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Covering 15 years of research (2000–2015), this scan seeks to identify, highlight, and outline educational and social programs and interventions that address the needs of American Indian and Alaska Native boys and men, ages 12 to 25, guided by the following questions: What specific interventions for Native boys and men have been developed? In what places have these occurred? What are the guiding principles and practices in these interventions that have led to increased personal and academic achievement?

This report begins by grounding this work in the histories and contexts of Indigenous men and boys and includes an assessment of what is known about their current status. This is followed by our methodological approach and processes. The report then presents our findings and conclusions and extends them to synthesized principles and practices that have emerged through the field scan. Finally, we conclude with recommendations.
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Introduction

The story of American Indian boys and men in academic fields is one of perceived dysfunction, "at-risk" descriptors, substance abuse, partner abuse, poor health, and low educational achievement. By many indicators and social markers, a large majority of Indigenous boys and men are struggling. But, as some are fond of saying, the devil is in the details. The available data tell a grim story about the past and present, but the "real story" of how American Indian boys and men are faring in the world is not fully told.

Without discounting statistics, our fundamental point is that anyone interested in this work needs to have more systematic, structural data to get the full, complex, nuanced picture of what is happening. Data on American Indians in the US Department of Education, Health and Human Services, Interior, and Justice are sparse at best. We have, in the words of Shotton, Lowe, and Waterman (2013) been relegated to “an asterisk.” The message to many of us is clear: American Indians, Alaska Natives, and Native Hawaiians (who are too often buried in the Asian Pacific Islander category, making them invisible as an Indigenous population in the United States) have been rendered “insignificant” as a result of this asterisk. Both the data neglect and the analytical dynamic producing invisibility perpetuates inequities that are at best unintended and, in moving forward, are unacceptable due to their contribution to the erosion of Indigenous sovereignty.

Data may have diminished the presence of Indigenous peoples, but the legal and political relationship between American Indians, Alaska Natives, and Native Hawaiians highlights the importance of recognizing and remediing this treatment. First, the US government and tribal nations have a unique relationship. American Indians are mentioned twice in the US Constitution. The "Commerce Clause" (Article I, Section VIII) notes that, “Congress shall have the power to regulate Commerce with foreign nations and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.” The significance of this is profound. In establishing the powers of Congress, it places Indigenous peoples in a political, governmental relationship with the United States. When writing the Constitution, the United States was a fledgling country and needed relationships with tribal nations in order to be seen as legitimate (Alfred 2001; Barker 2005). One only needed to examine some of the early treaties to see how this took shape. Rebecca Tosiie (2005) explores the myths surrounding Native peoples as pliant, obedient peoples who were wards of the state, countering that treaties themselves are indicative of a government-to-government relationship:

The first treaties between the U.S. and the Native Nations tell that story, such as the 1778 Treaty of Ft. Pitt with the Delaware Nation, in which the U.S. officials begged the Delaware leaders to have "safe passage" through "their country" and also begged for military assistance from Delaware warriors against the evil King of England. Who were the “Americans” at that time? Did they think they had the "right" to claim title to Native land? NO. Did they think they had the right to disinter Native remains and cart them off to museums and laboratories? No. Did they think that they had the right to unilaterally command the Delawares to obey their laws? NO, no, and no (44).

Tribal nations, and their citizens, were prominent parts of the national conversation. We believe that they should be again and in ways that reach for Indigenous well-being and thriving.

Early relationships between the United States and tribal nations became less respectful as the United States expanded its territory and authority through the Supreme Court, most notably in a series of cases known as "the Marshall Trilogy." Tribal nations went from treaty partners to “domestic dependent nations” whose “relation to the United States resembles that of a ward to his guardian.” (Cherokee Nation, 30 US (5 Pet.) at 17). This legal view of wardship grew into a trust relationship and its concomitant trust responsibility (Wilkins & Lomawaima 2001). The relationship essentially notes that the US government, through these cases and the hundreds of treaties, is responsible for maintaining the health, education, and general welfare of the original inhabitants of the United States. On this count, and many others, the government has failed.

1 The Trilogy consists of Johnson v. M’Intosh, 21 U.S. @ Wheat. 543 (1823), Cherokee Nation v. Georgia, 30 U.S. (5 Pet.) 1 (1831), and Worcester v. Georgia, 31 U.S. (6 Pet.) 515 (1832), all with opinions written by Chief Justice John Marshall—hence Marshall Trilogy. In Johnson, Marshall defined the status of Indigenous lands by establishing that native peoples held only a right of occupancy; or "Indian title," over land that could only be extinguished "by purchase or by conquest" of the United States or a European sovereign—not by private sale. Nearly ten years later, Cherokee Nation established that tribal nations are distinct political entities, but not considered "foreign." Instead, Marshall asserted that tribes are "domestic dependent nations" in a "state of pupilage" that instead resembles the relationship of "a ward to his guardian;” 30 U.S. (5 Pet.) at 17. Finally in Worcester, Marshall recognized the sovereignty of tribal nations, finding that states like Georgia could not take jurisdiction or make laws concerning Cherokee Lands; only the federal government has such power.

2 It is important to note here that by some estimates, tribal nations ceded as much as two billion acres of land in signing approximately 371 treaties. These treaties are agreements between equals and ratified by Congress. The agreements did a number of things, including creating reservations and making commitments from the federal government to tribal nations for the overall health, education, and general welfare of tribal nations. These documents may have been contested: some were violently enforced, and none of the treaties have been fulfilled by the federal government. Indeed, the current standoff between Lakota and Dakota peoples and the North Dakota Pipeline is rooted in agreements made (and broken) in 1868.
Following the above point, it occurs to us that the federal government should have a policy of understanding what is happening with American Indian peoples. How can the United States fulfill its responsibility to tribal peoples if it regularly marks them with an asterisk (with verbiage that loosely translates to statistical insignificance) and doing nothing to correct the status of the data? It is both irresponsible and unethical under the terms of the relationship. One could logically remove the “statistically” from “statistically insignificant” and read into the term that American Indians/Alaska Natives are simply insignificant. Foreshadowing one of our recommendations at the end of this report, the United States government must begin to oversample in its data collections so that researchers can establish some baseline data to establish mapping trends in the areas of health (both mental and physical), education (in terms of achievement and development), justice-related issues (including incarceration rates, violence), labor, land, and economic markers.

Finally, not fully understanding the experiences of an increasing segment of the population (American Indian/Alaska Native peoples now comprise 5.2 million of the US population) is puzzling. Simply erasing people from having any statistical significance fails to honor the original agreements between American Indians and the federal government and indeed contributes to a legacy of violence against Native peoples.

One of the primary goals of this report is to simply say, researchers, local, state, and federal governments, and society at large have a moral obligation to see American Indian and Alaska Native peoples as present, viable members of societies and nations.

Given this long history that removed (literally and metaphorically) Native peoples from the land as well as larger conversations and accountability around health, education, economics, and other markers of welfare, we want to turn to more specific questions of educational achievement. For Indigenous leaders, achievement in education is critical in beginning to redress the varied and systemic inequities impacting Native communities nationally. Positive education outcomes are important as they have the potential for enhanced social, political, and economic success—not only for the American Indian individuals but also for their tribal nations and communities. For many tribal communities, success is seen as a collective, shared, iterative, and interdependent among the nation and its members. In that sense, success for American Indians is reciprocal. That is, success of the individual is considered success for the community and vice versa. Tragically, the success and capacity for American Indian communities have been severely hampered by the systemic legacy of colonization and forced assimilation that have created an environment wherein American Indians and Alaska Natives are more likely to experience disparate social, economic, and life conditions. For example, American Indians experience higher rates of suicidality, cardiovascular disease, cancer, diabetes, and depressed mortality. These occurrences contribute to the average life expectancy of American Indians and Alaska Natives being roughly 4.4 years less than the US all races population (Indian Health Service 2016). Lower life expectancy among American Indians is not an isolated occurrence but rather is indicative of generally negative trends impacting American Indian communities.

Death statistics are reported higher within Native American communities than all others in respect to death from tuberculosis (600 percent higher), alcoholism (510 percent higher), and diabetes (152 percent higher) (NCAI 2012). Violence is prevalent amongst American Indian communities. For instance, AI/AN women are 2.5 times more likely to be sexually assaulted than any other race (NIEA 2014), and aggravated assault in AI/AN communities is roughly twice the national average (NCAI 2012). Additionally, there is a substantial dependency on alcohol and illicit drug use within NA/Al communities, resulting in AI/AN being more likely than other groups to require treatment for alcohol or illicit drugs (NCAI 2012). Substance abuse is also heavily prevalent among American Indian youth populations. For instance, it is reported that Natives aged 15 to 24 who were admitted to treatment facilities reported higher rates (69 percent) of alcoholism than non-AI/AN admissions (45 percent) (NCAI 2012).

In addition to lower life expectancy stemming from alcoholism, substance abuse, and health inequities, rates of suicide among American Indians are especially devastating American Indian communities. This is particularly stark for American Indian youth, who have the highest rate of suicide among all racial groups in the United States (CDC 2014). Suicide is the second-leading cause of death for Native youth aged 15 to 24 years old (NCAI 2012). The rates of suicide stemming from 15- to 24-year-olds represent 40 percent of all suicide in the AI/AN community (Carmona 2005). This is especially alarming to the overall health and well-being of

---

1 According to the 2010 Census, this is the inclusive number; that is, individuals claimed to have at least part of their ethnic heritage as American Indian/Alaska Native. Almost three million people claimed American Indian/Alaska Native as a sole identity.
American Indian communities, as the age range most afflicted by suicide comprises one of the largest segments of the American Indian population. Specifically, youth under the age of 18 constitute 32 percent of the total AI/AN population (NCAI 2012). These statistics are devastating and are compounded by a lack of access to effective educational opportunities.

Educational disparities persist throughout all age ranges for American Indians and Alaska Native students, beginning as early as kindergarten. Native kindergarten students are twice as likely as their white peers to be held back. There is a gap in national and AI/AN test scores, particularly in mathematics. Only 22 percent of fourth grade Native students score "proficient" or "advanced" levels in math (NIEA, n.d.). The number is even lower in eighth grade, where the percentage of Native students who score "proficient" or "advanced" levels in math is 17 percent. Another disparity exists in the labeling and diagnosis of students based on perceived educational level. AI/AN students are more likely to be mislabeled as special education (SPED) students (NIEA n.d., 26). When considering the level of academic achievement, living and school resource conditions should be considered, rather than individual intelligence or effort. For example, Native students who often live in rural areas may travel distances up to 320 miles to attend classes. In addition, only 40 percent of BIE schools have adequate digital broadband access (NIEA n.d.). At this point, it should be clear that this is less about individual notions of achievement and more about the structural and systemic inequities faced by large groups of people.

Graduation rates among Native students portray the issue of retention and completion. The high school graduation rate of AI/ANs is 67 percent, the lowest of any racial/ethnic demographic group across all schools (Executive Office of the President 2014; NCES 2016). An especially grim possibility faces the 48,000 students, or 7 percent of the overall AI/AN K–12 population, who attend Bureau of Indian Education (BIE) schools (NIEA n.d.; NCES 2012). The Department of Education found that BIE schools have a 53 percent graduation rate, lower than the 80 percent national average (Executive Office of the President 2014). In fact, 22 percent of AI/AN who are 25 years old and up have not completed high school (NCES 2016; NIEA n.d.). In part, this is due to the disparate rates of school punishment American Indians are exposed to inside the classroom. It is estimated that American Indians comprise roughly 1 percent of the student population yet represent 2 percent of school arrests and 3 percent of referrals to law enforcement (US Department of Education 2014). This disparity in education completion is compounded by the fact that native youth are 1.5 times more likely than their white counterparts to be incarcerated and subsequently transitioned into the adult criminal system (NIEA n.d.).

In postsecondary education, AI/ANs are at another disadvantage when compared to non-AI/AN groups. Only 13 percent of American Indians and Alaska Natives earn bachelor’s degrees compared to 29 percent in the general population (Executive Office of the President,2014; NCES 2016). Additionally, AI/ANs receive graduate or professional degrees at half the rate of the general population, at five percent (NCAI 2012). Despite this gap in rates, the amount of AI/AN enrolled in colleges and universities has increased more than twice in the past 30 years (NCAI 2012). Low attainment of postsecondary education is partially due to the ill-equipped nature of colleges. For Indigenous peoples who do graduate onto college, many do not have the proper mentorship to progress throughout their college careers successfully (Executive Office of the President 2014).

Indigenous communities simultaneously face the highest unemployment rates across the nation (as high as 90 percent on some reservations) as well as elevated rates of poverty (Brayboy et al. 2012). In 2012, for example, 29.1 percent of AI/ANs (alone) lived in poverty—the highest rate of any race group—compared to 15.9 percent for the entire nation (American Community Survey, 2012). Although Native women/girls tend to fare better in educational attainment, native boys and men lag far behind their Native and non-Native counterparts, as evidenced in the following table.

---

When it comes to education, Indigenous peoples experience (a) heightened instances of discrimination and racism in school settings, (b) low college enrollment, and (c) suppressed graduation rates at the secondary and postsecondary level when compared to other racial/ethnic populations (Brayboy et al. 2012). When we begin to explore reasons impeding upon Native educational attainment levels, research has found heightened instances of discrimination and racism both in and out of school settings (Office of Civil Rights 2003; National Congress of American Indians 2016). Some of this is tied to structural issues of funding and lack thereof, but there appears to be some connections to historical trauma (e.g., Brave Heart 2004; Walters & Simoni 2002; Walters et al. 2002; Whitbeck et al. 2004).

Particularly among Native men and boys, feelings of isolation, confusion, and despair, connected to loss of cultural identity and the presence of historic trauma negatively influence their experiences (Hale Mua interview). Fortunately, Indigenous scholars, allies, and community leaders are actively working against negative and damaging institutional and structural attitudes and practices (Brayboy 2005; Brave Heart & DeBruyn 1998; Walters & Simoni 2002). They seek to turn the tide by creating community and academic programs that are educationally and culturally responsive. Such programs and initiatives assert Native peoples by framing their practice using a strengths-based philosophy. That is, these programs seek to identify what is working well for Indigenous peoples as well as community members and elders who embody important cultural skills and knowledges for various life stages of Indigenous males: youth, warrior, man, father, grandfather, and elder (Hale Mua Interview).

Strengths-based initiatives are those that focus on the promises and possibilities of people, their communities, and their homelands. They seek to build on the (often) cultural strengths of peoples. These include the inclusion of cultural belief systems, ways of knowing, and routine practices in everyday life that guide how people engage the world. For example, the strengths of many Indigenous peoples is the collective and interdependent nature of engaging and being engaged by the world. A strengths-based approach would draw on the collective, with an eye toward creating a community of interdependent learners to address challenges. A strengths-based approach can also see the wisdom in intergenerational exchanges of knowledge that produce toward culturally and linguistically vibrant communities that are also growing and responsive to the needs and opportunities in the present. Further, strengths-based initiatives often focus on developing interventions that enhance and extend the capacity of communities to address persistent structural inequities, thus contributing to long-term sustainable solutions. For Indigenous peoples, this means that strengths-based approaches often contribute to enhancing tribal peoples’ capacity to defend and grow self-determination and sovereignty so that their communities can thrive.

### Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICATOR OF HIGHER EDUCATION ACCESS AND PERSISTENCE</th>
<th>ALL STUDENTS</th>
<th>WHITE STUDENTS</th>
<th>AI/AN STUDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>MALE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Took any May 2010 AP exam, with a score of 3 or greater</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004 high school seniors who applied to college by 2006</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Took the 2011 ACT and met or exceeded college readiness scores in four subjects (English, Math, Reading, Science)</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Started at a 4-year institution in 2004, completed a bachelor’s degree within 6 years</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students who earned a STEM bachelor’s degree in 2010</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: *AI/AN = American Indian and Alaska Native.

Data source: Ross, Kena, Rathbun, et al., 2012

When it comes to higher education, Indigenous students experience a higher rate of discrimination and racism compared to other racial/ethnic populations (Brayboy et al. 2012). This is also reflected in lower college enrollment and graduation rates at the secondary and postsecondary level (Office of Civil Rights 2003; National Congress of American Indians 2016). A strengths-based approach is necessary to address these issues by creating community and academic programs that are educationally and culturally responsive to the needs of Indigenous students.
Understanding the current state of health and education in Indian country is necessary to address inequities and assess the viability of programs that seek to diminish these inequities. An abundance of the literature highlights a deficit-based model that focuses on disparities faced by AI/AN population. Our research uses these statistics to guide strengths-based frameworks that focus on continuing and improving the assets and knowledges of the AI/AN community. Understanding the issues facing the AI/AN community is fundamental to the alleviation of disparities that interventions actively aim to mitigate. Deficit models that exist in many of the literature are reflecting the reality of many Native communities in this nation—as such, it is vital to address them. However, understanding the implications of colonization and forced assimilation on Indian country is crucial to conceptualizing the disparities present within those communities and the ones surrounding them.

We conceptualize colonization as the systematic insertion of assimilative practices on Indigenous peoples. These practices aim to remove and erase the unique cultural aspects of Native cultures and practices that have guided Indigenous peoples for millennia. These practices include removing tribal peoples from the lands of their ancestors, the creation of boarding schools, the systematic silencing of tribal languages, and the breaking up of communal lands in favor of individual land ownership. Colonization was initially implemented through brute force, but it is most effective when tribal peoples participate in their own colonization by no longer speaking their language, engaging in cultural practices, or perpetuating particular belief systems rooted in deficiencies. Drawing on the work of Fanon (1952/2008)—with one important change—colonialism can be explained thusly: “The [Native] enslaved by his inferiority, the white R12 man enslaved by his superiority alike behave in accordance with a neurotic orientation” (60). Although Fanon was originally addressing the plight of what he called “the Negro,” it is clear that his description of colonialism also addresses the plight of Indigenous peoples as well.

Colonialism’s roots are in the ideology of imperialism. Of this, Fanon writes, “Imperialism leaves behind germs of rot which we must clinically detect and remove from our land but from our minds as well” (49). And herein lies the rub with imperialism: it is rooted in the taking of both lands and minds. Strengths-based approaches focus on the reclamation and engagement of both lands and minds. Colonialism is most powerful when Indigenous peoples engage in the process inerting “the rot” into our minds. We believe that effective programs will address this rot of the mind directly and from the perspective of the strengths of Native peoples. We believe, and our findings suggest, that effective intervention programs that are rooted in and draw upon community and cultural strengths within American Indian communities are a way to begin mitigating and redressing systemic disparities for Indigenous people.

Programs specific to the needs and experiences of Native boys and men recognize that education and school have figure prominently in the quality of life of Indigenous boys and men. These programs root their solutions to male student success in relation to their communities and culture and provide support for the proposition that disparate educational outcomes for American Indian males can be effectively countered by engaging students with their culture and helping to facilitate their relationships within community. Moreover, they recognize education goes beyond the formal and Westernized notion of schooling to also include learning within Indigenous communities. Such learning often is family, community, and environmentally based, connecting boys and men to their ancestral homelands and allowing for important ceremonies and sacred and spiritual practices to take place.

Communal methods of learning have increasingly been used to redress performance within the classroom—for example, programs have utilized monthly talking circles to engage truant students, provide a space to learn, and provide feedback for one another (First Nations Development Institute 2016). This approach to education specifically invites the presence of older men who serve as role models or elders that imbue important cultural teachings and knowledges. The inclusion of elder males helps to provide mentorship, establish and reinforce stronger ties to community, and teach how American Indian males see the role of one another in relation to themselves, family, and the community at large. These teachings determine how masculinities are defined, redefined, and decolonized as well as the processes that construct the role of men and boys within Indigenous nations, communities, and families. Focusing on the roles of men is crucial to reframing the conversation of bringing boys and men back to the table to reassert the importance of relationships between males and females, and the lands of peoples.
The purpose of this report is to highlight and emphasize community programs that promote the education and well-being of Native men and boys. The resulting findings and recommendations that we share capture the breadth and depth of educational experiences among Indigenous men and boys. It allows us to discern guiding principles that might not otherwise be included in archival data or as educational tactics such as cultural practices (i.e., spirituality) in intervention(s), personal and emotional influences, and other individualized details regarding educational access, persistence, and attainment.

OVERVIEW OF NATIVE PEOPLES

Any discussion on American Indians, Alaska Natives, and Native Hawaiians requires a general understanding of what makes this population unique. In the United States, there are over 567 federally recognized tribes and many more state-recognized tribes—each with their unique language, culture, and history. According to the 2010 US Census, 5.2 million people or 1.7 percent of the US population identified as American Indian/Alaskan Native alone or in combination with other races. If considered alone, the American Indian/Alaskan Natives population is over 2.9 million or 0.9 percent of the US population. Moreover, American Indians and Alaska Natives hold a distinction separate from other groups and possess what has been termed “liminal status.” Liminal status refers to the fact that American Indians/Alaska Natives are considered both a racial group as well as a political group and can hold dual citizenship (considered a citizen of the United States as well as a citizen of their tribal nation).

Since 1997, federal guidance on maintaining, collecting, and reporting racial and ethnic data on American Indian and Alaska Native (AI/AN) populations allows individuals to self-select and self-report their ethnicity and race. This process also permitted the selection of more than one race or ethnicity. However, in order to hold citizenship as a tribal member, the process may be a bit more complex. American Indians and Alaska Natives who may wish to qualify for particular state and federal services cannot simply self-identify. They must be officially enrolled and recognized members of their tribe or communities.

Tribal nations are sovereign entities with the authorization to determine who is a member of their tribe. Official enrollment is important as it confers access to treaty-guaranteed education, health, and social services. One of the largest factors influencing financial and political resources available to Indigenous peoples is whether they belong to an officially recognized tribe. However, the process of tribal registration differs for each tribe. Some tribes may require different criteria to be considered a tribal member. Official tribal registration acts as a tribal census and provides the 567 tribes the right to oversee the blood quantum criteria. And these designations are fraught with colonialism and challenges.

Tribal recognition can range from the federal level to recognition at the state or local level, and it should be noted that being recognized by one entity does not guarantee recognition by another. In other words, belonging to a state-recognized tribe may not inherently grant recognition at the federal level and vice versa. "A federally recognized tribe is an American Indian or Alaska Native tribal entity that is recognized as having a government-to-government relationship with the United States, with the responsibilities, powers, limitations, and obligations attached to that designation, and is eligible for funding and services from the Bureau of Indian Affairs" (emphasis added, BIA) including services administered through the Office of Indian Education. State recognized tribes go through a formal process that is created by the state. However, state recognition does not confer access to federal benefits.

In some locations, the recognition process is not established, therefore, prospective tribal members cannot be recognized. The biggest difference between federal and state-recognized tribes is this: federally recognized tribes possess certain rights of self-government or tribal sovereignty. Each of the 567 tribes are entitled to certain federal benefits, services, and protections. On the other hand, tribes recognized only by the state do not receive nor are entitled to federal services or benefits.
**A Note About Terms**

The US Census has historically used the terms American Indian or Alaska Native to describe and identify Indigenous peoples of the United States. However, American Indian/Alaska Native are not the only terms used to refer to the Indigenous peoples of the United States. Native American is another term that both Native and non-Native people use in law and society. Depending on who you ask (e.g., government agency, tribal government, local community centers), you may also encounter the following terms: Indian (as outlined in the US Constitution), Indigenous, Native, and Aboriginal. There are also identifiers for the Indigenous people of the United States specific to a particular geographic region or tribe (e.g., Navajo, Hopi, Cherokee, Lumbee, Ojibwe, etc.).

For the purpose of this report, American Indian/Alaska Native and Indigenous will be used interchangeably but will be framed within the legal definition of Native American to better describe the unique working relationship Native Americans have to federal and state governments. Lastly, although not generally included under the term American Indian, the Indigenous peoples of Hawai’i, often referred to as Native Hawaiians (or Kanaka Maoli), do not hold federal recognition but are recognized as Indigenous by the state, and possess special state (and federally) recognized education benefits and rights. For the purpose of this report, we include Native Hawaiians under the term Indigenous.
Methods

METHODOLOGY & RESEARCH DESIGN
This comprehensive review examined the current state of the literature on Indigenous boys and men in middle school through college, between ages 12 to 25, and programs specifically designed to promote their education and achievement. Utilizing an archival data research approach, we reviewed tribal newspapers, academic peer-reviewed literature, including empirical studies, unpublished evaluation reports, and other grey literature. For the purposes of this review, grey literature is defined as non-empirical, non-academic, non-peer-reviewed literature generally targeted to inform a lay audience about programs and initiatives to better the current state of affairs for Native men and boys. In this study, we included findings generated from a Google search, Facebook, and LinkedIn program announcements as well as interview findings with program directors under this category. Grey literature allowed us to bolster the field scan by employing semi-structured interviews with two promising programs that have demonstrated successful approaches to improving outcomes for Indigenous boys and men in Hawai'i and Arizona. We want to be clear that grey literature is valuable, and we reject any hierarchies of what kinds of data or knowledge count. Given the paucity of studies in peer-reviewed research, it is crucial to draw on other data sources. And we have been profoundly influenced by our findings in the grey literature.

This field scan includes materials for a 15-year period (2000–2015), while taking into account the broader historical context from which the data and literature emerge. This time frame was selected because: (1) Relevant research on current education intervention programs often reference past programs and initiatives in their research background and literature review sections; (2) Focusing the scope of research to the past 15 years allowed for a manageable amount of data to be analyzed within the time frame; and (3) Research from the past 15 years highlights recent shifts in national education policy and its resultant effects on American Indians. The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, for example, did not emphasize community- or asset-based solutions to disparate educational outcomes for Native children, and received widespread criticism from Indigenous scholars.

DATA COLLECTION
This study was guided by the following research questions:
1. What specific interventions for Native boys and men have been developed? In what places have these occurred?
2. What are the guiding principles and practices in these interventions that have led to increased personal and academic achievement?

Drawing on academic scholarship (e.g., journals, books, dissertation abstracts) we emphasized the inclusion of formal and informal educational efforts within Indigenous communities and institutions. Formal educational efforts include schools and institutions of learning, while informal educational efforts are those programs localized within Indigenous communities that may not be documented in Westernized scholarship outlets or use alternative methods of teaching and learning. Again, we want to be clear that while many researchers and policy makers appear to be interested in what happens in schools and in the schooling process, we find great value in what happens outside of these institutions. To further elaborate on this point, we want to draw on the incisive work of Inupiat scholar Leona Okakok (1989), who writes:

Educating a child means equipping him or her with the capability to succeed in the world he or she will live in. In our Inupiat communities, this means learning not only academics, but also to travel, camp, and harvest wildlife resources in the surrounding land and sea environments. Students must learn about responsibilities to the extended family and elders, as well as about our community and regional governments, institutions, and corporations, and significant issues in the economic and social system (274). Effective programs happen both inside and outside of schools, but one important characteristic is that they recognize the role of
relationships between people and place, and people and each other. To conclude this point, while we use formal and informal sites here to denote what happens in the schooling process and within other formal institutions, we reject any sense of one being more important than the other. Again, drawing on Okakok (1989), it is important to make this distinction. For Inupiat peoples (in the far north of the state of Alaska), understanding how “to succeed in the world in which he or she will live in” demonstrates the folly of saying that “formal” education is more important than “informal” education. Of this, she writes, “Though most of the education in our traditional society was not formal, it was serious business. For us, education meant equipping the child with the wherewithal to survive in our world” (256). We agree that the work of helping Indigenous boys and men learn their roles and having the wherewithal to survive in the world is not only serious business, but the heart of the matter as well.

**Database search procedure.**

We searched ProQuest for identifying data across scholarly and newspaper archives because ProQuest provides depth of subject matter and breadth of access in a consistent search format. ProQuest also includes the Ethnic Newswatch database, which allows us to include academic articles, dissertations, and periodicals in our search. Table 2 shows the search terms used for the database search. In order to identify as much information as possible on our target population, we listed multiple ways Indigenous populations are identified in research under our target heading. Next, we added terms used to identify subtopics relevant to research involving Indigenous populations such as place-based education, which highlights the importance of land, space, and sacred spaces to many Indigenous peoples. We also included specific types of initiatives we know are increasingly promoted among Indigenous communities, including heritage language initiatives and programs focused on fatherhood. Lastly, we included gender pronouns to help highlight studies focused solely on men and boys.

**TABLE 2  SEARCH TERMS**

| TARGET: American Indian, Indigenous, Alaska Native, Native American, Native Hawaiian |
| AND: education, instructional strategies, culturally relevant teaching/pedagogy/education, place-based education, culturally congruent teaching/pedagogy/education, culturally responsive teaching/pedagogy/education, curriculum framework, place-based learning, culturally appropriate, culturally respectful, extracurricular, cultural* sustaining education, cultural* revitalizing education, support programs, camp |
| AND: community education, heritage language education, masculinity, father*, fatherhood |
| AND: men, boys, male |

In addition to using search terms, our team was tasked with ensuring that certain conditions were met in order to ensure studies were timely and relevant. Table 3 demonstrates the screening criteria used. Anything that did not meet all the criteria in this table was deemed irrelevant and excluded from the study.

**TABLE 3  SCREENING CRITERIA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME FRAME</th>
<th>2000–2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TARGET POPULATION</td>
<td>Race: AI/AN and Native Hawaiian men and boys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade level: 7–12 and postsecondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age: 12–25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANGUAGE / LOCATION</td>
<td>Articles must be published in the English language and focused on education in the United States</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gray Literature: Social Media and Google Searches

For programs that may be too new to have detailed academic reports or are not partnered with academic institutions, we utilized Google and social media (Facebook and LinkedIn) to identify anything that did not show up in the database search. We followed a similar approach, including the same search terms, and then altered the criteria to better utilize the enhanced search functions available through these platforms. We used search phrases that included “Native American boys program”; “Native American fathers and support programs”; “Family program and American Indian fathers”; “American Indian male program”; “Education programs for American Indian men”; “Programs for Native boys ages 12 to 25”; and “Camp for Native boys.” This last search term was used to identify special summer programming that may not have been identified under other search combinations.

Interviews

The Google and social media searches also helped us identify potential programs to interview. The purpose of the interviews was to delineate specific practices and initiatives that lead to enhanced academic persistence, graduation, and personal success of program participants. We identified two programs—one in the Southwest and one in the Pacific—that demonstrated successful approaches for improving outcomes for Indigenous boys and men. These programs were selected because they are currently in operation and because they reflect program diversity (one was community-based and explored fatherhood and utilized culturally relevant approaches to explore the roles of men in their Indigenous community; the other was specifically an academic program intended to enhance education enrollment and achievement at the postsecondary level). Furthermore, of the programs approached for an interview, these programs were the two who responded to our request and agreed to be interviewed. Interviews were conducted telephonically (with Hawai‘i) and in-person (in Arizona). Prior to conducting the interviews, we received approval from ASU’s Institutional Review Board (IRB) in order to ensure we were following all protocols outlined for ethical research with human subjects (this is an institutional requirement of ASU for all research studies involving human participants).

Interview questions were organized into two categories: (1) background questions to identify how and why programs were created and (2) questions designed to identify promising principles and practices (see appendix A for question set).

Coding Strategy and Analysis

After finalizing our search terms, we created a database with 609 potentially relevant sources. Data included a mix of academic articles, book chapters, dissertations, and newspapers. In order to standardize note taking among the research team, we created a coding sheet (appendices B and C). We selected five data sources, at random, to serve as a baseline for calibrating intercoder reliability and hone our article coding sheet. From there, all 609 articles were coded based on the article's publication information. Additionally, coding sheets were saved as form-filled PDF files to facilitate analysis and storage. Coding sheets and all research data were saved in a Google Drive folder accessible only to members of our research team.

Each reviewer determined and justified why the article was or was not relevant to our analysis. Relevant articles were further coded based on the primary RISE focus area, secondary RISE focus area, sample size, data set, and methodology, age of participants, how the research uses race/ethnicity/culture and gender as variables, Intervention/program type, limitations, recommendations, policies and principles, and finally a Likert scale rating the reading's accessibility and importance. We conceptualized accessibility as 5 meaning a high school student could read and fully understand the article and 1 representing a need for specialized knowledge to understand basic points. Importance was conceptualized as it pertained to the field, with 5 representing unique or groundbreaking research and 1 representing a simple repetition of an established study.

Our coding sheet and our research strategy closely examined age ranges to potentially disaggregate data based on these transition points: from elementary to middle school, from middle school to high school, from high school to the workplace and/or college, transition to fatherhood. We wanted to harness information on these transitional times in the lives of Indigenous men and boys to look for key interventions as Indigenous men and boys were acclimating to some new facet of their experiences. Furthermore, we wanted to emphasize how masculinities are conceptualized in this research, emphasizing the use of gender as a variable in academic research to see how Indigenous masculinities are being framed and how Indigenous men frame their own masculinities.
First, all articles and book chapters were ordered alphabetically and divided between six researchers in rotating bundles of 10 to 15. Once these were complete, all dissertations were divided in the same way, but clustered by approximately 600-page increments to better distribute the load between the members of the research team. After all 609 items in our database were coded with the coding sheets, the sheets were compiled into a spreadsheet, and then exported into a word document and printed as a book. Each sheet that was marked as relevant was then recoded and compiled based on emergent themes from the literature. Because the number of relevant studies was less than expected, each researcher also recoded borderline articles, ones that could arguably have been included, but for a flaw or feature like failing to disaggregate data based on gender, or focusing on an intervention that was within the larger scheme of RISE, although less related to education. The final layer of analysis translated this into a narrative description of what themes emerged from reading the research, what strategies were effective, and finally, a list of suggested recommendations based on research.

Interviews were coded using the same conceptual terms, without a coding sheet, but focusing instead on emergent themes, recommendations, and program details.

SEARCH RESULTS

**Table 4** Basic search results for articles between 2005 and 2015, by search terms*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEARCH TERMS</th>
<th>PROQUEST</th>
<th>GOOGLE SCHOLAR</th>
<th>JSTOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(education) AND (&quot;Native American&quot; OR (&quot;American Indian&quot;) OR (males))</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>5,101</td>
<td>17,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(education) AND (&quot;Native American&quot; OR (&quot;American Indian&quot;) OR (men))</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>15,347</td>
<td>964,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(education) AND (&quot;Native American&quot; OR (&quot;American Indian&quot;) OR (boys))</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>5,101</td>
<td>110,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEAN SEARCH RESULTS</strong></td>
<td>141</td>
<td><strong>8883</strong></td>
<td>363,867</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: *Searches conducted on April 13, 2016

**Table 5** Advanced search results for articles between 2005 and 2015, by search terms*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEARCH TERMS</th>
<th>PROQUEST</th>
<th>GOOGLE SCHOLAR</th>
<th>JSTOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(education* NEAR program*) AND (&quot;Native American&quot; OR (&quot;American Indian&quot;) AND (male*) OR (man*) OR (boy*))</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1,437</td>
<td>18,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: *Searches conducted on April 13, 2016
GOOGLE AND SOCIAL MEDIA DATA COLLECTED

Most programs for Native boys and men did not differentiate between genders. However, we found nine programs that served only Native American boys and men. The titles and location of these programs are:

- The Fatherhood is Sacred Program (Arizona)
- Good Road of Life Fatherhood Program (New Mexico)
- American Indian Summer Bridge Program (Arizona)
- Pueblo Pathways Project (New Mexico)
- Ysleta del Sur Project (New Mexico)
- STAR School (Arizona)
- Hale Mua Initiative (Hawai’i)
- Navajo Twin Heroes Conference (Location varies, New Mexico, Arizona, Utah)
- Hiyupo Boys Group (New Mexico)

Six of the nine programs were for youth ranging from 8 to 17 years old. Each program had an emphasis on general Native American culture, both in values and in practices. Three of the nine programs were related to education by focusing on postsecondary readiness or increasing rates of high school completion (American Indian Summer Bridge Program, Ysleta del Sur, and STAR). Developing relationships and identity was another common theme. Eight out of the nine programs focused on the individual’s place and responsibilities in the home, tribal community, or greater society (all programs except American Indian Summer Bridge Program). The hosting organizations were often extensions of, or highly incorporated, the local tribal community. Lastly, four of the nine programs emphasized or highlighted the role of community mentors or role models as an aspect of the program (Hale Mua, Ysleta del Sur, Pueblo Pathways, and Hiyupo). The nine programs were contacted to request interviews and/or more information, however, due to a limited time frame, only the ‘Aha K ne Foundation (Hale Mua) and Maricopa Community Colleges (American Indian Summer Bridge Program) were interviewed.
Findings

In this section, we report results in three areas. First, we discuss our reasons for why a majority of data collected were considered non-RISE relevant as that sheds light to the marginalization—and invisibility—of Indigenous men and boys in scholarly literature. Second, out of 609 sources, 48 were identified as RISE relevant, which means these sources centered specifically on program initiatives for Indigenous men and boys. Therefore, we discuss promising principles that highlight the power of community-based, asset-oriented strategies for Indigenous boys and men. Lastly, we highlight promising principles that were delineated from our scan but were not directly specific to RISE per se. These studies are important because they address principles that we consider closely connected to understanding the experiences of Indigenous men and boys in higher education.

NON-RISE RELEVANT

The majority of the dataset was deemed “non-RISE relevant” because it fell under one of the following categories: (1) the study had low sample size; (2) the study did not disaggregate findings by ethnicity or gender; (3) Native boys and men were not the focus of the study; (4) the study focused on curriculum-based learning and pedagogy with Native and non-Native participants (i.e., study was neither gender specific nor intervention specific); (5) study was focused on health (but not health education); (6) wrong age group; (7) the study did not focus on education; and (8) the study focused on education but was not program or initiative specific. Some articles fell under more than one of the categories, such as the case with category 4. In other cases, the studies crossed subcategories and could fit under more than one option. For example, one study met the criteria for category 2 and category 8 simultaneously. In this case, we placed the study under the primary or principal category where it fit best with the remaining literature in the subcategory.

We also acknowledged an apparent similarity between category 5 and category 8, however, due to the abundance of scholarship in the health area (a large portion of our findings fell under this subcategory), we decided to list these categories separately. Category 5 includes discussions on health, including studies on health status, health behaviors, and mental well-being, while category 8 includes discussions of studies in all other fields including history, anthropology, sociology, policy studies, social psychology, and health and communication. Although we found these research studies to be irrelevant for the purposes of this project, we are not suggesting that the research and their concomitant findings are unimportant. Some are. Our point here is that they were not relevant within the parameters we established for this report.

Within the first category were studies that included a low sample size. This made it difficult to generalize findings or draw any conclusive remarks. For example, one study focused on underrepresented doctoral students, but only included one Native American in a study of fifteen participants (Greer-Williams 2004). Moreover, it was unknown whether that Native American participant was male or female, as the researcher protected the anonymity of that individual. Additional research that did not provide findings based on gender include Broker’s (2010) dissertation on how the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 influenced culturally based education at one Bureau of Indian Education school in Minnesota serving Ojibwe students, and Brayboy-Locklear’s (2003) dissertation that explored Native American high school student resiliency and motivational factors at selected North Carolina school.

A second reason for exclusion was lack of disaggregation by race and ethnicity of data and analysis. Lack of disaggregation made it difficult to discern whose perspectives were presented. Studies in this category focused on the importance of culturally relevant curriculum, pedagogy, heritage language, and cultural stories in education (Barnard 2004; Bock 2006; de la Rosa 2005; Jen 2015; Peacock 2002; Perales 2014; Secatero 2009; White 2001). However, although some of these studies did offer recommendations for future programs, it is important to note American Indian perspectives were largely marginalized in those studies. Only two studies within this subcategory focused on American Indian experiences specifically, for example, Bircher (2004) examined the cultural influences of American Indian enrollment in community college, and Blair (2015) examined the role of American Indian Studies programs in promoting Native graduation, but since findings were not disaggregated by gender, this made it difficult to glean specific recommendations for boys.
Third included research wherein Native boys and men were either not included or not the focus. Some studies used males as a comparison group in their justification for programs serving girls and women (Angel 2006; Berry 2008 Dixon 2002) and were likely included in the dataset because our ProQuest search included full texts and abstracts, so the mention of boys, men, or males in articles discussing issues for American Indians, Alaska Natives, and Native Hawaiians would be included, even if the article is not relevant. Despite this, some of the research focused primarily on female youth provided useful insights and implications for male youth education as facilitated through culturally relevant intervention education programs. An example of this is a curriculum’s use of salmon cycles for American Indian youth interested in STEM fields. This dissertation focuses on the experiences of American Indian women in STEM education and provides insight on how to incorporate curriculum that could be benefit the retention and inclusion of male students (Ault 2008).

Among this category also was research that did not include either Native girls or boys. These studies typically focused on non-Native people who interact with Native peoples. For example, studies explored perceptions of non-American Indian/Alaska Native/ Native Hawaiian teachers on teaching Native students and profiles of non-Native artists and book authors whose work was inspired by Native peoples and history (Ball 2011; Chin 2010; Thigpen 2011; Korpi 2015; Roberts 2015), experiences of non-English speakers contrasted with “native” English speakers (Im 2007; Ngoc 2014), experiences of Hmong high school students (Thao 2009), the use of graphing calculators in algebra courses (Thomas 2001), and a non-Native teaching a Native studies course to non-Native students (Brantmeier 2012). Moreover, references to American Indian data did not include meaningful analysis of the population cited (Mason 2001). For example, a deeper and meaningful analysis could have included data disaggregated by gender, age, rural/urban environments, and tribal citizenship.

Fourth were studies focused on curriculum-based learning and pedagogy with Native and non-Native participants. An example of a study included Native American storytelling applying culturally responsive teaching curriculum in a high school classroom for college preparedness (Bowman 2015). Another example involved a case study about a tribally controlled college and use of tribally centered curriculum in a Native studies course to Native women that did not result in strengthened identities (Hogan 2002).

The fifth category of exclusion was one of the most dense areas of the dataset. This subset contained a heavy focus on health-related studies, which were largely deficit oriented, with a few that focused on sexuality among Native gay men. Studies ranged in topics from pregnancy prevention, binge drinking and alcohol usage, HIV/AIDS, cardiovascular risk factors, cancer, marijuana usage, mental health, hearing loss, and suicide. One focused exclusively on alcohol abuse among American Indians (Cometsevah 2013) without any substantive focus on encouraging success for Indigenous students generally, let alone men and boys. Although much of this literature was important to contextualize the general health state of Native Americans, these studies were negatively focused, depressing, and lacked programmatic recommendations. The disproportional focus of articles of this nature in literature suggests Indigenous peoples have more problems with obesity, diabetes, and drug and alcohol abuse than their non-Native counterparts, which is not true. Moreover, although negative health outcomes have been identified, the causes of the outcomes that examine the role of colonialism and historic racial disparities in healthcare are rarely examined; and rarely are beneficial, culturally rooted approaches to health, including a focus on spiritual practices, reported or connected to discussions of healing and improved well-being.

Of the articles that fell within the health subcategory, two articles focused on the prevalence of cardiovascular disease among American Indians and Alaska Natives (Jernigan et al. 2010; Nelson-Majewski 2015), one focused on HIV/AIDS (Vernon & Jump er-Thurman 2002); one focused on chronic disease factors among American Indian elders (Denny et al. 2006; McFall, Solomon, & Smith 2000); six focused on the heightened rate of diabetes within Indigenous communities (Bell et al. 2007; Bell et al. 2005; Best et al. 2015; Brewer-Lovery et al. 2010; Costa 2011; Streetman 2011); twelve examined substance use (Ehlers et al. 2009; Ehlers et al. 2007; Esqueda, Hack, & Tehee 2010; Dickerson et al. 2009; Dickerson & Johnson 2012; Swaim, Stanley, & Beavais 2013; Tann et al. 2007; Taylor 2000; Trageser et al. 2010; Weaver 2001; Westermeyer et al. 2009); one focused on cervical cancer among American Indian women (Peltier 2015); eleven examined dietary practices, overweight, obesity, and physical activity (Fila & Smith 2006; Gadhoke 2012; Howarth et al. 2006; Lee 2011; Omahen 2014; Ricci et al. 2012; Sabin et al. 2015; Dennison et al. 2015; Sinley 2015; Thompson et al. 2001; Wilkie 2003); another study examined domestic abuse and health of lesbian and bisexual Native American women (Lehavot, Walters & Simoni, 2010); another examined alcohol use among youth and adults (Jones-Webb et al. 2004); three examined family and domestic violence prevalence among American Indians (Jones 2008; Linton 2015; Matamonasa-Bennett 2013,
2015); one examined condom use among American Indian men (Rink, Anastario & FourStar 2015) one examined self-identification as American Indian and mental health services (Hack et. al. 2014), ten examined mental health, trauma, and resilience more generally (Balsam et al. 2004; Beals et al. 2005; Brinker et al. 2007; Brooks et al. 2012; Cutler 2006; Deters 2006; Earle, Bradigan, & Morgenbesser 2001; Robin et al. 2003; Hockenberry 2011; Jervis 2009; Robbins, Robbins, & Stennerson 2013; Robin et al. 2007; Theis 2014); one study about ADHD in American Indian and Alaska Native boys and girls (Lefler et al. 2009); one examined non-suicidal self-injury (NSSI) of Native adolescents (Cwik et al. 2011); three examined suicide risk factors (Dorgan 2010; Manzo et al. 2015; Walls, Chapple, & Johnson 2007); one examined men’s prostate in relation to their body mass index (Muus et al. 2009) and posttraumatic stress disorder (Dillard et al. 2007); and three examined the general health status of American Indian and Alaska Native males (Rhoades 2003; Barney 2004; Joe 2001); and two examined non-Native and Native mental health professionals mental health treatment strategies for American Indians (Harper 2013 Ka’ahanui 2003). With the exception of Rhoades (2003), Barney (2004), and Joe (2001), the majority of articles under this subcategory did not focus on education nor disaggregate data (by gender and/or race).

Some studies focused exclusively on health issues, with some education recommendation, but no program or intervention was structured around education for Indigenous men and boys (Anastario, FourStar, & Rink 2013; Eshkibok 2014). However, of the total articles that fell under this subcategory, three (Robin et al. 2003; Robbins, Robbins & Stennerson 2013; Rhoades 2003) presented information on factors or areas of focus that can inform successful asset-oriented programs, initiatives, or policies and improve health outcomes. Robbins, Robbins, and Stennerson (2013) caution, “before discussing some of the difficulties that many Native American families are currently facing, it is important to consider that these issues are not to be viewed as failures of Native Americans, but rather as the results of colonialization and the lack of tribal self-determination” (201). These studies highlight boarding schools, the process of removal and relocation, and the practice of cross-cultural adoption as particular governmental strategies that contribute(d) to devastation and poor outcomes for Native peoples. Similarly, Rhoades (2003) argues, “among the explanations for increased risk-taking behavior, especially among younger AI/AN males, are loss of cultural identity, loss of traditional roles for males, failure of primary socialization, and unresolved grief from historical trauma” (777). Fortunately, Rhoades (2003) offers recommendations as “programs designed to deal with ways to ameliorate risk-taking behaviors among AI/AN males are urgently needed” (777). He suggests interventions be designed with attention to social and cultural attributes and offers the example of another study wherein

Smith and Robertson reported a successful intervention that specifically targeted and took into account male reluctance to wear life preservers while boating and fishing. At the time the intervention was undertaken, drowning was the leading cause of injury deaths in Alaska, and life jackets were seldom used, so the Injury Prevention Program of the Yukon-Kuskokwim Health Corporation initiated a ‘float coat’ program. These coats not only provide warmth but also have built-in buoyancy, although they are unremarkable in appearance. It was reasoned that such coats would be acceptable in situations when the usual life preservers were not and would be worn in the course of work anyway. To promote the use of the float coats, a coalition of local leaders, health professionals, and merchants offered and promoted the coats at discounted prices in various sizes, colors, and styles. Local media cooperated with promotions. Following institution of the program, the number of deaths by drowning decreased by approximately 30 percent. (777).

According to Rhoades (2003), restoring the roles traditionally held by AI/AN males is a key strategy that will help address the negative outcomes associated with cultural and personal devastation caused by colonial acts of cultural violence and genocide. Indeed, in one of our interviews with the staff from the Hale Mua program, it became evident that (re)connecting men to discussions of traditional, cultural roles can help heal the negative effects of historic trauma and colonization (Hale Mua Interview). In fact, Robbins, Robbins, & Stennerson (2013) believe “traditional values and learning may offer buffers to domestic violence and lead to stronger marriages for Native American people. These include the importance of spirituality, receiving advice and counsel from family members, including the sharing of traditional stories (which taught values and provided guidance), having family members teach traditional roles and responsibilities within marriage, observing other couples (learning what problems to avoid and success-es to follow), trying to be good examples for their own children, learning from spiritual leaders and counselors, and learning from each other” (205).
The work of Greene et al. (2003) suggests addressing the outcomes of historic trauma is important because Native men are less likely to describe their distress in terms of being pessimistic or needing assurance. Instead they may experience changes in appetite, sleep difficulties, loss of interest in things, and lack of energy associated with depression. Similar to Rhoades (2003) and Stennerson et al. (2013), Theis (2014) believes traditional beliefs and practices promote a more rapid recovery from trauma, which can promote positive outcomes by preventing disorders. According to Theis (2014), statistically significant correlations exist between level of enculturation and posttraumatic growth (PTG). Traditional values and practices were found to promote higher PTG, resilience, and life satisfaction.

According to this research, cultural wisdom in addressing well-being is key to healing. However, in order to support social change, programs and initiatives should encourage researchers, clinicians, and policy-makers to explore Indigenous values and ways as mechanisms in cultural and personal growth and resilience.

The sixth category included a few studies focused on the validity of quantitative instrument testing among Native participants.

The seventh category was research focused on the wrong age group. Because this study focused on Native men and boys ages 12 to 25, any study or program targeted to youth below the age of 12 was not included. Three studies (Hixon 2002; Vande Sande 2001; Yaocihuatzin 2011) fell under this category. The purpose of Hixon’s (2002) study was to utilize a measure to study the locomotor and object control of four-year-old participants on the Cherokee nation; this study neither focused on the range of our targeted age group nor presented data that could inform an education initiative, program, or intervention for Native youth. Vande Sande (2001) examined transitions of American Indian students to an elementary school environment, while Yaocihuatzin (2011) analyzed depictions of Indigenous peoples in children’s books.

Eighth was research that did not focus on education. This included studies that examined race and racism, colonialism and the rise of “problem” behaviors, identity and culture, or “other.” Generally, studies that fell into this category were deficit oriented—especially those that addressed “problem” behaviors as noted below. Two articles (Huyser, Sakamoto, & Takei 2010; Jones & Galliher 2015) examined the degree to which race correlates with schooling and socioeconomic attainment. These studies examined how youth experience racial micro- and macro-aggressions though data was not disaggregated nor was racism examined in any particular context (education or otherwise). A third study examined the impact of staff’s own biases and racism in offering services for a Hawaiian Native adolescent treatment program (Duke 2003).

Another subset of research within this category examined risky behaviors among American Indian youth. Barrera et al. (2001), Lester (2002), and Cain (2007) examined “problem” behavior, which was associated with drug and alcohol use. Barrera focused on behaviors of adolescent American Indian, Hispanic, and Caucasian youth. In the results and discussion sections, the authors described significant subgroup differences in structural paths for the link between inadequate parental involvement with deviant peers. For the paths related to American Indian boys and girls, the differences were “quite strong” (149). Lester’s (2002) study used a National School-Based Youth Risk Survey that included 191 public, private, and Catholic schools and had 10,251 student submissions to explore risky behaviors of “gambling, excessive drinking, poor health care, and thrill-seeking” (24). The survey results “indicated that American Indian and Alaska Native youths engaged more often in risky behaviors than white or black youth” (Lester 2002, 24). Specific examples of risky behaviors were “carrying weapons, attempted suicide, marijuana use, and cocaine use” (28). However, the article did not provide the students’ background information of their community environment or whether or not they were living within an Indigenous communities; nor did it offer asset-based recommendations for improving outcomes (Lester 2002). In many instances, articles assessing risk factors did not detail or provide solutions or ways to engage the risk factors associated with American Indian youth.

Similarly, Cain (2007) examined psychological and cultural factors related to alcohol use, while Jervis et al. (2003) examined the manifestation of boredom as a result of postcolonial reservation life and how it can lead to “trouble” for Native peoples, trouble being associated with drug abuse, violence, and illegal activities. Further articles analyzing risk factors of American Indian youth were also marked as irrelevant because no intervention program specifically tailored to prevent the risks detailed were analyzed. For example, in the article, “Social Contexts of Drug Offers Among American Indian Youth and Their Relationship to Substance Use,” the analysis focused on the personal choices of American Indian youth an examined the manners through which American
Indians rejected drug or substance use was researched. The article did not detail any specific program developed to deter or rehabilitate substance abuse among American Indian youth. It only focused on the ways in which individuals avoided substance use (Kulis et al. 2006). Lastly, Ficek (2005) examined intimate partner violence among New Mexican women.

Of the research in this category, Goette (2009), Lucero (2009), Robbins and Hong (2013), and Chee (2002) examined the role of cultural identity and cultural connectedness, however, these studies did not provide implications for education or for asset-based programs or initiatives. For example, Goette (2009) offered recommendations for museums “as historically situated institutions” that possess the cultural authority to reproduce and interpret stories of diverse peoples, and Lucero (2009) examined whether and how cultural identity is transferred among multiple generations in urban settings. Lucero’s recommendations for education, however, focused solely on developing awareness among non-Indigenous social work providers about the cultural experiences of urban American Indians, similar to cultural awareness training, and presented no direct applicable suggestions for improving outcomes for American Indian men or boys. Hostetler’s (2000) dissertation focused on a literary analysis of American Indian–authored texts on the subject of American Indian identity and renaissance. While Robbins and Hong (2013) examined spirituality and connectedness to the self from an Eastern and Western perspective, they did not present implications for Native men or boys. Finally, Chee (2002) used measurement scales in a study to show the relationship between identity and self-esteem of Native college students offered no specific design suggestions for program interventions.

Three articles fell under the “other” subcategory. Guilmarten (2002) examined historic fashion among the Montana frontier, Rombough and Keithly (2005) examined how the feudal system and Protestant work ethic influenced reservation life, and Riggs (2008) examined a religious placement program that removed Native children from their homes and placed them in non-Native homes in an attempt to assimilate them.

Ninth, and last, was research that was education focused but not program specific. For example, some focused on theoretical possibilities—reassessing educational pedagogy through Alaska Native knowledges (Amarok 2014), code-switching in professional and educational settings (Fairbanks 2005), envisioning boarding school letters as captivity narratives (Gregor 2010), or notions of objectivity in science in relationship to Indigenous spirituality and land (Geffen 2005), experiences of Native women faculty in higher education (Fox 2003; Holiday 2006; Ka’opua 2013); and school superintendents attitudes and strategies to address achievement gaps amongst minority students (Hammond 2003). Some studies addressed challenges and barriers to the success of Native students on college campuses, but failed to substantively address issues or interventions unique to boys and men—failing to disaggregate data by race and/or gender even when Indigenous male participants are in the study (Azure 2004; Berrington 2003; Bueno Watts 2011; Bundy 2006; Gordon 2003; Gurley et. al. 2001; Mendez, Mendoza, & Malcolm 2011), lacking description or recommendations for programs or interventions (Azure 2013; Bill 2012; ), highlighting experiential learning design of a Native youth activities sports program (Martin, 2015), or quantifying issues like student engagement or culture without adequately conceptualizing or operationalizing Indigenous education in a way that is relevant to this study (Ahmed 2014; Bryan 2003; Hellerstedt et. al. 2006). A study that addressed distance learning with a comparison of Native and non-Native college students in a science course but lacked depth about online teaching pedagogy and student learning was important, but did not correspond with the purposes of our study (Foster 2012).

Among this category were also general reports on current education attainment for Native students (Maynor 2011; Wu 2015), explorations on the “achievement gap” (Collins 2012), and dropout (including factors that influence dropout but no preventative measures or programs). Similar to health researchers, Conley (2008) found adult Native students face a series of barriers to education including, “the impact of identity crisis and identity diffusion; lack of involvement in cultural activities; racism; lack of funds; and language...[however] differences did exist between the sexes regarding the educational barriers. No participant reported that belonging to a specific Native American Indian Nation was an educational barrier” (48). Cultural discongruity appeared to be a challenge as participants reported being forced to learn a Eurowestern language, and not being able to participate in Native American cultural activities was reported as a major educational barrier. On the other hand, deficit-oriented research focused on the impact of biculturalism on learned helplessness among Native Americans (Storey 2007) as well as examining the relationship of educational level, reservation status, and blood quantum with anger and post-colonial stress.
Research on dropout focused on identifying “at-risk” students (Cornell 2002) as well as the relationship between school disciplinary action and dropout (Guardino 2013; Stokes 2011). These studies generally focused on the reasons for dropout and did not propose or explore achievement strategies, initiatives, or support mechanisms (i.e., education interventions), nor did they present an exhaustive focus on gender differences in dropout (Galindo 2003). Although (Guardino 2013) did disaggregate findings by gender, examining expulsion rates for junior high students, with rates being elevated for Native boys, no intervention or further education discussions were presented specific to Native boys.

Research focused specifically on high school-aged students’ examined perceptions of high school graduation, college enrollment, and relevant areas for postsecondary degree study (Krogman 2013; Downs 2006; Lesky 2008; Starks 2010; Baker 2003, respectively). Some studies include mention of peer associations like fraternities (Collins 2015), however, these are only mentioned by students in passing, without larger substantive interrogation on how they function as interventions or programs. Creative student programs exist, like a study of youth media organizations and the stories that students tell, but even this lacks a description of the experiences of the Indigenous students in the study, focusing instead on broader notions of youth culture rather than identifying the intersections and unique experiences created by race and gender (Gibbons 2011).

Only one study focused on the experiences of students with learning disabilities, specifically in terms of how they influence postsecondary decision-making practices (Yamamoto 2010). Two studies (Farris 2013; Gillis 2001) examined high school graduation experiences for Native American boys, and while Farris (2013) and Cumbow (2014) specifically did not disaggregate recommendations by gender, their research suggests success for Native students is due to supportive and positive family influences; schools and educators who provided support that aided and encouraged students; specific instructional strategies used by schools and educators, which were beneficial for the students (though these were not elaborated upon); and intrinsic and extrinsic motivators that improved the student’s ability to persist in high school.

Research on postsecondary education success was not often targeted specifically toward Native males. Only one study focused specifically on Native men at Harvard and another examined teaching strategies of music educators and disaggregated findings by gender (Bitsoi 2007; Young 2006). Four studies (Korkow 2008; McCaffery 2012; Springer 2015; Young 2006) identified positive influences of academic success. McCaffery (2012) and Young (2006) found faculty mentorship, strong cultural identity, desire to “give back” to Native peoples, and, for students with tribally based research, relationships with elders as sources of knowledge rather than solely academia as sources of strength was important for success. Additionally, Springer (2015) noted the positive relationship between persistence and cultural student organizations (citing the work of Gloria & Kurpius 1996; Kuh & Love 2000; Guiffrida 2003; Meseus 2008). Korkow (2008) and Young (2006) added support systems built of family, friends, peers, and mentors, and faculty members who provided support during moments of adversity. Faculty were identified as key to socialization, culture, and spirituality, and intrinsic factors such as the desire to overcome barriers were also noted as important to success. Within this subcategory, only two studies (Francis 2005; Gonzales 2007) did not focus on strategies for success, but rather on the role of remedial education and perspectives of Native students at a community college and how that defines their sense of “Indianness.” Although Gonzales (2007) sought to explore remedial education as a tool for retention, it was found that despite Native men enrolling in remedial education at higher rates than Native women, remedial education is not a strong predictor for academic success or continued persistence.

Next, research focused on course delivery resources. For example, Caldwell (2015) examined the role of interactive videoconferencing course delivery for Navajo students in rural communities. Although the author evaluated course delivery satisfaction by disaggregating results, no significant differences were found by gender. Shadowwalker (2012) examined depictions of American Indians in secondary history textbooks but did not focus on education experiences of Native boys or men. Lastly, Van Gelder (2002) examined the importance of place in Road Scholars education programs but did not examine the experiences of Native peoples.

Although they failed to address the substantive issues of RISE head-on, they offered important considerations regarding Indigenous fatherhood (Upham 2010), access to healthcare (Winters et al. 2004); participation in sports (Ali-Christie 2013); histories of Native schooling and institutions (Anderson 2009; Askins 2009; Grey 2014); teacher training (Bussinger-Stone 2009; De La Mare 2010; Exton 2008; Hechenberger 2009); and general student experiences at predominantly white schools and universities (Collins 2015). Still other articles had little bearing on RISE-related issues, or focused on geographies well beyond the United States (Asunce, González-Oliver, & Mulligan 2008).
SECOND SECTION: RISE RELEVANT LITERATURE

Academic literature on programs and interventions specifically serving American Indian, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian boys and men emphasize the importance of cultural knowledges and how Indigenous peoples strategically apply those knowledges for survival and success. Even though some programs are not designed with the approach of strengthening Indigenous knowledges and communities, Indigenous boys and men have found ways of incorporating different cultural traditions. Ronald L. Pitcock’s (2000) historical analysis of the Choctaw Academy describes the school’s roots in treaty promises to the Choctaw Nation to educate “eighteen or twenty boys of the best promise,” to enhance English language literacy among Choctaw boys (391). The academy was founded in 1843 with the intent to assimilate students into white polity, furthering the goals of removal that drove the Treaty of Dancing Rabbit Creek and the removal of the Choctaw nation from Mississippi to Oklahoma. However, the students did not assimilate through literacy, and instead kept Choctaw world views, using their English literacy to critique, subtly or overtly, the school system, and federal Indian policy—which in turn caused the school to be closed after only five years (Pitcock 2000, 419). This program succeeded in its nominal goal of literacy, but the importance is in how the students used the formal, Anglo knowledge provided by the program in ways that were particular to their own cultural norms and experiences.

Compare this study with Mary Callis Ash’s (2015) modern dissertation study of Lumbee youth at a week-long summer camp for herpetology (the study of reptiles and lizards). Located in the North Carolina Sandhills at the intersection of Robeson, Hoke, and Cumberland Counties, this camp is within the homelands of the Lumbee Tribe of North Carolina, a state-recognized tribe with deep ties to the lands, rivers, and even reptiles of North Carolina. Through observation and interviews with Lumbee youth, and six boys in particular, Ash found that the youth’s engagement with herpetology was predicated by informal science education that develops in Lumbee ways of knowing, and place-based knowledges from living in rural homelands (2015, 290–91). Participants in the camp supplemented their own place-based and Indigenous knowledges with technical knowledges from herpetology, providing Lumbee youth with additional experiences and knowledges that would enhance science education (Ash, 2015, 293). However, Indigenous and community knowledges are not only important as a supplement to formal education practices, but also as a way of connecting and sustaining community among Indigenous men. Pember describes how tribal colleges like Lac Court Oreilles Ojibwe Community College have implemented a Men’s Talking Circle to recruit and retain Native men (2011). The Talking Circle program provides a space for American Indian men to create a support network where men can express emotion freely among peers, again building upon Indigenous knowledges since “intimacy and vulnerability do not conflict with traditional roles for American Indian Men,” particularly for Dakota men (2011). Pember’s description of the talking circle notes that persistence is not only about peer support, but also boils down to the lunches, served during the talking circle, that sustain students facing financial challenges.

Moreover, emphasis on peer support within community and family was a particularly dominant theme in relevant programs seeking to redress challenges and inequitable education outcomes for American Indian boys. Funded by the First Nations Development Institute, the Career Exploration Program “CRACE” of Cocopah Nation utilized monthly talking circles for truant students. The space provided students with an opportunity to talk with one another and learn about career opportunities available to them beyond high school graduation. The program successfully reduced adolescent truancy by 25 percent in the academic year of 2014–2015 (First Nations Development Institute 2016, 5). Furthermore, Cocopah Nation, in an effort to shift punitive-oriented approaches and criminal outcomes for youth truants, promoted adult role models to their students. The relationship between youth and mentor was oriented toward enhancing life skills by promoting male youth empowerment. The Cocopah Tribal Truancy Prevention Program has been successful in finding alternatives to punitive approaches to student behavior and has instead shifted their focus to youth empowerment, and facilitated relationships between youth, elders, and community.

The use of role models and talking circles provide culturally effective spaces and reflective relationships to acknowledge and discuss critical issues of importance to American Indian boys and men. In addition to talking circles, Garcia’s (2002) dissertation research acknowledges the socioeconomic challenges American Indian boys face within their Indigenous community, while focusing on how education provides an opportunity for American Indian boys to overcome difficult situations and provide a brighter outlook on their career. The study uses a values-based career intervention program “in order to reinforce staying in school and enhance their career behaviors” (19). Furthermore, the intervention program found that “[t]he boys’ preference for their native language was related to more positive self esteem and grade self-efficacy. The boys’ preference for their own culture was correlated with
lower suicidality.” Garcia (2002) recommends that “for future research emphasize the need for counselors to take into consideration biculturalism, enculturation, and resiliency factors when working with Native American youth” (iv). An additional recommendation for further research can explore areas of how the use of culturally relevant curriculum and indigenous knowledge used in secondary education can help change the classification of “at risk” into a “college going” population.

Finally, Brave Heart et al. (2012) describe alternative ways of thinking about interventions for American Indian men by focusing on the impacts of historical trauma, on Native men and boys generally, that have resulted in “male separation from the traditional self, internalization of oppression, and identification with the aggressor—an intrinsically devalued true self” (2012, s179). Programs like RezRIDERS, a “multilevel extreme-sport experiential education intervention” encourages community among American Indian youth by addressing historical trauma and cultural protective factors through extreme sports by “shifting high-risk behaviors to a controlled program setting” (2012, S180). Thematically, each of these intervention programs shift deficit and punitive approaches to engaging American Indian men to culturally relevant and relational-oriented approaches that each emphasize relationships to family, community, identity, and culture.

GREY LITERATURE AND EMERGENT THEMES: PROMISING PRINCIPLES FOR INDIGENOUS EDUCATION

While we reviewed the literature on programmatic initiatives for Indigenous men/boys (RISE relevant), we learned that much of the scholarship on this particular topic and population was scarce. However, there was a body of literature identified as critically important to understanding Indigenous men/boys in higher education. All these studies included Indigenous participants in their data collection; many were not specifically centered on men/boys but inclusive of them. Some of these studies did not come from the educational discourse, but included other fields such as, but not limited to, health, history, psychology, and sociology. And many of these studies did not focus on programmatic practices, but still provided insights to promising principles. Therefore, we elaborate on these six (6) promising principles of empower, enact, engage, enlighten, envision, and enhance that were gleaned from this set of literature.

**Empower: Nurturing and Strengthening Identity Development**

Much of the literature discusses ways identity development is nurtured and strengthened. Effective interventions and programs serving American Indian boys and men harnessed and accentuated Indigenous knowledges, created space for peer networks and sharing, and most importantly, acknowledged traumas specific to American Indian boys and men in order to provide a space for healing. Returning to tribal values and developing cultural and bicultural competence framed as “new warriors” were keys to solving domestic violence and other social challenges including those occurring at school settings (Matamonasa-Bennett 2005). This literature argued the empowerment of Native youth is done through fostering identity development in meaningful ways through Native languages and cultural traditions that reflect Native epistemologies, allowing students to negotiate through, “the place between,” which is the process of gaining the skills to self-determine (Elliott 2010, 181). Promoting youth empowerment through the facilitation of cultural knowledges and emphasizing relationships to tribal communities are meaningful ways of redressing historic and present-day institutionalized oppression. We want to add here that there are polycultural aspects to many Indigenous peoples’ lives that are not often captured in the literature. These polycultural aspects show up with mixed race or mixed national peoples, two-spirit and/or transgendered peoples, and those tied to urban, rural, suburban geographies. There are, of course, the usual complexities associated with the lives of Indigenous peoples. Our point here is to suggest that we recommend moving to polycultural analyses and competencies in the future.
This type of work also underscores the importance in recognizing the internalized oppression and historical trauma through a counter narrative approach that promotes the strengths and positive qualities of American Indian peoples (Grayshield et al. 2015). Examples of this include strengthening identity development through identifying personal strengths within themselves and others (Elliott 2010; Grayshield et al. 2015; First Nations Institute 2016). By instilling a greater sense of self-confidence, American Indian students are more equipped to survive and thrive at school settings including college campuses (Davis 2004; Guilmino 2006; Londerback 2008). According to this research, it is important for educators to understand educational enhancers for Native students include being able to participate in cultural activities and having a strong personal and cultural identity and language (Bock 2006; Conley 2008; McCaffery 2012; White 2001; Young 2006). The promotion of cultural knowledges and ways of being serve as sources of strength and motivation for Indigenous peoples in spaces where they are traditionally underrepresented and underserved. And, we cannot overemphasize the importance of approaching challenges through a strengths-based approach, but rather deficit-oriented ones. To be clear, there are significant challenges that Indigenous peoples face; there are also significant strengths through which to address them.

Further, Young (2006) suggests the reason why Native Hawaiians are able to “play the game” and navigate institutions of education successfully is because they have a special strength to adapt to potentially challenging situations and take away value from any experience. Thus it is important to recognize the resilience of Native students as well as the specific strengths they draw from their cultural backgrounds and communities to persist. One participant explained it as such:

I think being Hawaiian helped me here. Hawaiians, I think it is a part of our strengths. Some people see it as a weakness but I see it as part of our strengths. I think that we’re able to see the good in other people. We are able to appreciate another person’s perspective or point of view. I took of what I knew of being a Hawaiian in my family and my own personal identity, I took that into my studies and realized though that there were forces forcing me to conform, I was able to appreciate, I think because I’m Hawaiian, that this was an interesting perspective and that maybe there was some value that I can take and incorporate into my own life as it is appropriate for me. (Young 2006, 93)

An additional form of an educational enhancer incorporates cultural environments with motivation. Specifically, Lino’s (2010) Native Hawaiian study explores “the relationship of a culturally relevant and responsive learning environment to achievement motivation for Native Hawaiian secondary students” (vii). The Nä ‘Öpio: Youth Development and Assets Survey was completed by 3,100 Native Hawaiian students in grades 6 through 12 at seven Native Hawaiian language immersion schools. The survey findings revealed “the four strongest correlations with achievement motivation were Cultural Attachment, Connection to ‘Ohana (Family), Connection to ‘Aina (Land), and Connection to Cultural Practices” (Lino 2010, 112). A second survey findings indicated, “[w]ith respect to gender, in all seven outcomes, including achievement motivation and the six elements of cultural connectedness, female students scored higher than their male counterparts” (112). These findings further support the proposition that Indigenous students are better served and better achieve in education settings when culture—viewed as a resource—is a component of instruction and fundamental to interventions.

**Enact: Spiritual Practices and Sharing Stories**

Specific ways to empower identity development opens the door to our second important principle, which is enact. Enact is the ability to practice particular teachings that engage and implement identity development. Tradition-based spiritual practices, which are those teachings rooted in Indigenous epistemologies and ontologies were found to be an integral source for

R35 American Indians (Elliott 2010; Grayshield et al. 2015; Matamonasa-Bennett 2005). Native men who experienced domestic violence underscored how participating in sweat lodges provided a space for them to speak freely and feel safe and vulnerable to cry because there was a sense of no judgment from those participating (Matamonasa-Bennett 2005). Other spiritual traditions and cultural practices included participating in seasonal ceremonies, prayer, and smudging. An important aspect of the enact principle is to be open to dialoguing about spirituality (Grayshield et al. 2015).
According to Jones, Castellanos, and Cole (2002), recommendations for successful retention of Native Americans include a sweat-house for Native Americans, and more money for powwows. Although her research did not focus exclusively on the experiences of Native men and boys, rather, it examined the experiences of American Indians more generally, Jervis (2009) found that among 44 Northern Plains American Indians, cultural trauma was expressed in disillusionment with community leaders and grief about perceived culture loss as well as the complex connections between traumatization at the level of the individual and the community. Spirituality and religion served as a primary means for reconnecting with traditional culture, which proved crucial in people’s attempts to cope with community traumatization (Guilmino 2006; Jervis 2009; Korkow 2008). Conley (2008) also found participating in cultural activities, having a strong personal and cultural identity, and practicing spirituality enhanced education success. According to Peralez (2014), Native American culture is a contributing factor for academic resiliency. Tribal identity is important as is identity as a person, blood memory/blood quantum, prayers, stories told by grandfathers, and Native value systems.

Another important positioning of enacting is through sharing stories with other Natives. In one study, sharing stories of violence with other Native men was helpful for their own healing, but also provided a space where other Native men could connect and relate with those who may encounter similar experiences (Matamonasa-Bennett 2005). Stories offer a place to “speak from the heart” (Matamonasa-Bennett 2005). In another study, fatherhood roles were examined when substance abuse patterns intersected with fatherhood (Neault et al. 2012). In that study, they assert that programs should provide an openness to discuss the impact of substance use on their families. Creating the spaces for Native boys and men to tell their stories to each other is a form of re-education and allows them to reconnect to a collective experience, itself a form of re-educating. Often, this can release feelings of individualized shame because many programs are not constructed to help people see their experiences as part of collectives. Indeed, individual achievement and individual mental health models are pervasive.

Engage: Relationships with People and Place Matter

Engaging in relationships with people (institutional staff, advisors, faculty, peers, and family) and place (home and homelands) were critically important for American Indian success underscoring that relationships matter (Davis 2004; Elliott 2010; Matsumoto 2010; Kealoha 2012). One historical study examined the development of “survival schools” during the 1970s, a time of increasing societal activism such as the American Indian Movement (AIM). These survival schools were two schools in Minneapolis and St. Paul that were created by AIM. R36 members. Davis (2004) found that a successful component of these survival schools were that they cultivated close bonds among their students such that students were expected to care for and watch after their class peers like brothers and sisters. In addition, these schools fostered cooperative relationships between staff members and students’ parents and extended families. In another study among Native Hawaiian undergraduate students, relationships with advisors, faculty, and peers provided an accountability process for Native students’ successful progression in their academics (Kealoha 2012). This study asserted that family involvement in the accountability process should also be developed (Kealoha 2012). This literature fruitfully and effectively speaks to the engagement of building extended family at college settings.

We understand the powerful role of family and will expand on familial relationships in the next principle. According to Conley (2008), Farris (2013), Guilmino (2006), Peralez (2014), and Young (2006) Native students pursuing higher education report the impact of supportive, involved family and friends as positive influencers. Young (2006) notes, in conjunction with building relationships, Native Hawaiian men emphasize the kuleana (which effectively translates to “responsibility”) that Native Hawaiian doctoral students have to their community—and, by extension, the lands and people therein. Further, Guilmino (2006) identified family of origin push for education, community influences, support from acquired family (e.g., spouse), as well as parental modeling of work ethic as asset-based aspects that positively influence career success for Native males. Further, when it comes to making important education and life decisions, Guilmino (2006) adds it is important to keep in mind, when Native peoples are asked to consider a course of action, they may be hesitant to make an immediate decision as cultural protocol may necessitate discussion with the family prior to committing to something that could impact the family or larger society. The insistence on protocol highlights the importance
and power of relationships between people and each other, people and place, and individuals and the collective. The collective survives when cultural norms are observed and used to guide decision-making processes.

Having a connection to home (place) and returning home was crucial for American Indian/Alaskan Native doctoral students’ persistence and degree attainment in a psychology program (Elliott 2010). Policies and practice within education that promulgate the relationality between American Indian students and tribal communities is crucial to the future success and capacity of American Indian communities.

**Enlighten: Reciprocal Learning from Engaging with Family, Elders, and Mentors**

Closely linked with the engage principle is the enlighten principle, which we refer to as the reciprocal learning (enlightenment) that ensues when engaging with others. We found that scholarship supports the powerful learning exchanged when Native students connect with family (Davis 2004; Elliott 2010; Hudson 2014; Kealoha 2012). Among Native college students attending a non-Native college and university, one study found that students preferred seeking assistance from family members when encountering psychological or mental health concerns (Hudson 2014). Furthermore, Native parents transmitted messages that instilled cultural pride and effective coping strategies when Native students encountered discrimination (Yasui et al. 2015). Students benefit from family support. When Native parental control became a feature of institutional governance for survival skills, the entire school also benefitted from parental expertise (Davis 2004). Moreover, actively seeking relationships with elders in the community was an important enlighten principle for achieving sobriety and creating relationships with supportive partners among Native men who experienced domestic violence (Matamonasa-Bennett 2005).

When continuing our enlighten principle, we found evidence that asserted the influential role of mentorship. Social support from faculty/staff mentors were the most powerful non-cognitive factor among undergraduate Native students (Gloria & Robinson-Kurpius 2001). Mentors, both from an educational and cultural context, were key to aspiring Native psychologists in “getting through” their doctoral education (Elliott 2010). Peer mentoring programs helped in the adjustments/demands of college life among Native Hawaiian students (Kealoha 2012). In another study among Native men who have experienced domestic violence assert that having positive, non-violent mentors were important to their healing (Matamonasa-Bennett 2005).

According to Conley (2008), the impact of women mentors is important, as noted by both sexes as an educational enhancer for Native students who wish to pursue higher education as well as having supportive involved teachers, professors, or instructors (Conley 2008; Farris 2013; Guilmino 2006; Korkow 2008; McCaffery 2012; Neuerburg 2000; Peralz 2014; Young 2006). McCaffery (2012) specifically suggests elders play an important role in persistence and success, teaching others, and learning from elders. For Guilmino (2006), the importance of role models, successful leaders, and elders was evident and important.

**Envision: Purpose-Driven Framework**

Several studies illuminate an envision principle, which we refer to as a purpose-driven framework, strengthens students’ motivation to persist in college. A desire to help community was a guiding force for Native doctoral students as it illustrated a “full circle of purpose” (Elliott 2010, 177). Young (2006) further suggests that academic cohort experiences are important for Native Hawaiian male student success. According to participants in Young’s (2006) study:

- Most of the men had very little to say about the experience of being a male doctoral student. This issue pertained more to ethnicity than gender. However, one participant suggested that there are fewer Native Hawaiian males with PhDs in comparison to females. He offered an explanation. “We need a lot more because there are very few. The most recent graduates have been predominantly female. Without sounding sexist, I think it’s harder for Native Hawaiian males to go through this because they are expected in the culture to be the breadwinners. I think it’s harder” (92).
• The participant suggested that the task of completing a dissertation was very western because it required the student to work alone. He elaborated, “So relationships were very important and that’s Hawaiian. You don’t do it by yourself. You have to do it with others. The more hands, the better. I also think that part of the socialization process for higher ed. and also for doing the dissertation is very western. You know, you just be by yourself, all alone. I think that without my sense of not just relationships, but connection, with this greater world being sort of a spirituality kind of thing [I would not have succeeded].”

• Participants suggested that Native Hawaiians need to view their doctoral work as something to help the Native Hawaiian community. A participant clarified, “That’s why you sit at almost dichotomous ends because the dissertation and getting the degree is R38 yours, but if the dissertation is about your Hawaiian communities, ah, that dissertation is not yours alone. You are speaking with their words so you have to honor their voice, their history, their experiences” (94)

In many ways, the notion of envisioning is directly tied to larger conversations around the importance of tribal nation building (Brayboy et al. 2012; Brayboy, Castagno, & Solyom 2015). The nature of being driven by collective purpose is crucial to the success of all Native students and peoples; it is especially true for Indigenous men and boys.

**Enhance: Institutional and Tribal Support**

Enhancing is the way in which institutions and tribes provide support to Native students. Within institutions, according to Barnard (2004), Blackwell (2001), Bock (2006), de la Rosa (2005), Guilmino (2006), Jamerson (2013), Jen (2015), and Peralez (2014), having Native instructors, access to classes on Native topics, curriculum centered on Indigenous roots, and applying learned skills in life contribute positively to Native student persistence and success (56–61). Bock (2006) explicitly states educators should not assume that all students understand European-based stories and their themes—a disconnect between culturally relevant curriculum can influence student reading comprehension. Tribally specific support was another principle that enhanced the students and institutions. Tribal-specific associations with cultural identity and traditional ways of parenting revealed protective forces in shaping American Indian fatherhood roles (Neult et al. 2012). According to Jones, Castellanos, and Cole (2002), recommendations for successful retention of Native Americans include creating an opportunity for the Native American tribe leaders to talk to the university president and setting goals for Native American students’ retention. Moreover, institutions and tribal nations that provided financial resources to Native students was a necessary resource (Bitsoi 2007; Guilmino 2006)
Discussion

The principles noted above offer patterns across the studies that were relevant for our work. Rather than engage in perpetuating deficit-oriented views of what is happening with and among Indigenous boys and men, we believe that a strengths-based approach is necessary and important. Because education, schooling, and practices happen in place, and because we do not have large-scale data, we are hesitant to draw broad conclusions about specific responses to the literature. We are, however, inclined to suggest that there are some themes or principles that may travel across contexts and moments. We have outlined these principles in the previous pages, including: empower, enact, engage, enlighten, envision, and enhance. We return to them here.

The notion of empowerment is not an easy one for us. Following Deloria (1973/2003), we believe that power can neither be given nor received. Power is, we believe, embedded in us all. The work is to assist young people in finding ways to access the power they have and then deploy it in ways that allow them to be strong, self-sufficient, proud, and giving. Programs that are guided by the notion that they can assist young people in unlocking their inherent strengths will successfully address many of the challenges that Indigenous boys and men encounter.

While we are engaged in this project in a two-dimensional process (reading and writing, and placing knowledge on paper) and in a noun-based way (knowledge takes the form of a R39 report), we believe that programs must take on four-dimensional, verb-based responses to the challenges in front of, and resources embedded in, Indigenous boys and men. The idea that programs should enact is crucial, and it draws on both embodying and enacting knowledge, but also embedding conceptions of spirituality. By this, we are not calling for religion; instead, we believe that successful programs will successfully connect to particular moral and ethical framings guided by connection to place and belief systems that are congruent with groups. Embodied knowledge that contains ties to spirituality is a four-dimensional framework. Programs rooted in doing and enacting solutions carry the possibilities of success. We do reform, we enact it, and we embody it.

Directly tied to enactment is the concept of engagement. We engage place, people, ideas, and ethical concerns. In our interview with Keola Chan, of the Hale Mua, he noted that their successful program emerged from concerns that Kanaka Maoli women’s and children’s needs were being addressed through programming, but men were struggling with domestic violence, substance and alcohol abuse, and suicides. Rather than accept or turn away from the challenge, they decided to engage them. In short, it is incumbent upon researchers and program builders to become what Lumbee legal scholar Robert A. Williams (1997) calls “story hearing fools.” In this case, programs that work often emerge from challenges that the community has already identified. The community too, has a series of responses to the challenges. In our conversations, Mr. Chan told us, “We need to have more of these conversations…[there] should not be separate academic and community facets.” Crucial in this powerful observation is that academics must listen, and we must find ways to partner with communities. But, it is communities that drive the conversation.

These conversations between communities and researchers serve to enlighten our understanding of the challenges. But they also illuminate the role of reciprocal relationships between elders, community members, and children. The intergenerational transfer of knowledge is clearly one direction highlighting a pathway to success. Recently, we heard about a successful young woman named Danielle Ta'Sheena Finn, the current Miss Indian World, who earned her Juris Doctorate at Arizona State University, who said about her work as a leader and activist, “Oyáte kin nípi kta cha léchamun. I do it so my people live.” We find this notion of “I do it so my people live” a perfect way to engage and talk about larger conceptions of reciprocity. We have written about the notion of reciprocity as, “I take so that I can give to others” (Brayboy et al. 2012). The larger point here is that enlightenment is not about telling others how to see; it is the idea that we see through the work and example of others. Programs that are guided by intergenerational exchanges of ideas will be successful.

Ms. Finn envisions a future for her community and others that is rooted in futures of their own making. Programs that envision bright-lined futures for children are crucial to addressing the challenges in front of Indigenous peoples, boys, and men. It is important that programs addressing the needs and futures of Indigenous boys and men are intentional and deliberate. Here, by deliberate we do not mean slow and plodding; rather, we want to suggest that programs with vision (those that are envisioning) are thoughtful about creating pathways for participants to create, nurture, and enact futures of their own making. We envision so that we can do; programs envision toward the end of enacting and enhancing the lives of people.

We close this section with an emphasis on engaging in an enhancement of ideas, lives, and futures. This work must be forward- and future-focused. Great programs will consider how they can illuminate possibilities. Work with Indigenous peoples can often become mired in the past. The challenges in front of our communities are not new, but centuries old, and historical trauma is real. While we understand these, we want to encourage researchers and funders to honor the past, while pressing to create and enact—to enhance—new futures and possibilities for Indigenous peoples.
Recommendations

Any set of recommendations for thinking about how to address the needs of Indigenous boys and men must lead with the very premise that there must be a structural change in the narrative about the Indigenous boys and men. As we walk around our college campus, look at our own family members (on a daily basis), and travel into Native communities, we see hope, promise, strength, and action in which Indigenous men are engaged in important work. The “dysfunctional” Indigenous man is a creation of a system that rests on the shoulders of colonization. We propose that programs be built on the strengths of language and culture, rooted in place, to assist tribal peoples in creating futures of their own making. Throughout this document, we have attempted to point to the promise of language and culture. The Hale Mua Program, for example, is an example of the promise of listening to communities, returning to traditional teachings and roles, and engaging in the promise of the future. We strongly urge private foundations, philanthropies, and governmental entities in finding ways to partner with organizations and leaders who understand who they are, culturally and linguistically, as well as leaders who love their communities and its members.

It is also important that researchers also understand and engage language and culture into their work. According to Guilmino (2007), when possible, it is important to incorporate Native language into research and interaction/education.

Cultural customs that are traditionally taboo in one culture may be ordinarily displayed in another. For example, in social interactions, Native Americans tend to have a reserved, cautious manner, feel little need to explain things verbally, and maintain less eye contact in conversation. In addition, they often use another person to help them communicate (Edwards & Edwards 1980). Wing, Crow, and Thompson (1995) stated that Muscogee (Creek) Indians, especially those traditional members of ceremonial grounds, typically looked down while speaking to elders or guests and allow them to speak first. In their recent experience with ethnographic interviewing of Native Americans, Kawulich and Curlette (1998) observed that asking or rephrasing a question either may result in an appropriate response or may be met with skepticism and silence, depending on the subject. Asking too many in-depth questions about certain subjects may be considered rude. It may be helpful to note that many Native Americans are reticent about sharing their thoughts and feelings until appropriate relationships and contexts have been established. Stone and Njumbwa (1994) conclude that this hesitation necessitates sensitivity and empathy on the part of a counselor to ensure correct understanding of the problem.

The researchers mentioned above all conducted studies involving primarily Native American participants with no comparative norm group. It is with this type of research methodology that the advancement of multicultural sensitivity takes place. Yet, it is still discouraging to see these authors use their data which was acquired from specific tribal communities and generalize to other Native American communities. Wing et. al. (1995) systematically made references to the specific population under investigation, and did not sway to make grand generalizations about their findings to other Native American groups. This form of research is hoped to be obtained from this study (14).

Research needs to examine nontraditional forms of education as strengths-based forms of instruction “The teachings of traditional customs and values should not be dismissed because learning does not take place in a classroom. It seems all too often that researchers are proponents of “fitting” Native Americans into traditional education systems, when it seems the focus should be on the preservation of Native American traditions and how those traditions can be passed down to younger generations” (Guilmino 2007, 27).

Rink, Anastario, & FourStar (2012) add research that works beneficially with and for Native communities, includes tribal council members, and makes recommendations for how to disseminate the study results on the reservation. It also updates tribal councils regularly in order to receive input and guidance during the various phases of the research process, including study design, review of data results, data dissemination, and manuscript review and approval.

Furthermore, given the sensitive nature of some research topics, it may be necessary to involve Native male researchers, who may be enrolled members of the tribe, to conduct in-depth interviews with the target population.
Pairing programs like those mentioned above with researchers and academic institutions would also allow a systematic collection of data to occur so that the principles outlined in this report can be enhanced with data. These data can be used in both formative and summative evaluations, and to assist funders in highlighting important aspects of the work that are transferrable. Fundamentally, understanding how things work relies on data, its collection, and analyses.

There is clearly not enough data to engage the work as robustly as necessary. The purpose of the final analysis was to focus on identifying key strategies that contribute to reducing disparities for Indigenous boys and men. One concern, for us, in raising this issue is that funders and scholars will read our scan as a suggestion that because there isn’t much out there, researchers should not be concerned. We want to argue quite the opposite. We encourage—in the strongest possible terms—a more focused approach on highlighting work being done, and on creating new initiatives that will allow others to follow. This is not only important; it is necessary and crucial to the future of Indigenous peoples. Our first set of recommendations, then, is that there must be a more systemic, systematic, and intentional effort to collect data, including by oversampling for American Indian, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian peoples.

The use of the asterisk to address any population being “statistically insignificant” should be rendered an artifact of the past. We understand that this will require additional funding from local, state, and federal agencies. We believe that the data collection—and their concomitant analyses—will pay itself back through healthier, more productive peoples. And, while we understand the importance of an economic argument for engaging in the work, we want to reiterate the moral and ethical reasons for this recommendation. Given the trust relationship and responsibility between tribal nations and the US government, the collection of data is necessary.

Enhancing the data is also important. To this end, we recommend that agencies find ways to be able to link data sets and resources. Life is not simply about what happens in school or an individual’s (or group’s) engagement with the justice system alone. It is complex, nuanced, and intersectional. So too should our data be intersectional to help us understand how different factors influence the lives of Indigenous peoples, men, and boys. A coordinated effort will also allow researchers and scholars, working closely with tribal communities, to establish more nuanced, textured programs to meet the complex needs of Indigenous boys and men.

On a higher education level, we believe that there are ways to assist Indigenous boys and men in both completing their degrees and in better understanding possible futures. Creating Native cultural centers on college campuses will allow young men there to both have a refuge from the daily stressors of being on campuses that are often hostile to them, and to engage in community building. These centers are a crucial part of assisting the young men in feeling like they belong to the institution and it belongs to them. Coordinating with the physical space to provide emotional and psychological support is also crucial. We recommend that institutions implement student support groups and encouraging culture-specific student groups. Combining the physical with the psychosocial elements are crucial in assisting Indigenous men in making the transition into higher education. Additionally, we believe that institutions can:  

- Provide freshman seminars that use college transition approaches, develop mentor programs and create liaisons for Native students in key university offices.
- Create orientation programs and first year academic learning communities that focus on Indigenous traditions, heritage, culture, and “ways of knowing” to foster student success.
- Develop summer bridge programs with curriculum that includes study skills, time management, financial resources, faculty expectations, and student support services.
- Institutions must continue to support student organization and groups that are Indigenous focused.
- Create liaisons for Indigenous students in key university offices (financial aid, business affairs, and admissions) where staff is trained in understanding and being sensitive to cultural norms.
- Provide pre- and in-service training for all staff on developing, implementing, and maintaining in-class curricular by using culturally conscious ways of instructional design such as the cultural tool of a talking circle.
We would be remiss if we did not encourage funders to take seriously the invisibility and erasure of Native peoples more generally and Native boys and men more explicitly. There is a clear need for funders to take the issue of the current state of Indigenous boys and men—and their communities—seriously. To this end, we recommend that new funding streams be opened that will allow researchers opportunities to explore the current state of education, health (both mental and physical), culture and linguistic, justice-related, suicidality, labor, nutrition, and housing for Indigenous peoples more generally and Indigenous boys and men more specifically. These opportunities should take both topic-specific and intersectional analyses. It is difficult to fully address the nature of the challenges in front of us without fully understanding what the challenges—and resources to respond—truly are.

We are also calling on academic institutions and researchers across racialized groups to do a number of things. First, institutions and researchers must be deliberate and intentional in examining and exploring the current state of Indigenous boys and men. There is significant work already addressing black boys and men and Latino boys and men; although we recognize that there needs to be more work on all racialized boys and men. Institutions need to be conscious of closing the gap in what we know about Indigenous boys and men. We understand that some non-Native scholars of color have been hesitant to join in this work. While we understand this, and we believe that Native scholars should lead the way, there is a need for coalitions to engage this work. Second, and relatedly, we call on these individuals and institutions to prepare future Indigenous scholars to be able to engage in producing research and creating policy. There are numerous scholars of color and allies who have the capacity to do this; we urge them, in the strongest possible terms, to engage in this important capacity-building work. Third, there must be a more focused effort on building coalitions across racialized groups. This will generate interesting and productive scholarship, create support systems for scholars and communities, and amplify everyone’s voices. Finally, we call on institutions and scholars to be mindful of making important connections between Indigenous boys and men, and women and girls. It is vitally important that we do not unintentionally create tensions through gendered work; instead, we believe there are some useful connections that will benefit everyone. The Hale Mua program is indicative of ways to frame these conversations. It was a group of women who called on men to engage in the important work of healing; that call was done within the context of understanding the importance of gender roles in Indigenous communities.

Finally, we call on authors, journal editors, conference reviewers, and presses to seriously engage in the pursuit of scholarship that addresses Indigenous boys and men. In our call to change the narrative, one place to begin is in the published articles. We found few pieces in our extensive review that focused specifically on Indigenous boys and men in peer-reviewed scholarship. While we are not “blaming” editors, we are making a call for editors and others who are in the role of acquisitions to be mindful and intentional in seeking, cultivating, and encouraging submissions on this topic. Working closely with scholars already embedded in the boys and men scholarship, a database of potential authors and contributors can be developed and cultivated.

We end by recognizing that the challenges encountered by Indigenous boys and men are not new; they are centuries old. Over 100 years ago, Arthur C. Parker (1916) addressed what he called the “seven stolen rights” (254). American Indians have been:

1. robbed of freedom of action;
2. robbed of economic independence;
3. robbed of social organization;
4. robbed of intellectual life;
5. robbed of moral standards and racial ideals;
6. robbed of a good name among the peoples of the earth; and

While we might take issue with how some of these sentiments are expressed, we think that the essence of the concerns are as viable in June 2017 as they were in September 1916. Parker was not done, however. He went on to write:

Whether he can express his thoughts in words or not, whether the turmoil in his heart finds voice or not, the American Indian who has suffered the oppression that is worse than death feels that civilization has (1) made him a man without a country; (2) usurped his responsibility; (3) demeaned his manhood; (4) destroyed his ideals; (5) broken faith with him; (6) humiliated his spirit; and, (7) refused to listen to his petitions (256).

Again, this list could have been used to outline this report, our findings, and our response therein. Our hope is that in 10 years, we can have some assurances that we are on a pathway toward creating meaningful, proactive responses to the challenges facing tribal communities and our boys and men. After centuries of neglect, we choose to move toward visions of hope, promise, and possibilities. As parents, partners, friends, and children of Native boys and men, they (and our ancestors) deserve our very best efforts. Those efforts lie ahead; let us get to work.
Our research team is a multiracial one. We are Indigenous peoples, representing citizens of the Navajo Nation, Hopi Tribe, Mohegan Tribe, Lumbee Tribe, and Ojibwe tribe. We also have members of our team who are Puerto Rican, Mexican, black, and Middle Eastern. What unites the team, comprised of individuals from both Arizona State University and the University of Washington is that we are scholars focused on the work of justice and are committed to disrupting the rendering of Native boys and men as invisible and insignificant. Our team is comprised of Indigenous faculty members, postdoctoral fellows, doctoral students, and undergraduate students. We are parents to Indigenous children (including Indigenous boys), understand both urban and rural Indigenous communities, having deep roots in these places, and are committed to the larger questions of equity and justice, which guide our work. We are both men and women. Our structure is rooted in long-term relationships with, for, and among Native communities, and we are part of the Center for Indian Education.
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RISE INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

Program:
Date of interview:
Interviewer(s):
Interview participant(s):

1. Tell us about how your program came to be
   a. How long have you been in operation?
   b. How did it start?
   c. Why did it start?
   d. What has been important in the development of your program?

2. What are the central activities and approaches of your program?
   a. How do you do what you do?

3. What are the most significant challenges you encounter in running your program?
   a. How do you manage these challenges?
      i. Who helps with them?
      ii. What are the outcomes of the challenges?
   b. What would make the challenges go away?
   c. How much do you think those challenges are specific to your community and how much are they challenges that you think other communities would face?

4. What are the most significant rewards or impacts of your program?
   a. How do you explain these awards or impacts to others?
   b. How do these rewards manifest themselves? What do they look like?

5. How and in what ways do you engage tribal communities in your work?
   a. What, specifically, do communities contribute to the program? To programming?
   b. What challenges present themselves in the relationship between your program and communities? How and in what ways do tribal communities contribute to your programs successes?
   c. How do you think tribal histories impact or shape your program and work?

6. What are the best lessons you have learned from running the program?
   a. About community relationships?
   b. About the challenges faced by Indigenous boys and men?
   c. About the futures of Native boys and men?

7. If money was no object, what would the perfect program look like to address the needs of Native boys and men?
   a. What are those challenges they face?
   b. What is stopping you from building the perfect program?
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