (Comanche) – and asked participants what they observed. By looking at the fact that, for example, the words for ‘fish’ in Numu, Newe, Hopi, and N̄um̄ Tekwap̄ bear many similarities while the

⁵The use of this term with a capital <L> is as Leonard (2017) intends: a reference to the established academic field. It stands in contrast to linguistics, with a lower-case <l>, which refers to the study of language more broadly.

words for ‘fish’ in Wašiw and Diné Bizaad do not share those similarities (nor similarities to each other), participants could observe directly why linguists describe these languages as belonging to the same language family. Though these notions of family relationships as conceptualized by linguists do not always align with notions of relationships Indigenous people have for themselves, it can be useful for Indigenous people to understand where these notions that linguists have come from. This was, in fact, an observation that was made by a participant in the workshop in response to the question of why learning about these relationships might or might not be useful.

The other two topics of the workshop – morphemic analysis and grammar through immersion – dealt more directly with the type of linguistic activities that learners were more likely to experience in an educational setting. In introducing linguistic analysis in general, the facilitator emphasized that in order for linguistics to serve Indigenous communities, practitioners need to take only those concepts and tools that serve the goals of language teachers without concern for dealing with those that do not. This was an important point to emphasize since participants were in agreement that often conventional Linguistics concepts feel very disconnected from the experiences of language teachers and learners. In order to model conventional analysis for the local languages, the concept of the morpheme was introduced. The reason for this choice was that Ignacio had noted that the concept of the morpheme (i.e., a part of a word that carries meaning or function) had proven useful to learners of Numu in the community classes that he was taking. After doing some morphemic analysis problems in Numu and Wašiw, we discussed ways in which this kind of activity might or might not be useful for learners. Though participants could see ways in which pointing out morphemes would be useful to some learners, one participant also noted that a disadvantage of this approach was that this “wasn’t how the language worked”, a comment which reflects the idea shared by other participants as well that more natural language learning occurs in a more immersion-oriented context (e.g., Genee & Junker 2018; Langley et al. 2018).

Indeed, the final component of the workshop – grammar through immersion – proved to be the most compelling for participants. Ignacio started this part of the workshop by teaching participants two phrases in Diné Bizaad (‘I see ___’, ‘you see ___’) and two individual words (‘rock’ and ‘water’) speaking only in Diné Bizaad and using props and gestures. After participants mastered these, we debriefed the experience, discussing how grammatical concepts (e.g., changes in the verb based on person and number, word order) could be taught using only the language. Building upon ideas that Ignacio had learned through experiences such as those in the Institute on Collaborative Language Research (CoLang) in 2018 (namely, a workshop called “Pedagogical Grammar” facilitated by Conor Quinn and Mary Linn), he presented key points to keep in mind as one is developing an immersion-oriented program for teaching grammatical concepts:

- Keep lessons highly focused and minimal (e.g., one grammatical concept at a time, with two or three sentences or phrases using that grammatical concept and with appropriate repetition)

- Focus on performance in the language (e.g., interactive lessons where the language is used in context)
- Teach phrases, words, grammatical concepts that are immediately usable
- Develop lessons that logically build on each other to support communication
- Build grammatical concepts into lessons, though grammar does not need to be taught explicitly if that is not useful

Finally, this component of the workshop introduced the use of media as a means of introducing students to grammatical concepts in an immersion-oriented manner. The facilitator showed participants a story in Newe⁶ that could also be used to teach grammatical concepts through stories, especially those geared towards children and that feature repetition of phrases along with visual cues to aid in understanding. Given how the importance of immersion had emerged in previous workshops, viewing the teaching of grammatical principles in these ways was well received by participants. Indeed, future workshops of this kind can be organized so that there is even greater focus on teaching through immersion.

5.5 Workshop 4: Great Basin History/Culture The topic we had chosen for the fourth workshop was Great Basin history and culture. In keeping with the reclamation-based notion of remaining locally oriented and of the Indigenous notion of the interrelationship between culture and language with the land, we wanted to make sure we had a session that focused on the particular historical and cultural experiences of the local communities, including history of the area, songs and dances, and Traditional Ecological Knowledge. The original intent was to bring in facilitators from the three major Indigenous groups in the area – Numu, Wašiw, and Newe – in order to present a fuller and more comprehensive sense of the cultures in the area and to be as inclusive as possible in the voices that were represented through the workshops.

Though having a workshop focused on the Great Basin served to reinforce key components of our decolonized approach to teacher-training, logistical issues prevented us from achieving many of our goals for this workshop. The challenges were in part because of the timing; the workshop was held in February, which can be a difficult time both with regard to travel in the area as a result of weather and with regard to people's schedules. In the end, the main facilitator we had asked was unable to make it. We decided to hold the workshop anyway since many participants had already made special plans to attend. Able to step in at the last minute, Ralph Burns (Numu) agreed to facilitate the workshop.

A renowned storyteller and language teacher who has presented on a variety of topics related to the Great Basin in a variety of settings, Ralph used stories to convey information about the people and culture of the area. His stories touched on a variety of topics relevant to the area, including the following: the ancient Lake Lahontan that once covered a good portion of the Great Basin, archeological remains

⁶The video is part of the Shoshoni Language Project through the University of Utah. It is available through YouTube: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8DKJeD3xTVs>.

that date back to 9,400 years ago, language varieties that were and are spoken in the area, the story of the Pyramid Lake War, the creation of the reservation, Ralph's experiences learning the language from his grandmother, Ralph's relationship to the language over the years, and his experiences with language revitalization. The stories that Ralph presented then prompted a discussion both of questions raised by the specific stories he offered and of how stories in general can serve the greater goal of language and culture maintenance and revitalization. Thus, though we did not necessarily achieve some of the specific goals we had in mind (e.g., bringing in facilitators from different tribal groups, including music and dance, integrating Traditional Ecological Knowledge), we nevertheless stayed true to our overall goal of supporting the integration of history and culture into instruction of the languages of the area.

5.6 Workshop 5: Media/Recording Our fifth and final workshop in the teacher-training series focused on media and recording. It was held in March 2019 at the RSIC Tribal Health Center. Recognizing that documentation of Native American languages could serve as a valuable instructional tool for supporting language revitalization and aware of the increasingly prominent role of media in language reclamation efforts, we wanted participants to engage with ways to potentially incorporate media and recording in language maintenance and revitalization projects. This workshop involved several presentations, with each facilitator addressing a particular area of focus based on their expertise.

The first presenter was Macario Mendoza, a UNR student who has also been studying Numu through RSIC. In addition, he has also taken it upon himself to work with an elder, Ralph Burns (introduced in §5.5), to record traditional stories and oral histories and to produce language lessons published online.⁷ Macario talked about the process of documentation and provided technical information that would be useful for others interested in doing documentation for their own purposes. In addition, he showed several of the lessons he had developed. What he had produced had the advantage of being very accessible, both in terms of the content and in terms of how readily others can use it. Macario's work was well-received, and many attendees described it as inspirational because of the initiative he had taken to do the work, for the way it supported language learning, and because of how he showed that producing this kind of material was easier than many had imagined.

The next two presenters were both filmmakers: Shane Whitecloud and Tsanavi Spoonhunter (Numu, Lakota, Northern Arapaho). Shane spoke about his experiences starting a non-profit organization. Though there are clearly challenges involved with such an endeavor, he discussed how establishing a non-profit can serve as a very useful means of consolidating community-support efforts. Tsanavi participated through FaceTime (which seems appropriate given that one of the themes of the workshop was how media can support community-building). She led a discussion on representation of Native people in the media. Though the discussion can be applied to Native representation more broadly, the focus of the discussion was local. Specifically, we reflected on a film involving the Stewart Indian School (discussed in §2). The film

⁷ <https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCqVNzrrNcbvAHfTNFnbR9vA>.

had recently been screened locally and most participants of the workshop had familiarity with it; many had attended the screening and some had also been interviewed for the film. The questions we engaged with touched on the kinds of representations that were and were not depicted in the film, as well as the level of involvement (or lack thereof) of Native people on the creative team. We discussed the implications of these kinds of representation and ways we can make further progress with regard to Indigenous representation in the media. This part of the workshop, therefore, dealt with broader issues involving media – topics that could serve as fruitful prompts for discussion in language and culture classes and that are important to keep in mind for anyone producing Indigenously-related media of any kind.

The final presenter of this workshop was Myrton Running Wolf (Blackfeet, Wasco), a UNR faculty member who was raised in the Reno area. One focus of his presentation was challenges and ethical issues involved when working with tribes; another focus was on Native participation in various aspects of media production. For both, he drew on his own experiences as a director, actor, producer, and writer working both on mainstream media projects and on those involving Native America. As with the other presenters in this workshop, Myrton's presentation highlighted how media can be integrated into Native culture in a way that is both true to traditional values and goals and responsive to changing times.

6. Discussion As mentioned in §2, one of the goals of the present paper is to share insights gained through this project that can serve other decolonial, reclamation-based endeavors. Many of the insights that we offer will certainly be familiar to others who have embarked on this type of community-based work. Indeed, best practices developed through projects such as these are often shared informally at conferences, community gatherings, and other casual encounters. Such insights, however, are much less frequently represented in more formal academic publications (articles in the present journal notwithstanding). If scholars are to engage meaningfully with decolonization of the relationships between the academy and the community, then it is important to articulate insights gained from community-based work in traditional academic venues. Doing so serves both to support communication among different groups engaged in similar work and to further the goal of creating a more decolonized academy. Therefore, at the risk of stating the obvious for those who have undertaken such reclamation-oriented projects themselves, we offer several generalizations that emerged from our work.

One of the features of the project that made it successful was the fact that community-building was present throughout the project. In order to engage with as many different groups working on language maintenance and reclamation, we reached out to potential participants and facilitators that represented different ages, teaching roles, and tribal affiliations. Though certainly different groups have distinct needs and interests, we sought to foster a common sense of purpose by being as inclusive as possible in the hope of fostering future collaborations that benefit multiple communities. The workshops themselves were designed to foster community-building through the various small- and whole-group discussions and activities, and through the meet-and-

greet before each workshop. Indeed, through these efforts, several people ended up meeting each other for the first time at the workshops, and several others ended up seeing people they had not seen in a while. The workshops, therefore, were both sites of introduction and sites of reunion.

In addition to serving the goal of community-building, another consideration that guided the selection of potential participants and facilitators was the fact that invitation to be involved with the project also served as a way of honoring the contributions of people engaged in this work, an idea that was reinforced through the letter of invitation that explicitly referred to the recipient's expertise and skills. We honor people by giving them a platform to speak. In addition, by explicitly framing the workshops as an opportunity to respect and learn from previous work, the workshops served as a link between the achievements of the past and aspirations for the future.

Another key to the success of the project involved knowing when to stay consistent and when to be flexible. The anchor of the workshops was a clear vision articulated from the outset, a vision focused on decolonization and on capacity-building. When decisions had to be made – about logistical issues, setbacks, or change to the original proposal – we reminded ourselves of the major goals of the project. Out of this, consistent themes were able to emerge throughout the workshops, such as immersion as an ideal method of instruction, language teaching as a form of social and cultural uplifting, and the use of a diversity of methods to support language maintenance and revitalization. Clarity about and focus on the major goals of the project also provided guidance on what we could be flexible about. As mentioned in §4.4, part of the original proposal involved the development of a handbook. Rather than continuing to attempt to make sure we focused on the handbook even after it became clear that this was not a priority of participants, we were able to readily discard this component of the project without necessitating undue time spent on that decision. In addition, this flexibility allowed us to respond organically to setbacks quickly and smoothly, as was the case with the fourth workshop, in which the original facilitator was unable to attend at the last minute.

As this project represented a collaboration between people associated with UNR and with RSIC, we needed to be intentional about the roles played by each organization. This is especially the case given that adopting a decolonization framework and a reclamation-based approach requires the project as a whole to be guided by the community's priorities. A useful heuristic for the division of responsibilities was that the university provided the infrastructure for the project and the tribal community provided the vision and details. In other words, funding and resources (such as space in which to meet, expertise of university faculty, and a certain type of legitimization that comes with academic affiliation) came through the university while the decisions about content for the workshops, structure of the workshops, and logistics came from the community. This was made possible by the fact that meetings always had representatives of both organizations and that, in fact, some members of the organizing committee, facilitators, and participants held both tribal and university affiliations.

Though we did not set up a formal system of assessment of the project, we did regularly reflect on what reactions we observed during and after the workshops, and

we also gathered feedback through informal conversations. Our sense of participants' responses to the workshops came through debriefing discussions we had with them and with facilitators. In addition, given that organizers were also participants and facilitators, our own observations of participants' reactions also served as a form of assessment. Other observations that indicate that the workshops influenced thinking and practice include the fact that concepts such as immersion and decolonization were evident throughout the workshops and in the language classes attended by project organizers. Furthermore, other factors that we considered in determining that this was a project worth implementing again in some form were the observations that we had many repeat participants, that word-of-mouth invitations resulted in new participants coming in throughout the series, and that participants expressed an interest in having additional workshops of this kind. Our overall assessment, therefore, was that this program supported language teaching and that this is a project we would like to expand further in the future.

7. Conclusions Given the colonial legacy associated with institutions such as universities, it can often be a daunting task to engage in truly collaborative partnerships between the academy and communities, in large part because of the divergent needs and interests of the groups involved (e.g., Rice 2006; Eira 2008; Leonard & Haynes 2010; Czaykowska-Higgins 2009; Cruz & Woodbury 2014). The obstacles posed by colonial structures are multi-faceted and wide-ranging. Therefore, addressing the question of how academics can participate in projects that benefit the communities they work with at least as much as these projects benefit the academics requires approaching the problem from multiple angles and through multiple avenues. The model discussed in this project – whereby resources come from the colonial institution while decision-making remains in the hands of the tribal community – serves as one example of how a more decolonial partnership can be built between universities and Indigenous communities. In this project, it was critical that the university provided resources with minimal external expectations in order to allow for the elevation of Indigenous voices.

The ideas that emerged over the course of this project – e.g., community members' preference for the incorporation of immersion techniques in language instruction; the inextricable connections among language, place, and people in an Indigenous worldview; the value of recognizing the contributions of others by giving them a platform to speak from – arise from a decolonial engagement with members of tribal communities, one that is grounded in the principles of responsible work with communities. These principles include negotiation, respect, involvement, and acknowledgment (Eira 2008). Projects that adopt these principles are community-oriented, with practical relevance to the community; collaborative, with shared control of the project; and action-oriented (Rice 2018) – qualities that we believe characterized our project. The aforementioned ideas that emerged from this project reflect the values and priorities of the particular communities of the participants in this project. Though we would expect them to resonate with other communities engaged in similar work, a

reclamation-based approach to language work requires that each community decide for itself what needs and goals will guide the community's projects.

The workshops served as venues for participants and facilitators to share experiences, concerns, and ideas. People who have undertaken different forms of language maintenance and revitalization were able to engage more deeply with topics of interest to their work. This allowed for a celebration of previous successes and the generation of ideas for future work. In addition, the workshops provided a venue in which frustrations and setbacks could be expressed, sometimes in order to develop next steps and sometimes simply to give voice to shared challenges. By creating a forum focused on Indigenous expression of Indigenous concerns and interests, we were able to serve a variety of decolonization and reclamation-oriented goals: community-building, affirmation of past work, and inspiration and ideas for future work. In this way, we were able to leverage a more decolonized form of education in order to begin to undo some of the damage caused by colonial education.

References


- Adams, David Wallace. 1995. *Education for extinction: American Indians and the boarding school experience, 1875–1926*. University Press of Kansas.
- Benedicto, Elena. 2018. When Participatory Action Research (PAR) and (Western) academic institutional policies do not align. In Bischoff, Shannon T., & Jany, Carmen (eds.), *Insights from practices in Community-Based Research: From theory to practice around the globe*, 38–65. De Gruyter Mouton.
- Chee, Melvatha R. 2019. Explaining child verb acquisition through shared cultural knowledge. Paper presented at the Symposium on American Indian Languages, Tucson, AZ, 12 April 2019.
- Chew, Kari A. B. 2019. Weaving words: Conceptualizing language reclamation through a culturally-significant metaphor. *Canadian Journal of Native Education* 41(1).
- Coe, Kathryn, Agnes Attakai, Mary Papenfuss, Anna Giuliano, Lorencita Martin, & Leon Nuvayestewa. 2004. Traditionalism and its relationship to disease risk and protective behaviors of women living on the Hopi Reservation. *Health Care for Women International* 25(5). 391–410. doi:10.1080/07399330490438314.
- Cruz, Emiliana & Anthony C. Woodbury. 2014. Collaboration in the context of teaching, scholarship, and language revitalization: Experience from the Chatino Language Documentation Project. *Language Documentation & Conservation* 8. 262–286. <http://hdl.handle.net/10125/24607>.
- Czaykowska-Higgins, Ewa. 2009. Research models, community engagement, and linguistic fieldwork: Reflections on working with Canadian Indigenous communities. *Language Documentation & Conservation* 3(1). 1–50.
- Dupris, Joseph. 2019. maqlaqsyalank hemyeega: Goals and expectations of Klamath-Modoc revitalization. *Language Documentation & Conservation* 13. 155–196.

- Eira, Christina. 2008. Linguists and communities: Discursive practice and the status of collaborative language work in Indigenous communities. *Language & Intercultural Communication* 8(4). 278–297.
- Errington, Joseph. 2008. *Linguistics in a colonial world: A story of language, meaning, and power*. Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Fitzgerald, Colleen M. 2018. Reflections on language community training. In McDonnell, Bradley McDonnell, Andrea L. Berez-Kroeker, & Gary Holton (eds.), *Reflections on language documentation: 20 Years after Himmelmann 1998*, 86–99. University of Hawai'i Press.
- Genee, Inge & Marie-Odile Junker. 2018. The Blackfoot Language Resources and Digital Dictionary project: Created integrated web resources for language documentation and revitalization. *Language Documentation & Conservation* 12. 274–314. <http://hdl.handle.net/10125/24770>.
- Gerds, Donna B. 2010. Beyond expertise: The role of the linguist in language revitalization programs. In Grenoble, Lenore A. & N. Louanna Furbee (eds.), *Language documentation: practice and values*, 173–192. John Benjamins.
- Gerds, Donna B. 2017. Indigenous linguists: Bringing research into language revitalization. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 83(4). 607–17.
- Golla, Victor. 2011. *California Indian Languages*. University of California Press.
- Golla, Victor, Ives Goddard, Lyle Campbell, Marianne Mithun, & Mauricio Mixco. 2007. North America. In Asher, R.E. & C.J. Mosely (eds.), *Atlas of the world's languages*. 2nd edn, 7–46. Routledge.
- Grenoble, Lenore A. 2009. Linguistic cages and the limits of linguists. In Reyner, Jon & Louise Lockard (eds.), *Indigenous language revitalization: Encouragement, guidance, and lessons learned*, 61–69. Flagstaff: Northern Arizona University.
- Hodge, Felicia S. & Karabi Nandy. 2011. Predictors of wellness and American Indians. *Journal of Health Care for the Poor & Underserved* 22(3). 791–803.
- Jenni, Barbara, Adar Anisman, Onowa McIvor, & Peter Jacobs. 2017. An exploration of the effects of mentor-apprentice programs on mentors' and apprentices' wellbeing. *International Journal of Indigenous Health* 12(2). doi:10.18357/ijih122201717783.
- Langley, Berney, Linda Langley, Jack B. Martin, & Stephanie Hasselbacher. 2018. The Koasati Language Project: A collaborative, community-based language documentation and revitalization model. In Bischoff, Shannon T. & Carmen Jany (eds.), *Insights from practices in Community-Based Research: From theory to practice around the globe*, 132–150. De Gruyter Mouton.
- Leonard, Wesley Y. 2012. Framing language reclamation programmes for everybody's empowerment. *Gender & Language* 6(2). 339–367.
- Leonard, Wesley Y. 2017. Producing language reclamation by decolonising 'language'. *Language Documentation & Description* 14. 15–36.
- Leonard, Wesley Y. 2018. Reflections on (de)colonialism in language documentation. In McDonnell, Bradley, Andrea L. Berez-Kroeker & Gary Holton. *Reflections on Language Documentation: 20 Years after Himmelmann 1998*, 55–65. University of Hawai'i Press.

- Leonard, Wesley Y. & Haynes, Erin. 2010. Making “collaboration” collaborative: An examination of perspectives that frame linguistic field research. *Language Documentation & Conservation* 4. 268–293. <http://hdl.handle.net/10125/4482>.
- Lee, Robert & Tristan Ahtone. 2020. “Land-grab universities: Expropriated Indigenous land is the foundation of the land-grant university system”. *High Country News*. 30 March 2020.
- McCarty, Teresa L. & Sheilah E. Nicholas. 2014. Reclaiming Indigenous languages: A reconsideration of the roles and responsibilities of schools. *Review of Research in Education* 38. 106–136.
- McKinley, Elizabeth Ann & Linda Tuhiwai Smith. 2019. Towards self-determination in Indigenous education research: An introduction. In McKinley, Elizabeth Ann & Linda Tuhiwai Smith (eds.), *Handbook of Indigenous Education*, 1–15. Springer Nature Singapore Ltd.
- Oster, Richard T., Angela Grier, Rick Lightning, & Maria J. Mayan, & Ellen L. Toth. 2014. Cultural continuity, traditional Indigenous language, and diabetes in Alberta First Nations: A mixed methods study. *International Journal for Equity in Health* 13. doi: 10.1186/s12939-014-0092-4.
- Pérez Báez, Gabriela. 2018. Slowly, slowly said the jaguar: Collaborations as a goal of linguistic field research over time. In Bischoff, Shannon T. & Carmen Jany (eds.), *Insights from practices in Community-Based Research: From theory to practice around the globe*, 112–131. De Gruyter Mouton.
- Pihama, Leonie & Jenny Lee-Morgan. 2019. Colonization, education, and Indigenous peoples. In McKinley, Elizabeth Ann & Linda Tuhiwai Smith (eds.), *Handbook of Indigenous Education*, 19–27. Springer Nature Singapore Ltd.
- Poetsch, Susan, Michael Jarret, & Denise Angelo. 2019. Learning and teaching Gumbaynggirr through story: Behind the scenes of professional learning workshops for teachers of an Aboriginal language. *Language Documentation & Conservation* 13. 231–252. <http://hdl.handle.net/10125/24867>.
- Pratt, Richard Henry. 1973/1892. *Official Report of the Nineteenth Annual Conference of Charities and Correction (1892)*, 46–59. Reprinted in Pratt, Richard H., “The Advantages of Mingling Indians with Whites,” *Americanizing the American Indians: Writings by the “Friends of the Indian” 1880–1900*, 260–271. Harvard University Press.
- Rice, Keren. 2006. Ethical issues in linguistic fieldwork: An overview. *Journal of Academic Ethics* 4. 123–155.
- Rice, Keren. 2011. Documentary linguistics and community relations. *Language Documentation & Conservation* 5. 187–207. <http://hdl.handle.net/10125/4498>.
- Rice, Keren. 2018. Collaborative research: Visions and realities. In Bischoff, Shannon T. & Carmen Jany (eds.), *Insights from practices in Community-Based Research: From theory to practice around the globe*, 13–37. De Gruyter Mouton.
- Running Wolf, Myrton W. 2020. “Loose production but great cause!!”: A response to the 2019 Rhetoric Society of America Project in Power, Place, and Publics at the University of Nevada, Reno. *Review of Communication* 20(2). 188–196.

- Smith, Linda Tuhiwai. 2012. *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples*, 2nd edn. Zed Books Ltd.
- Thompson-Hardin, Bonnie. 2019. History and daily life at the Stewart Campus. In Cowie, Sarah E. Cowie, Diane L. Teeman, & Christopher C. LeBlanc (eds.), *Collaborative archaeology at Stewart Indian School*, 107–128. University of Nevada Press.
- Stebbins, Tonya N., Kris Eira, & Vicki L. Couzens. 2017. *Living languages and new approaches to language revitalisation research*. Routledge.
- Swadener, Beth Blue & Kagendo Mutua. 2008. Decolonizing performances: Deconstructing the global postcolonial. In Denzin, Norman K. Denzin, Yvonna S. Lincoln, & Linda Tuhiwai (eds.), *Handbook of critical and Indigenous methodologies*, 31–43. SAGE Publications.
- University of Nevada, Reno. 2020. “University Accreditation.” <https://www.unr.edu/accreditation/mission>.
- Wilson, Shawn. 2008. *Research is ceremony: Indigenous research methods*. Fernwood Publishing.

Ignacio L. Montoya
ignaciomontoya@unr.edu

 orcid.org/0000-0002-5354-8657

Debra Harry
dharry@unr.edu

Jennie Burns
jburns@rsic.org