Indigenous scholarship: WHAT REALLY MATTERS AND TO WHOM?

Onowa McIvor & Trish Rosborough

2020

CHAPTER 8

Indigenous Scholarship: What Really Matters and to Whom?

Onowa McIvor and Trish Rosborough

> Academic success is still measured at an institutional level in terms of how many peer-reviewed articles are available in the library for other academics who know how to access them and not in terms of developing relationships, building community knowledge, effecting positive changes in communities, or the policies that affect those communities. (Styres, Zinga, Bennett, & Bomberry, 2010, p. 640)

(*Image used with permission, from* www.tomgauld.com)

Through writing in personal narrative voice, two Indigenous professors reflect on the processes they experienced with tenure and promotion at a mainstream western Canadian university. They share their different but interconnected stories of maneuvering the tenure and promotion system. One moment being experienced in mainstream universities, it seems, is the acceptance of more broadly defined measures of scholarship and, yet, the implementation of these updated and more inclusive policies remains questionable. Are these changes an indication of the recognition of community-based and community-engaged research and scholarship as legitimate by senior colleagues, or are they a pleasant afterthought once the "real measurements" are met? Throughout this chapter, we share our tenure stories and reflect on the questions: What really matters, and to whom?

Indigenous scholars are growing in number, and allyship[1] is more prevalent as colleagues with social justice agendas gain traction via widespread reconciliation efforts. This is resulting in greater influence of Indigenous-grounded knowledge and ways-of-being are becoming embedded into the fabric of universities' policies and practices. Our chapter focuses on the ways in which Indigenous thought and ways of knowing have influenced policy at one mainstream western Canadian university, and highlight the further work that remains. Advocating for a balance between the various audiences and benefactors of Indigenous scholars' work is an important part of this chapter's contribution as we continue to fight for voice and space to matter in a system that historically did not value the aspirations and intellectual contributions of Indigenous peoples (inside or outside the academy). We explore tangible examples of the tension between the importance of accessibility of knowledge and the value system held by many tenure committee members. These tensions often exist in the debate between open-access journals (or book chapters) versus top-tier journals, as well as plain-language reporting targeted towards community members and the general public (also often not valued by tenure committees as it is deemed not peer reviewed). Further to this, the authors explore the importance of working with community research partners and hearing their expectations for meaningful (to them) scholarship and research contributions. Throughout this chapter, the authors reflect on the importance of living the "four R's" of Indigenous-engaged research—Respect, Relevance, Reciprocity, and Responsibility (Kirkness & Barnhardt, 1991) as foundational to this

work of bridging the space between mainstream tenure and promotion expectations, and the incorporation of significant Indigenous contributions into academic policies and processes.

Inspiration of Method

This chapter follows the rich tradition of autoethnography largely credited to Carolyn Ellis (2009) who is often considered the grandmother of this method. However, storytelling in various forms is also an ancient Indigenous practice. Onowa merged these two worlds by applying autoethnography in her doctoral work, blending it with Indigenous methodologies, as explained in McIvor (2010, 2012). In her dissertation, Trish used a narrative inquiry approach that included the use of personal stories and journals (Rosborough, 2012).

Several other Indigenous scholars have also demonstrated the effective use of storytelling or narrative methods in their writing, helping to create new ways of sharing knowledge. While Absolon (2011), Archibald (2008), and Wilson (2008) are pioneering and foundational exemplars, subsequent Indigenous scholars also provided inspiring, influential and innovative examples of Indigenous storying scholarship toward the formation of this chapter. Angela Jaime (2008) interweaves the stories of two Indigenous professors describing their struggles and active resistance in the academy. Antone and Dawson (2014) discuss Antone's Indigenous worldview approach to the tenure and promotion process through the use of first personal dialogue and narratives. Anishnaabe-kwe activist and organiser Wanda Nanibush (2014) demonstrates, through an interview-style journal article with Rebecca Belmore, a Winnipeg-based Anishnaabe artist, about her journey to becoming both an artist and an *Idle No More* organizer, that Indigenous-style conversational interviewing can stand alone as enough. Kahnawà:ke scholar and political activist Taiaiake Alfred also demonstrates an Indigenous style of conversational interviewing in his two books, *Peace, Power and Righteousness* (1999) and *Wasáse* (2005). Most recently, Rosborough and Rorick (2017) "apply an Indigenous relational approach" (p. 12) to their work by introducing one another and by using a narrative approach to explore their research and explain their process of knowledge making. Our chapter was inspired by all of these examples and follows both the Indigenous storytelling tradition and scholarly exemplars provided by these authors.

Storying

In accordance with this interweaving story method, we begin with a rich discussion about our shared and different experiences of traversing the tenure and promotion process. As the chapter progresses, we discuss what changed for us once we were informed of our successful navigation through this process. We agreed on four themes, formed around sets of questions that we hoped to answer in order to focus our ideas. The first theme is the tenure process itself of going up and going through. We reflected on the process of preparing our tenure packages, the advice we received, our understanding of the process and access to information, and the challenges of aptly describing community-engaged work. The second theme is developed through a set of stories focuses on what changed for us (after success in the tenure process). It gave us the opportunity to reflect on the early days of being newly tenured, on what (if anything) changed for us post-tenure in how we did our work, and on what surprises awaited. The third theme focuses retrospectively on what we believe needs to change (about the tenure process). Specifically, what would foster greater success for future Indigenous academics coming through the tenure process? The last theme is developed as a set of stories focuses on the concept of reciprocity. As an important Indigenous value that was nearly impossible to include in our processes of building our tenure packages, we felt it was important to write about those who had helped us along the way. We reflect on the support we received from other Indigenous scholars and, in the sense written about by Kirkness and Barnhardt (1991), the responsibility we now carry to reciprocate by supporting other Indigenous scholars.

Our Stories

The Tenure Process

Trish

There are some life events, like planning a wedding or a memorial for a loved one, that require learning on the job. Since we go through these experiences rarely, or maybe even just once, we do not have much prior knowledge to depend on. Going through the tenure and promotion process reminds me of these other once-in-a-lifetime events. Much about the tenure-track process was a mystery to me. Certainly an important part of achieving tenure is about the work

one does: the research, publications, grants, service contributions, teaching, course experience surveys, and other role expectations. What was not so certain for me was how much would be enough, what would count, and how to articulate that work by building a tenure and promotion package. Getting information about the criteria, the process, and the preparation of my package was a much bigger job than I imagined. Like with other infrequent life events, in the months following the achievement of tenure and promotion to associate professor, I have reflections about what I know now that I wished I knew then.

If I were at the start of this journey now, I would turn my attention to learning about the tenure and promotion process much sooner than I did. I jumped into my appointment as assistant professor without much thought about what it meant to be on a tenure-track. My excitement and focus for my new role was the opportunity to work with communities in something I cared deeply about: Indigenous Language Revitalization (ILR). I learned quickly that teaching takes as much time as one will give it and that devoting time to engagement with our community partners is essential to building better outcomes in ILR. Of course, I was aware that 40 percent of my role was meant to be dedicated to research, and yet, the research and writing took a back seat in the first two years of my appointment. Despite the good advice I had been given to publish some articles from my dissertation while the content was current, I did not make the time to write. At that two-year mark, I recorded a dream in my journal: "I am with some scholars in an informal setting. Wanting to give me some feedback and support, they ask me to read something from my notebook. I flip back and forth through the pages but I can't find anything. I haven't written a thing." If I had been more thoughtful about the expectations for publications, I would have better paced my writing. Instead, in the third and fourth years of my appointment, I had to push hard with my writing and research agenda to fill the gaps.

Had I paid attention to tenure-track expectations earlier on, I would have also been more deliberate about documenting and collecting the evidence of my work. In the months before building my package, I reviewed the department, faculty, and collective agreement documents, and developed a table that brought together the processes and criteria for tenure and promotion. This exercise took some of the mystery out of the expectations. The table gave me confidence

that I had met the criteria and helped me to be thoughtful about the evidence I needed to provide. It was also in these months before preparing my materials that Onowa, who had applied for tenure the previous year, shared her package with me and provided some guidance about the process. I have such gratitude for her generosity and mentorship. Through our discussions, it became clear that I would have to tell the story of my work to make it possible for the committee to understand the ways in which I had met the criteria.

Onowa

I am not like most of the jury of my peers, by whom I was ultimately to be judged, because the essence of who I am comes from a different time and place. My homeland (far away in Treaty 5 and 6—overlapping Northern Manitoba and Saskatchewan) runs thick in my veins and I find commonality and comfort in the similarities of worldview with the peoples whose land I visit, those of the SENĆOŦEN and Lkwungen speaking peoples on southern Vancouver Island. My first responsibility is to the community, both my own and those I serve, to listen to what they need and to use the privilege I have gained by being inside an institution we were not allowed into until the 1960s, to create spaces and programs that serve our people. Following this, the privilege of being a scholar is to participate in knowledge creation. Most of this also happens alongside and within Indigenous community, those who are also sophisticated research partners. I define partnership as "each contributing their talents, knowledge, and curiosities to the research agenda and process." The ultimate judgment, however, of your trajectory and worth as a scholar, is offered by a group of individuals who largely hold a different worldview, who make the rules of what counts and then unilaterally decide if you are worthy of staying in the academy. This creates a massive challenge for Indigenous scholars, in capturing, presenting, and promoting our work for what it is, as well as honouring our collective experiences within communities in a highly individualized process, while fearing that it will be either misunderstood or dismissed as unimportant—or both. Most Indigenous scholars hold a collective worldview, where their work comes from a place of service and responsibility to community and society. In addition, many of us have cultural teachings that are in direct conflict with the promotional nature of putting together a tenure and promotion package that is focused on the individual and our achievements. Oftentimes in community, this

kind of accolade can actually only be offered by others and not by the person themselves. Also, in a traditional Indigenous education, there is much more emphasis on the journey itself and less on the outcome. The experiences of learning, absorbing, learning some more, integrating that learning, and then being held up by your community when they feel you are ready for a certain job, task, or duty is a high honour, but not one that you would normally self-nominate. Antone and Dawson (2014) explain that for Indigenous faculty members, "almost every aspect of the process may be alienating and contrary to [our] belief systems" (p. 287).

Antone and Dawson (2014) also describe the difficulty of including an understanding of who we are as Indigenous people, a cultural foundation foreign to that of our tenure packages. One of the stories and experiences Antone and Dawson share is about a smudge ceremony held at the institution (with great difficulty). For me, the early realization of not being able to smudge my office when I first moved in, an important spiritual practice for me whenever occupying new space, was the first clash I felt that I could not bring or be my whole self in to this place. (The reason it was not permitted is because of the smoke produced from the burning of traditional medicines, even with the door closed and windows open, and the few minutes that it lasts. What is an essential and sacred cleansing ritual for me is considered a health hazard for others.)[2]

Because I was concerned the committee may not be able to fully judge my portfolio due to lack of similarity in scholarly background, early in my tenure process I requested that an Indigenous scholar to be added to my committee. From some of the comments in the letter I received, I believe it helped the committee better understand me as a scholar. The committee's comments were often complimentary and fair; however, the cultural bias towards certain kinds of representation of scholarship remained apparent (despite the perhaps lone voice). One example of this was the committee members disapproving of the kinds of Indigenous-focused and open access journals I had chosen to publish in. They recommended a more direct aim towards leading journals at the next stage of my career. In addition, the committee commented in my letter on the quantity of co-authored publications I had (an important approach in relational knowledge building and mentorship work) but more troubling was that "the committee ha[d] some concerns about how [my] scholarship was presented." They had complimented how well

put together my package was, leaving me to interpret the meaning of this statement. I was surprised at how strongly I reacted to this comment. While I was alone in my office, the atmosphere in which we receive most feedback, I felt my face flush at the reminders of the European-worldview privilege in our workplace and how difficult it is to stay true to who we are as Indigenous peoples, and to meet the expectations of our families, extended families, and communities, while also adhering to the rules and expectations of this other world.

What Has Changed?

Trish

Konelīne—beautiful place—is how the Tahltan describe their territory. It's true. This place in northern British Columbia, with its rivers, mountains, forests, and wildlife, is breathtaking. It is also a long ways from Victoria. When I teach in the Tahltan territory, it takes me two days to get there and two days to return to Victoria. I make arrangements for childcare, schedule other work to accommodate my time away, and pack my suitcase with textbooks, program materials, and teaching supplies. I fly from Victoria to Terrace, Smithers, or Whitehorse. From any of these airports, it is a seven to eight hour drive through the mountains into Dease Lake where the program in Indigenous language revitalization is being delivered in partnership with the Tahltan Central Government. If our schedules align, I make the drive into Dease Lake with another instructor or the program coordinator. Before heading out, we pick up groceries for the program and sometimes prescriptions or other items that students and Elders have requested.

Teaching in this community-based program is a privilege and a rich experience. The courses I teach are well supported by the community and fluent Elder speakers. The local college provides us with classroom space, the school with access to a kitchen for hands on language learning, and community members generously host us in their camps for on-the-land immersion. The students actively give back to community through course projects and their work in the immersion preschools and school classes. To teach and learn well in this setting requires that we engage with community and with this beautiful place beyond the course syllabus. Community engaged work is not unique to me or to our language program; it is an approach that is common, and is perhaps required for Indigenous scholars. In conversation with Tahltan academic Edōsdi/Judy Thompson, we spoke about how community work plays a vital role in who we are

as Indigenous scholars. Speaking about the importance of language, Patricia Louie, one of the Tahltan students, has said, "I think our language and our culture is what makes us unique, it's what makes each nation strong. And if we don't have it, then we're just, we're just like everybody else" (Edōsdi/Thompson & Bourquin, 2016). Edōsdi and I recognized how this might parallel the importance of community-engaged work for Indigenous scholars, without it, we're just like everybody else.

When I think about achieving tenure and promotion and what it means for the communities I work with, I see an interesting dynamic. In the same way that community-engaged scholarship may be invisible to tenure and promotion committees, the tenure and promotion process is often invisible to the community members. The way in which my publications, research, service, and teaching are evaluated by the institution is mostly unknown to the communities. Indeed with my own community, when my university commitments keep me away from language and cultural activities, I worry that I might be viewed as too busy—not a characteristic I value.

I had expected that putting some things on hold, particularly learning and teaching my own language, Kwak'wala, was a temporary situation while I focused on meeting tenure and promotion criteria. Here I am, five months after the effective date of my tenure and promotion to associate professor, and I am still struggling to keep up with my workload. Because I applied a year early, I have yet to take a study leave since beginning my tenure-track position. Perhaps my upcoming study leave will be when I feel a break from the focused push to meet expectations, and I will be able to get back to Kwak'wala research, learning, and teaching.

While achievement of tenure might not be very visible to our community partners, it does bring stability to the work. Having tenured faculty strengthens the capacity of the unit to respond to community direction. I see this appointment not only as an acknowledgement of my work, but more importantly, as an acknowledgement and investment in the work of language revitalization. As a new and developing area of scholarship, each new tenured faculty member in language revitalization builds the profile of this field.

Onowa

As I was both late—having been in a faculty position for eight years when I put my package forward for consideration—and early—because only four of those years were in a tenure-track position, like

Trish—it has meant a one-year delay in waiting for my (post-tenure) study leave to begin. This made what was already a one-year long process (from the time you put in your package until your official transition to being officially tenured) into a two-year process of waiting for the reward of a one-year study leave. Sometimes people asked me, "How does it feel now to finally have tenure and promotion behind you?" When I could answer honestly, I would often say, "anti-climactic." Eight years is a long time in a position, and even one year is a long time for a promotion process (while the standard for our profession); then waiting an additional year for study leave to begin was harder still. I do not regret going up early (year four rather than year five), as I was ready to test the system and myself, but it would have been more celebratory to have been able to go on study leave at the end of the tenure process, as is normally intended. A (slight) caution about going up early.

A few surprises awaited me in the post-tenure year. One is that I falsely believed I would have more time for research, reading, and writing because that big focus and push for tenure was out of the way. Instead, you start doing all the others things you have been putting off—it is remarkable how quickly the rest of your life piles up and gets disordered when you neglect every other thing. I cleared out crammed closets in my home that would barely close, and reconnected with my children. I started to purge duplicated and volatile electronic filing systems that made no sense. I cleared out years of old paper files and dusted! I agreed to supervise more graduate students, as my tenure letter had suggested—a lot more. I agreed to a new leadership role in my department, as Graduate Advisor, plus more committees and service commitments. Why, I ask myself now? I was already doing a lot along the road to tenure! But suddenly you think, "well, now I can do more!" and it seems that everyone else has this expectation too. What I wasn't doing more of was reading, writing, and completing my research project(s). In fact, it seemed, I was doing less scholarly work than before I went up for tenure because during that time you are so driven. This seemed a ridiculous trend, and it is one I have not yet figured out how to fully reverse—even now on study leave.

I guess what people expect you to say when they ask you about tenure is that you are relieved to have job security, and of course that it true. But it is deeper than that, as it is also peer recognition that you *are* a real scholar and that your work is worthy of a lifelong

investment and deeper exploration. That is an amazing feeling, and an honour that I will be forever grateful to have received. Perhaps more importantly though, as Trish has stated, it brings stability and greater strength to our field of study, as we recognize that there are still too few Indigenous scholars taking on the role of professor, particularly in the discipline of Indigenous language revitalization.

What Needs to Change?

Trish

I went through the tenure process when Indigenous education was a small unit within another department. Having recently become our own department, we are in an excellent position to develop policies and procedures that will serve Indigenous scholars well. However, all departments have the opportunity to consider how their appointment, tenure, and promotion policies and practices can be changed to advance the success of Indigenous scholars within the academy. Giving consideration to the ways of knowing and being that are important to Indigenous scholarship and to the needs of the communities we work with can build a stronger and more responsive academy.

Considering what counts for tenure decisions is a good place to begin. I agree that publications are an important part of my scholarship and are one way that I meet the responsibility to the field of ILR. I appreciated that the year I went up for tenure and promotion, the department had established a clear minimum number of expected publications. I thought I had gone beyond that threshold, but I was surprised to learn that some of the writing I judged to have the most impact was not counted toward this total. Two of these pieces were not counted because they were chapters in a book that was not considered to be peer-reviewed. However, the co-editors of this book are highly regarded senior Indigenous scholars in Canada and I believed that contributing to this text was meaningful in the field of Indigenous education. I had enough other publications, however, so there was not much of a consequence to having these chapters disallowed. What concerns me is that the way impact is perceived and measured by tenure and promotion committees may discourage and limit tenure-track scholars from publishing in the places that have the most impact in the intended community of practice.

I would also like to see some changes to how community-engaged scholarship is weighted for tenure and promotion decisions.

The department I was in has policy that describes community-engaged scholarship, which is a good start. This policy invited me to tell the story of my community-engaged work that might otherwise be invisible to the committee. However, it is not clear to me what has shifted in the other expectations to make up for the time that I dedicate to community-engagement activities. It would be helpful to tenure-track faculty and committees to have clear criteria about how community work is considered as part of a scholarly agenda. My hope is that as a new department, we will find ways to value community work by shifting, rather than adding to, expectations.

Onowa

Indigenous scholars are almost always the minority within larger departments or other configurations, and so both the policies and committee make-up then are based on a foreign worldview. Having more Indigenous-led and Indigenous-centred academic units, where we can be the majority and not the minority, and develop our own policies and standards from our own worldviews, is necessary for significant change. Further to this, we need considerably more Indigenous leadership within academic institutions at the decanal, vice-president, and presidential levels. Encouraging and promoting more Indigenous leadership in vital positions throughout the academy would do more than many of the current recruitment and retention processes we have today, encouraging and supporting Indigenous success in the academy at all levels, including moving through the professorial ranks.

Increasingly, academic units are adding community-based and Indigenous scholarship policies to their tenure and promotion processes. This was not in place when I went through, but it was the following year (when Trish went through). However, we both wondered how seriously it was taken up by the committee, since even in the policy, it was a fourth category. We got the sense it was taken as a nice-to-have and bonus material, but only if you fully met the standard criteria first in the three traditional sections (i.e. not genuinely integrated). It moved us to discuss our desire for future scholars to have a more meaningful experience with this policy and for committees to receive support for this shift to fully implement this kind of scholarship and its evidence as equal. We have since been so fortunate to be a part of creating our own Indigenous Education department and will have the opportunity to be a part of this kind of policy creation and implementation in a majority Indigenous environment.

Finally, in contemplating what needs to change, from what I learned in the process of going up for tenure and promotion and the reaction I had to my committee letter, I sincerely believe we have to let go of so much counting and find a way to view tenure portfolios more holistically (a view shared by Antone & Dawson, 2014). There are 36 numerical references in my five-page letter, not including grant dollar amounts or the years that I was involved in various initiatives. The 'counting' was about courses taught, number of sections, teaching scores, averages, anomalies, numbers of graduate students completed, defenses chaired, students withdrawn, summation of articles, book chapters and reports, presentations, keynotes, awards, number of grants, committees served, and reviews performed by category type. Summarized at the end of each section simply as "she has met the standard." Overall, I found this letter, which was essentially the committee's interpretation and summary of my life's work to this point, disheartening.

I often say to colleagues when discussing this, it seems to me that the tenure and promotion system has lost the plot. The questions I think we should be asking ourselves are: Is this person showing promise as a scholar? If a community-based scholar, are they engaging with community? Are they writing grants? Are they creating or co-creating knowledge and finding important ways to share that knowledge—to both broad audiences and academics? Is there a trajectory of creative, useful engagement, and does the future for this person look promising? Are they making a difference in the lives of students? Are they engaging in the life of the academy and community? If one can answer yes to most of these questions, then they are probably ready to be confirmed with tenure so they can keep doing their good work. I sincerely hope we can all find a way to regain focus and purpose with tenure and promotion processes and focus more holistically on each faculty member's contributions and trajectories in the future.

Reciprocity

Trish

I am grateful to the mentors and advocates who supported my tenure and promotion process. I am especially grateful for the fellowship of other Indigenous scholars. The institution can misunderstand my community work, the communities can be unaware of academic

requirements I have to meet, and while my family supports me in many ways, they have little knowledge of the complexities of the tenure-track professor role. It really is other Indigenous scholars who understand what it means to be an Indigenous scholar in the academy. My intention is to give back by offering support to others, both to individual scholars and to influence change from within the system. At this time, there are still too few Indigenous scholars to take up the roles in ILR in the academy. Supporting new scholars to pursue and be successful in tenure-track roles makes a contribution to the Indigenization of the academy, the strength of the ILR field, and expands my own circle of collaboration.

A very helpful gesture from others has been the invitation to collaborate in research and writing projects. I value collaborative approaches to scholarship and believe this aligns with Indigenous ways of knowing. Working together serves as a meaningful form of mentorship. Through collaborative relationships with experienced scholars I have learned much about research, writing, and publishing. Besides the opportunity to learn together, the commitment made to others when co-writing is a good motivator to get the work done. Since publications are an important criterion in the awarding of tenure, writing together can be especially supportive to new scholars.

I came into my academic journey aware of the importance of privileging the voices of Indigenous scholars in my writing, as well as acknowledging those who have influenced and made space for my scholarship. From my mentors, I have learned the value of including the work of new scholars in my writing. I am appreciative of others who reference my writing in their own publications and courses. We have the opportunity to hold each other up by how we access and share each other's work. Cherokee scholar Daniel Heath Justice advocates for ethical citation practices and reminds us of the importance of broadening the inclusion of diverse voices. Justice's hope for his own text is "meaningful, expansive, and transformative inclusivity" (2018, p. 242). Inclusion of Indigenous voice by referencing both established and new Indigenous scholars is an act of reciprocity that can make positive change for both individuals and the academy.

Onowa

This chapter would be incomplete without an acknowledgement of the many people who offered useful advice and encouragement throughout this tenure process, and really, over the eight years

leading up to it. Some of these experiences were just one conversation, while others are multi-year enduring friendships and collegial partnerships, but all had a place in the journey. Besides some of the confusing administrative processes and contradictory advice I received early on in my career, the majority of colleagues were generous and kind. Many shared both their physical packages, stories of their journey, and meaningful encouragement. Without these people, this process would have been lonelier, more frustrating, and more uncomfortable. Together with my family and community, these people helped me to stand tall, and maintain the courage to represent myself the way I knew I needed to.

According to Kirkness and Barnhardt's (1991) principles of Indigenous scholarship the responsibility of reciprocity now falls to scholars like Trish and me to provide meaningful and beneficial mentorship to incoming and junior colleagues. I accept the responsibility to check in with people and offer myself to help in the ways I can—to decipher and interpret, advocate when necessary and appropriate, and be encouraging while people are finding their way. We all do this with our graduate students, but new and incoming faculty also need mentorship, supports, and guidance. I remember feeling the transition from doctoral completion to navigating the road to tenure as somewhat abrupt and without many indicators as to whether I was on the right path.

Styres et al. (2010) remind us that "currently, the representation of Aboriginal PhDs in academia is deficient" (p. 629). This is not only due to the barring of Indigenous people from universities until the 1960s and the substandard education received in residential and day schools, although these are important factors. There are contemporary factors for this modern-day phenomenon as well. As Indigenous authors in an edited volume by Mihesuah and Wilson (2004) have theorized, we must continue changing the academy. We cannot simply make room for Indigenous people anymore, but rather we must create leadership positions, autonomous and majority Indigenous spaces, genuine and true partnerships, and Indigenous-led and Indigenous-created policies to genuinely change the way academic business is done. Within universities, Indigenous people must see space to bring their worldview and cultural and spiritual lens with them into the buildings, classrooms, their research projects, their writing and other forms of their scholarship, as well as into leadership roles.

Conclusion

A senior administrator once told Onowa, after examining her curriculum vitae, which that person judged as being too service focused and therefore not scholarly enough, "I think you are ambivalent about being a scholar" (see McIvor, Rodríguez de France, & Rosborough, 2017). Yet, as Antone and Dawson affirm, "teaching, learning and research are often inseparable in community contexts" (2014, p. 299). Simply put, universities need to learn what is valued by Indigenous peoples and the communities they serve. Styres et al. (2010) remind us that the experience of "walking in two worlds" and "creating ethical space" for research

> is sacred, spiritual, engaging, ambiguous, and challenging. It will simultaneously bring us to our knees in humility and raise us up to new heights of understanding and awareness in creating collaborative knowledge systems no longer based on colonialist notions of domination, power, control, and usury, but rather on mutuality, egalitarianism, shared knowledge, and a new way of relating. (pp. 645–646)

While the experience Onowa had with a person in a power-over position unsettled her, it ultimately led her to rise up to new heights. Rather than change herself to better conform, it pushed her to articulate her Indigenous-led and focused scholarship in a way that she had to trust the committee would understand. While Trish did not share this experience, she learned from the experiences Onowa had—both by questioning if her contributions as well as her collaborative and community-focused efforts would be seen as scholarly (enough) and then used these warnings to form robust arguments for her scholarship to stand firmly on its own.

ekosi / he'ą̄m (that is It)

It is a tremendous privilege to be given the opportunity to tell our stories. It is our shared hope that our stories may be helpful to others going through this process, as well as for those supporting or leading processes like these. To that end, we have offered our advice on changes that could be made in departments and university policies to assist Indigenous scholars' further success in advancing through the

academy. Some of these offerings are perhaps not necessarily specific to Indigenous scholars and may benefit others as well.

Antone and Dawson (2014, p. 307) encourage us to "live our responsibility"—the same responsibility we believe that Kirkness and Barnhardt (1991) promote. It is through writings, such as this chapter, that express Indigenous voices and methods of presenting as scholarly, along with (and of equal importance) the way we conduct ourselves each day with our students, with colleagues, and in community that we hope we have offered some new knowledge and encouragement to emerging Indigenous scholars—those to whom we are now responsible.

Endnotes

1 Defined as a "supportive association with another person or group, specifically, members of a marginalized of mistreated group to which one does not belong" (www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/allyship). For further information, see http://www.guidetoallyship.com/

2 Years later, when the First People's House was built, they allowed for smudging in the building at any time, and we can now "notify" our Dean's office as well as Facilities Management and are allowed to smudge in our offices with 72 hours' notice.

References

Absolon, K. E. (2011). *Kaandossiwin: How we come to know*. Black Point, NS: Fernwood Publishing.

Alfred, T. (1999). *Peace, power and righteousness: An Indigenous manifesto*. Don Mills, ON: Oxford University Press.

Alfred, T. (2005). *Wasáse: Indigenous pathways of action and freedom*. Peterborough, ON: Broadview Press.

Antone, E., & Dawson, T. (2014). "But how do I put this dream catcher into my teaching dossier?" Learnings and teaching from one faculty member's tenure experience of documenting community-based teaching and learning. In C. Etmanski, B. L. Hall, & T. Dawson (Eds.), *Learning and teaching community-based research: Linking pedagogy to practice* (pp. 287–307). Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.

Archibald, J. A. (2008). *Indigenous storywork: Educating the heart, mind, body, and spirit*. Vancouver, BC: University of British Columbia Press.

Edōsdi/Thompson, J. C., Bourquin, M. (Producers), & Bourquin, M. (Director). (2016). *Dah Dzāhge Nodeṣidē: We are speaking our language again*. [Motion picture]. Canada: Tahltan Central Government. Retrieved from https://vimeo.com/217095185

Ellis, C. (2009). *Revision: Autoethnographic reflections on life and work*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

Jaime, A. (2008). Native women: Decolonization and transcendence of identity. *International Journal of Multicultural Education*, *10*(2). https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.18251/ijme.v10i2.119

Justice, D. H. (2018). *Why Indigenous literatures matter*. Waterloo, ON: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.

Kirkness, V. & Barnhardt, R. (1991). First Nations and higher education: The four Rs- respect, relevance, reciprocity, responsibility. *Journal of American Indian Education*, *30*(3), 1–15.

McIvor, O. (2010). I am my subject: Blending Indigenous research methodology and autoethnography through integrity-based, spirit-based research. *Canadian Journal of Native Education*, *33*(1), 137–155. Retrieved from https://search-proquest-com.ezproxy.library.uvic.ca/docview/864885228?pq-origsite=summon&accountid=14846

McIvor, O. (2012). *îkakwiy nîhiyawiyân: I am learning [to be] Cree* (Doctoral dissertation, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC, Canada). Retrieved from https://open.library.ubc.ca/cIRcle/collections/ubctheses

McIvor, O., Rodríguez de France, M. D. C., & Rosborough, T. (2017). I think you are ambivalent: The realities of Indigenous scholarship in mainstream universities. In T. Sibbald & V. Handford (Eds.), *The academic gateway: Understanding the journey to tenure* (pp. 93–110). Ottawa, ON: University of Ottawa Press.

Mihesuah, D., & Wilson, A. C. (Eds.). (2004). *Indigenizing the academy: Transforming scholarship and empowering communities*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

Nanibush, W. (2014). An interview with Rebecca Belmore. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, *3*(1), 213–217. Retrieved from https://jps.library.utoronto.ca/index.php/des/article/view/21311/17377

Rosborough, T. P. (2012). *Ḵ̓a̱nge̱xtola sewn-on-top: Kwak'wala revitalization and being Indigenous* (Doctoral dissertation, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC, Canada). Retrieved from https://open.library.ubc.ca/cIRcle/collections/ubctheses

Rosborough, T. P., & Rorick, čuucqa L. (2017). Following in the footsteps of the wolf: Connecting scholarly minds to ancestors in Indigenous language revitalization. *AlterNative: An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples*, *13*(1), 11–17. https://doi.org/10.1177/1177180116689031

Styres, S., Zinga, D., Bennett, S., & Bomberry, M. (2010). Walking in two worlds: Engaging the space between Indigenous community and academia. *Canadian Journal of Education*, *33*(3), 617–648. https://doi.org/10.2307/canajeducrevucan.33.3.617

Wilson, S. (2008). *Research is ceremony: Indigenous research methods*. Black Point, NS: Fernwood Publishing.