

The Social Justice, Peace, and Environmental Education Standards Project¹

Julie Andrzejewski, St. Cloud State University

Abstract

Inspired by the Alaska Native Knowledge Network's Standards for Culturally Responsive Schools, members of sixteen social justice, peace, and environmental education (SJPEE) special interest groups (SIGs) from the American Educational Research Association (AERA) and several other prominent organizations have been involved in drafting SJPEE "standards" based on research, theoretical perspectives, foundational documents and models. Ten SIGs have already disseminated drafts to members and beyond to help forge a set of standards, guidelines, or queries representing collective visions for social justice, peace, and ecological sustainability. A project goal is to garner the energy and wisdom of many constituencies to increase visibility, credibility, and accountability for SJPEE in the national educational agenda.

The Project Takes Shape

Over the last decade, the Alaska Native Knowledge Network (ANKN) has been influencing educational systems through a series of groundbreaking Standards and Guidelines for students, parents, educators, curriculum, schools, and communities (Assembly of Alaska Native Educators, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002). Using an inclusive decision-making process, five cultural regions in Alaska cooperatively developed a vision to integrate indigenous worldviews and ways of knowing into Alaskan educational systems. The cultural standards that emerged from this process established a powerful blueprint for educating native children while assuring flexibility of activities and timelines needed by each region.

Using the ANKN standards as a model, I decided to explore the potential for involving progressive educators in the development of positive "standards" for SJPEE. The Chairs of several pertinent AERA SIGs responded enthusiastically to an initial invitation to pursue this idea. Another impetus was the potential for increasing alliances among AERA SIGs and other organizations working on social justice, peace, and environmental education.

At the first town meeting of eight SIGs, the discussion was guarded - but optimistic. The first question addressed was whether such standards could provide a tool for fostering SJPEE education in schools and universities, or whether the national imposition of "standards" had been so malevolent that this tool ought not to be pursued. While the negative consequences of government imposed standards and standardized testing were of great concern and frustration, the grassroots efforts of multiple constituencies within the ANKN provided an intriguing example of the constructive development and implementation of social and environmental justice standards. A consensus emerged to move forward with a collaborative research and writing project to explore and develop broad-based SJPEE guidelines or standards.

In the second year, representatives, designees, or volunteers from fourteen SJPEE SIGs and other organizations² learned how such standards or guidelines might be written and used, shared

¹ I wish to acknowledge those who contributed to this project and article: John Alessio, Marta Baltodano, Ray Barnhardt, Candice Carter, Robert Crafton, S. Maxwell Hines, Ji-Yeon Jo, Margaret Maaka, Bonnie Mullinix, Valerie Owen, John Palmer, Cornel Pewewardy, Valerie Polakow, Gregory Smith, Robin M. Smith, Aline Stomfay-Stitz, Linda Symcox, Diane Torres-Velaquez, Christopher S. Walsh. Joining the project: David Gruenewald, Charlotte Harris, Todd Jennings, Sharon Nelson Barber, Beth Swadener, Sharon Tettegah, Freeman Wicklund.

² Critical Examination of Race, Ethnicity, Class, and Gender; Critical Educators for Social Justice; Research Focus on Black Education; Environmental and Ecological Education, Global Child Advocacy, Hispanic Research Issues; Indigenous Peoples of the Americas; Indigenous Peoples of the Pacific; Research on the Education of Asian and Pacific Americans; Research Focus on Education in Caribbean and Africa; Disability Studies in Education; Research on

theoretical perspectives and initial drafts of SJPEE standards/guidelines, and discussed concerns. Intense interactions about community involvement, adaptation to different community needs, and whether statements should be called “standards” were raised and debated³. While no definitive answers to these concerns were reached, considerable excitement emerged about the possibility that SJPEE standards could increase interest, visibility, knowledge, and institutional transformation.

Interest in the project continues to grow with the involvement of additional SIGs and organizations⁴, drafts of standards or guidelines being written, revised, and disseminated, and possible uses of such documents being envisioned and discussed. Every group is working at its own pace with its own procedures.

Historical and Political Context

A summary of the historical and political context of the standards movement might demonstrate the potential of this project. The recent educational standards movement was initiated, for the most part, by powerful conservative forces. Lynne Cheney and others were interested in forestalling or reversing the influx of social issues and paradigm shifts arising from scholarly challenges to the traditional story of “progress and democracy” in Western civilization. Although emerging from conservatives, standards have not always remained under their control, as evidenced by the rise and fall of the National Standards for History from 1993-95 (Symcox, 2002). When these standards, developed by scores of dedicated teachers and scholars, did not represent the “patriotic” and exclusionary vision of “America” desired by the funders, the Republican controlled Senate publicly condemned the standards. Even under this negative aura, the National History Standards are currently being used by teachers all over the United States.

As this scenario illustrates, educational standards are strenuously contested in the struggle to control the perception of reality by children and youth. With mass media concentrated under the control of ever fewer giant corporations, media watchdogs (Phillips & Project Censored 2003, Stauber 2002, McChesney 1999), document increased censorship, propaganda, and public relations campaigns serving the interests of corporate elites. Schools and universities are the other primary source of ideas and information for the populace. They can be tools for critical thinking, social and environmental justice, and active citizenship; or they can further consolidate this corporate view of reality. Efforts toward the corporate control of education include the promulgation of the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS), the voucher movement to shift public funding to private schools, and top down standards requiring accountability through high stakes testing further justifying the privatization of education (Berliner & Biddle, 1995; Vinson et al, 2001). Such educational policies will increase global corporate domination, militarism, economic disparity, environmental destruction, and control of democracy and dissent. Given the quashing of public dissent through the Patriot Acts I and II, and the state of permanent war, countervailing educational forces are needed more than ever.

At the same time conservative forces are pressuring schools and universities to conform to these policies, progressive multicultural, social justice, and environmental education movements have burgeoned within academic institutions, professional associations, and non-profit organizations. Creative spaces for questioning, investigating, re-searching, and teaching new paradigms, inclusionary theories, perspectives, and knowledge bases have deepened and matured (Gollnick and Chinn, 2002; Grant and Gomez, 2001). Outside of the national media spotlight, parents, educators, and students, with a solid research base, have responded to the standards and testing movement in

Education of Asian and Pacific Americans; Peace Education; Democratic Citizenship in Education; National Association of Multicultural Education, Alaska Native Knowledge Network.

³ Since there are differences of opinion about what to call these documents, the terms “standards or guidelines” will be used to indicate continuing dialogue.

⁴ The Research on Women in Education SIG, Amnesty International USA, and Teachkind are joining the conversation.

different ways. Some communities and professional organizations have issued statements or resolutions challenging high stakes testing and voicing rights and principles of quality education (New Paltz Education Network, 2002, NAME 2001, Rethinking Schools 1999).

Other organizations are responding by developing and implementing educational standards promoting democracy, inclusion, and social justice. On a global level, the World Indigenous People's Conference on Education issued the Coolangatta Statement on Indigenous Peoples' Rights in Education. This document situates indigenous human and educational rights in a global colonial context and draws upon numerous international charters, conventions, and civil rights documents to support their claims to "systems of education which reflect, respect, and embrace Indigenous cultural values, philosophies, and ideologies..." (WIPCE, 1999).

The ANKN standards and guidelines have been endorsed by governmental and non-governmental agencies, and adapted to address areas beyond schooling, including the development of "Culturally Responsive Guidelines for Alaska Public Libraries," developed by the Alaska Library Association (2001). On an international level, the ANKN standards were recently incorporated into an indigenous higher education accreditation system developed by the World Indigenous Nations Higher Education consortium, and have served as the subject of a case study on innovative practices in indigenous education prepared by UNESCO. The ANKN standards have stimulated numerous professional development initiatives for educators in Alaska, such as a set of courses on Creating Culturally Responsive Schools" offered through the Alaska Staff Development Network, and a new graduate course at the University of Alaska Fairbanks on "Alaska Standards for Culturally Responsive Schools." Although "academic performance" as defined in traditional western paradigms must be subject to scrutiny in itself, the impact of the implementation of the ANKN standards on areas of academic performance is being followed by the Alaska Rural Systemic Initiative (AKRSI). Based on data gathered on mathematics benchmarks, Barnhardt (2002) summarizes, "The consistent improvement in academic performance of students in AKRSI-affiliated schools over each of the past six years leads us to conclude that the cumulative effect of utilizing the Alaska Standards for Culturally Responsive Schools to increase the connections between what students experience in school and what they experience outside school appears to have a significant impact on their academic performance."

On another side of the spectrum, what role might NCATE, NTPBS, and INTASC have in fostering SJPEE standards for teacher education? Beyerbach and Nassoij (2003) evaluated these three sets of standards on the extent to which "they defined and advocated for educational equity." They concluded, "Whereas race, class, gender, ability, language, and religion were explicitly mentioned in each set of standards with regard to diversity, these terms were rarely linked to the concepts of equity, power relations, prejudice, and oppression...Though there was some talk about stereotyping...and some language about testing bias..., an anti-bias (Derman Sparks, 1997) perspective was noticeably absent in the national standards." While some institutions might voluntarily utilize these standards to further social justice education (Gallavan and Troutman, Jr., 2001), the standards themselves do not appear to provide an impetus to do so.

The standards or guidelines for SJPEE developed in this project could fill the apparent void left by existing agencies. By involving educators and organizations already dedicated to SJPEE issues, inviting open and democratic participation, and drawing upon many knowledge traditions, the content can emerge from the literature and convictions of educators uncompromised by countervailing economic and political forces.

Theory and Research Base

The SJPEE standards project is based on worldviews drawn from many strands of ancient and contemporary thought that all beings and the natural world are interdependent in profound and complex ways. Activities that affect certain aspects of the ecology affect living beings and vice

versa in ways that are difficult for even the most sophisticated scientists to understand, much less “predict and control.” We are now living in the age of the sixth mass extinction of species; the only one caused by a species living on the planet (Scaff 2002). The initial consequences of global climate change are slowly being recognized and acknowledged (Dauncey 2001). The economic and political activities of humans, which benefit some beings at the expense of others, now dominate the earth. These policies and practices maximize short-term gains at the expense of long term survival and well-being for all. Regardless of the “realities” created to justify the commodification of any and all natural resources, the wars initiated to extract them, or the claims of superiority based on one human characteristic or species over others, all living beings are affected by these activities, directly or indirectly, sooner or later (Barlow & Clarke 2002, LaDuke 1996, Shiva 1995).

Thus, the emerging vision for the project is global and inclusive of knowledge and thought from many intellectual traditions, ways of knowing, and social movements. The scope of SJPEE in this project will draw from knowledge, theory, research, and international agreements on race, ethnicity, class, gender, sexual orientation, disability, national origin, religion, age, physical appearance, species, human rights, global peace, citizenship, democracy, biodiversity, and ecological sustainability. While this vision may appear overly broad, a global perspective can help everyone involved with the project sustain mindfulness of the interfaces of suffering and liberation, challenge us to seek information on issues we know the least, and ground our daily practice in actions for a better world. A shared global vision can assist in writing even the most specific SJPEE standards and can help resolve conflicts when they arise. Importantly, it must remain open to revision as our own understanding of the interrelationships between all significant aspects of life increases.

One example of a comprehensive vision and corresponding actions is outlined in *The Better World Handbook* (Jones, Haenfler, & Johnson 2001). The seven foundations of a better world (economic fairness, comprehensive peace, ecological sustainability, deep democracy, social justice, culture of simplicity, and revitalized community) can help educators and students move from cynicism to hope. Worldwatch Institute research documents the connections between issues of social justice, peace, and ecological survival (Bright et al, 2003, Sachs 1995). Another significant area of theory and research which can inform this project is the impact of commodification of non-human animals on the welfare of human beings, ecological systems, and the lives of animals (Mason 1998, Nibert 2002, Robbins 2001).

Given this broad philosophical base, it would be impossible to acknowledge all the ancient peoples or cite all the contemporary scholars, educators, authors, and activists who have made contributions to the social justice, peace, ecological sustainability, and humane education components of this project. However, a few key historical and contemporary works can at least reveal a limited sense of the breadth and depth of the project. This project draws upon the theories of Dewey (1916) on democracy and education; Fanon (1968) on racism and colonialism; Friere (1970) on liberatory education; Adams, Bell, & Griffin (1997); Banks (1997); Banks & Banks (2003); Bowers (2001); Collins (1990); hooks (1994); Harding (1993); Ladson-Billings (1995); Moraga and Anzaldúa (1981); Nieto (2000); Sapon-Shevin (1999); Sleeter and Grant (2003); Skrtic (1995); Takaki, R. (1993); Tuhiwai Smith (1999); Young (1990); and a host of other groundbreaking scholars in anti-racist, social reconstructivist, multicultural, feminist, social justice, disability, gay/lesbian/bisexual/transgender, environmental, humane, and peace education.

As groups delve further into the research and theories for their work, the intersections of the theoretical foundations will emerge more clearly. At this point, Cochran-Smith’s (1999) “Six Principles of Practice for Learning to Teach for Social Justice” provides a significant framework for standards drafted by the Research on the Education of Asian Pacific Americans SIG. Young’s (1990) “five faces of oppression” is a pivotal theoretical model for the Critical Educators for Social Justice standards on social and economic self-determination for teachers. The Disability Studies SIG uses a model of emancipatory spirituality or politics of meaning to extract the idea of Ethical Impact

Standards from the work of Learner (2002). Critiques of the CEC performance-based standards for special education teachers (Owen, Neville, & Smith, 2001; TASH 2001) are used to challenge the medical deficit-oriented model of disability.

The Environmental and Ecological Education SIG queries draw upon Bowers (2001), Huckle & Sterling (1996), The National Project for Excellence in Environmental Education (1993), Orr (1992, 1994), and Smith & Williams (1999). The Peace Education draft is based in peace development literature (Harris & Morrison 2003, Lantieri & Patti 1996, Salomon & Nevo 2002, Stomfay-Stitz 1993). Reaching out to other traditions, the Gay and Lesbian Studies SIG calls upon Christian pacifism (Muste 1972), Buddhism (Hahn 1995), “New Times” theory (Hall & du Gay 1996) and queer theory (Britzman 2000, Talburt 2000) to inform their initial statements, drawing upon a mix of ancient traditions and contemporary theories for definition and practice of social justice.

The Role of International Research and Policy

International documents and mandates for human rights, social justice, and ecological sustainability are another rich source of integrative and applied research as well as legitimacy for the development of SJPEE standards. For instance, many educators are unaware that the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948 includes a mandate for “every individual and every organ of society” to “strive by teaching and education to promote respect for human rights and freedoms.” It is not surprising, therefore, that implementation of this mandate is irregular, at best. For baseline data, Banks (2001) surveyed all 50 states to determine if and how the UN human rights education mandate is being implemented and assessed. In an updated report at the National Summit on Human Rights Education, Banks (2003) found that 25 states include human rights education (HRE) concepts or content somewhere in their state standards and 25 states do not. Even where HRE is included, however, it is often limited in scope and depth and does not extend to an exploration of values and action. The SJPEE standards project could help inform teachers about the UDHR mandate that provides a basis upon which to include human rights in their teaching.

Just a few of many international documents with multiple constituencies that could provide significant guidance for the development of SJPEE standards are:

- the Coolangatta Statement on indigenous peoples’ rights in education, 1999.
- The Earth Charter, 2000
- The Hague Agenda for Peace and Justice for the 21st Century, 1999
- the International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights (ICESCR), 1976
- the Kari-Oca Declaration of Indigenous Peoples’ Earth Charter, 1993
- Principles of Environment Justice, (First National People of Color Environmental Leadership Summit, 1991)
- The Tbilisi Declaration, 1977
- the UN Convention on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (CERD), 1969
- the UN Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW), 1981
- the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC), 1990
- The UN Plan of Action for the UN Decade for Human Rights Education, 1995-2004

Several of these documents are being used in the SJPEE standards. The ICESCR and the Covenant of Civil and Political Rights were used by the Critical Educators for Social Justice SIG. The Environmental and Ecological SIG draws upon the tenets of the Earth Charter (2000). The National Association for Multicultural Education (NAME, 2002) draws from the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in the draft Criteria for Evaluating State Curriculum Standards on five aspects of curriculum: inclusiveness, diverse perspective, alternative epistemologies/social construction of knowledge, self-knowledge (identity), and social justice.

Criteria for Process and Content

With a few exceptions, SIGs meet once per year at the annual meeting so work progresses slowly through email and occasional phone communications. Since the purpose of this project continues to evolve through studying ANKN standards, reviewing research, discussion, writing, and revision, I offer some tentative criteria gathered from discussions about the SJPEE Standards Project. These can serve as another area for discussion and revision.

- Efficacy: to explore the efficacy of a set of standards or guidelines to foster education on social justice, global peace, human rights, and ecological sustainability.
- Research-based: to apply and translate available research on SJPEE through the development of standards or guidelines to help students, teachers, schools, communities, teacher preparation, accreditation, and other aspects of education.
- Internationally-based: to locate historical, international, and/or legal documents addressing SJPEE upon which educational standards or guidelines could be based;
- Democratically-developed: to democratically and collaboratively generate, draft, disseminate, discuss, revise, and continually improve a set of SJPEE standards or guidelines;
- Accessible: to create standards or guidelines that are clear and understandable to educational practitioners at all educational levels, and by students wherever possible.
- Practical: to develop practical, useable standards or guidelines that may be helpful in bringing SJPEE into all aspects of education wherever desired and possible.
- Adaptable: to create templates that “are not intended to be inclusive, exclusive or conclusive, and thus should be reviewed and adapted to fit local needs.” (Assembly of Alaska Native Educators, 1998, 3)
- Experiential: to explore models for community-based learning and SJPEE activities that foster everyday social responsibility and global citizenship (Andrzejewski & Alessio, 1999)

The Overview Statement

The overview statement (Box 1) introduces our vision and the sample standards or guidelines (Box 2) are in the process of evolving. We continue to invite suggestions to help these documents meet the above criteria.

Standards for Social Justice, Peace, Environmental Education

As educators, teacher educators, scholars, and educational administrators focusing on social justice, peace, and environmental education, we envision a world of caring, respect, compassion, and peace. We seek to encourage understanding, conservation, and celebration of differences – different species, ecologies, cultures, heritages, languages, belief systems, epistemologies, and ways of living.

We are dedicated to fundamental values inspired by international agreements like the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Convention for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, the Convention for the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women, the Convention on the Rights of the Child, the Coolangatta Statement, the Earth Charter and others. Such documents put into words the values of human rights, liberty, justice, dignity, democracy, freedom of body, speech, and religion, and access to adequate food, water, shelter, and health care. We further draw upon the collective wisdom of many cultures around the world which value cooperation, sharing, compassion, reciprocity, equanimity, harmony, natural law, biodiversity, spirituality, non-violence, and peace. In particular, the values inherent in the work of indigenous peoples' organizations (e.g. the World Indigenous Peoples' Conference on Education and the Alaska Native Knowledge Network), offer guidance, critical reference points, and valuable models for those seeking to promote social and environmental justice in the United States and around the world. Central to the future of human beings, other species, and the natural environment is our ability to support the practice of these values in our lives and in those around us.

Mission statements of most educational institutions in the USA currently highlight key elements of these values. However, missions, philosophy statements, and institutional goals are only as good as their implementation and lived experience. In keeping with the movement for greater accountability of social institutions, these standards provide a lens through which to evaluate whether the everyday actions of our educational institutions are congruent with their stated values. They further provide an institutional mechanism for monitoring the extent to which the entire educational system embodies these values through the personnel, the physical environment, the overt and hidden curricula, the students themselves, and in relationships with the larger world of families, communities, the natural world, and other species.

We assert that educational institutions at all levels should place a central emphasis on integrating and fostering social justice, peace, ecological sustainability, and humane education through every aspect of the educational process: interpersonal relationships, community, curriculum, teaching, leadership, research, and institutional policies, procedures, and practices. Toward that end, educational institutions have an obligation to prepare active, peace-oriented, democratic citizens with the commitment, motivation, knowledge, and skills to work for a better world.

Examples of SJPEE Standards or Guidelines

Because participants in the project have been encouraged to be creative and bring the expertise of their SIG memberships into their drafts, the documents do not follow the same format. If one looks closely, the influence of the ANKN cultural standards is evidenced in some ways in every draft. However, the drafts also reflect the influences of other significant theoretical perspectives and applied activities. If we expect the standards to encourage respect for differences, it is important to value the variety of expressions these drafts represent. How these drafts will evolve, influence each other, and forge new insights, relationships, research, and practice is an exciting prospect. After the first selection from the ANKN model, each of the following excerpts is drawn from a different SIG draft in order to present a sense of the project. Drawn from over 34 pages of drafts from twelve groups, only a few excerpts have been selected.

Sample Standards or Guidelines

ANKN Standards for Students: Culturally-knowledgeable students:

- are able to build on the knowledge and skills of the local cultural community as a foundation from which to achieve personal and academic success throughout life.
- demonstrate an awareness and appreciation of the relationships and processes of interaction of all elements in the world around them. (ANKN, 1998) (contact: Ray Barnhardt [o](#))

The Hispanic Education SIG includes Standards for Educators: Educators are responsible for providing a safe and stimulating environment that reinforces the cultural wellbeing, and strengthens the cognitive, affective and linguistic development of the student. Academic achievement is a by-product of a well-nurtured child. Educators that meet this standard:

- Carefully review all curriculum resource materials to insure cultural accuracy and appropriateness and teach students to make similar critical judgments.
- Acquire advocacy skills in order to support the needs of their students, and are able to communicate those needs in ways that are heard and respected. (contact: Diane Torres-Velaquez vlazquez@unm.edu)

The Disability Studies SIG Includes Ethical Impact Standards for Curriculum

The curriculum for an ethical school draws upon diverse resources to build an empowering and coherent learning community where all voices are heard and all participants are challenged and engaged individually and in groups. Such a curriculum would discourage any attitude or action that supports humans harming humans. A curriculum that meets this standard:

- Teaches skills and critical analysis of the social construction of commonly held cultural assumptions underlying our decisions and consequent outcomes such as disability, class, gender, ethnicity, etc.
- Provides opportunity to practice skills and develop new habits of respect, caring, perspective taking, and determining ethical impact of courses of action. (contact: Robin M. Smith smithrm@newpaltz.edu)

Safety and Respect Standards for Schools and Higher Education Institutions

Safe schools, colleges and universities place primary emphasis on fostering a socially just and respectful environment rather than relying upon external controls, surveillance, and punishment. Schools which meet this safety standard:

- Have a mission that reflects the importance of democracy, social justice, peace, non-violence, environmental integrity, and personal responsibility
- Establish a reward structure that recognizes contributions toward meeting this mission. (contact: the author)

The Peace Education SIG includes Standards for Students, Teachers, and Teacher Educators:

- Students will learn about historical events that have been motivated by non-violence.
- Students will develop and use skills of peace making and peace building.
- Teachers will model peace-building interaction and positive regard for all school participants.
- Teacher educators will teach about and demonstrate processes of integrating peace education into the daily fabric of the classroom routine. (contact: Candice C. Carter carter@unf.edu)

The Critical Educators for Social Justice SIG drafted Standards for Social and Economic Determination of Teachers

- Teachers have the right to teach human rights, social justice, and the concept of sustainable development
- No teacher should be forced to teach to the test or be bribed or punished to increase the test scores of their students. (contact: Marta Baltodano mbaltoda@lmu.edu)

The Environmental and Ecological Education SIG focused on Real Life Problem-Solving:

- Students possess the analytical, social, and political skills necessary to address (social / environmental) problems successfully.
- The School features an approach to teaching that is participatory and experiential rather than didactic. (contact: David Gruenewald dgruenewald@wsu.edu)

The Gay and Lesbian Studies SIG used Buddhist principles to identify Experiential Standards:

Aware of the suffering caused by exploitation, social injustice, stealing, and oppression,

- I vow to cultivate loving kindness and learn ways to work for the well being of all people.
- I vow to practice generosity by sharing time, energy and material resources with those who are in real need.
- I will respect others, but I will prevent others from profiting from human suffering. (contact: Christopher S. Walsh chriswals77@yahoo.com)

The Research on the Education of Asian Pacific Americans incorporated activism into the curriculum:

Social justice educators are willing and able to make explicit the inequalities that exist within the educational system and society as a whole. Further, these educators model activism by critically analyzing and exploring social injustices within the class as well as standing up against the status quo. Teachers who meet these guidelines develop classrooms that:

- " Encourage critical thinking and activism about information, texts, and events.
- Openly discuss race and racism, equity and inequity, oppression and advantage." (Cochrane-Smith, 1999, 133) (contact: John palmer jpalmer@mail.colgate.edu)

Looking Forward

The ANKN identifies a number of positive ways in which such standards might be helpful. Two of these are:

- They may be used as a basis for reviewing school or district-level goals, policies and practices with regard to the curriculum and pedagogy being implemented in each community or cultural area...
- They may be used to devise locally appropriate ways to review student and teacher performance as it relates to nurturing and practicing culturally-healthy behavior, including serving as potential graduation requirements for students.” (ANKN, 1998, 4)

A national set of standards or guidelines for social justice, peace, ecological sustainability, and humane education is only one of many scholar-activist efforts to influence education toward meeting these goals. A practical set of SJPEE standards or guidelines could become a powerful tool in the uphill struggle of educators to counter corporate manipulation and domination of education. Resulting critical knowledge, activist skills and dispositions will enable educators and non-educators alike to work for a better world.

In the words of Chief Seattle, “This we know. All things are connected like the blood which flows within one family.” In this same way, the SJPEE project will support education for the benefit of all living beings and the sustainability of the earth.

References

- Adams, M., L.A. Bell, & P. Griffin, eds. (1997). *Teaching for diversity and social justice: a sourcebook*. New York: Routledge, 3-15.
- Alaska Library Association (2001) *Culturally Responsive Guidelines for Alaska Public Libraries*. Fairbanks: Alaska Native Knowledge Network, www.ankn.uaf.edu/standards/library.html
- Andrzejewski, J. & J. Alessio. (1999). *Education for global citizenship and social responsibility*. (monograph) Burlington, VT: John Dewey Project on Progressive Education.
- Assembly of Alaska Native Educators (1998). *Alaska standards for culturally-responsive schools*. Fairbanks: Alaska Native Knowledge Network, www.ankn.uaf.edu
- Assembly of Alaska Native Educators (1999). *Guidelines for preparing culturally responsive teachers*. Fairbanks: Alaska Native Knowledge Network, www.ankn.uaf.edu
- Assembly of Alaska Native Educators (2000). *Guidelines for respecting cultural knowledge*. Fairbanks: Alaska Native Knowledge Network, www.ankn.uaf.edu
- Assembly of Alaska Native Educators (2001). *Guidelines for strengthening indigenous languages and guidelines for nurturing culturally healthy youth*. Fairbanks: Alaska Native Knowledge Network, www.ankn.uaf.edu
- Assembly of Alaska Native Educators. (2002). *Guidelines for Culturally-Responsive School Boards*. Fairbanks, Alaska Native Knowledge Network, www.ankn.uaf.edu
- Barlow, M. & T. Clarke. (2002). *Blue gold: the fight to stop the corporate theft of the world's water*. New York: The New Press.
- Banks, D. (2001). What is the state of human rights education in K-12 schools in the United States in 2000? A preliminary look at the national survey of human rights education. Paper at AERA.
- Banks, D. (2003). *Promises to keep: results of the national survey of human rights education 2000*. Retrieved on November 28, 2003 at <http://hrusa.org/education/PromisestoKeep.htm>
- Banks, J.A. (1997). *Educating citizens in a multicultural society*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Banks, J.A. & C. McGee Banks, Eds. (2003) *Multicultural education: issues and perspectives*. 4th Ed., Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Barnhardt, R. (2002) *AKRSI 2002 annual report to NSF*. Fairbanks: Alaska Native Knowledge Network, www.ankn.uaf.edu.
- Barnhardt, R. (Sept 22, 2003) Social and environmental justice education as critical as ever *AACTE briefs*, pp. 5, 7.
- Berliner, D., and B. Biddle. (1995). *The manufactured crisis: myths, fraud, and the attack on america's public schools*. Reading, MN: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc.

Beyerbach, B. and T. Nassoioy (2003). *The new york consortium for professional development standards review project* Presentation at AERA.

Bowers, C.A. (2001) *Educating for eco-justice and community*. Athens: The University of Georgia Press.

Bright, C. et al. (2003). *State of the world 2003*. Washington D.C.: The Worldwatch Institute.

Britzman, D.P. (2000). Precocious education. In *Thinking queer: sexuality, culture, and education*. Eds. Talbert, S. & S. Steinberg. New York: Peter Lang.

Cochran-Smith, M. (1999) Learning to teach for social justice. In G.S. Griffin (Ed.) *The education of teachers: ninety-eighth yearbook of the national society for the study of education*. (pp. 114-144). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Collins, P.H. (1990) *Black feminist thought: knowledge, consciousness and the politics of empowerment*. New York: Routledge.

Dauncy, G. (2001). *Stormy weather: 101 solutions to global climate change*. Gabriola Island, BC: New Society Publishers.

Derman-Sparks, L., Phillips, C.B. & A.G. Hilliard III. (1997). *Teaching/learning anti-racism: a developmental approach* New York: Teachers College Press.

Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education*. New York: The Free Press.

Earth Charter USA Campaign (2000). *The earth charter*. Retrieved on July 31, 2003 from www.earthcharterusa.org

Fanon, F. (1967). *Black skin white mask* New York: Grove Press.

The First National People of Color Environmental Leadership Summit. (October 1991). *Principles of environmental justice*. Retrieved on January 23, 2004 at www.charityadvantage.com/summit2/EJPrinciples.asp

Friere, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Seabury.

Gallavan, N.P. and P.L. Troutman, Jr. (2001). Cultural diversity and the NCATE standards: a story in process," *Multicultural perspectives* 3 (2), 13-18.

Gollnick, D.M. and P.C. Chinn (2002). *Multicultural education in a pluralistic society* 6th Ed. Upper Saddle River: Merrill Prentice Hall.

Grant, C.S. and M.L. Gomez (2001). *Campus and classroom: making schooling multicultural* Upper Saddle River: Merrill Prentice Hall.

The Hague Agenda for Peace and Justice for the 21st Century (UN Ref A/54/98), (1999) (<http://www.haguepeace.org/>).

- Hahn, T. N. (1995). *Living Buddha, living Christ*. New York: Riverhead Books.
- Hall, S. & du Gay, P. (1996). *Questions of cultural identity*. London: Sage.
- Harding, S. Ed. (1993). *The racial economy of science*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Harris, I.M., & Morrison, M.L. (2003). *Peace education*, 2nd ed. Jefferson, NC: McFarland.
- hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: education as the practice of freedom*. New York: Routledge.
- Huckle J., & Sterling, S. Eds. (1996) *Education for sustainability*. London: Earthscan.
- Jones, E. R. Haenfler, & B. Johnson. (2001). *The better world handbook: from good intentions to everyday actions*. Gabriola Island, BC: New Society Publishers.
- LaDuke, W. (1996). *Native American Land Struggles, Environmentalism, and Indigenous Women*. (video of presentation at St. Cloud State University).
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy," *American educational research journal*, 32 (3), 465-91.
- Lantieri, L., & Patti, J. (1996). *Waging peace in our schools*. Boston: Beacon.
- Learner, M. (2002). Wallstreet meltdown. *Tikkun*, 17(5), 8-9.
- Lorde, A. (1981) Can the Master's Tools Dismantle the Master's House? In *This bridge called my back: writings by radical women of color*. Eds. Moraga, C. & G. Anzaldúa, Watertown, MA: Persephone Press.
- Mason, J. (1998). *An unnatural order: why we are destroying the planet and each other*. New York: The Continuum Publishing Company.
- McChesney, R. (1999). *Rich media, poor democracy* New York: The New Press.
- Moraga, C. & G. Anzaldúa Eds. (1981). *This bridge called my back: writings by radical women of color*. Watertown, MA: Persephone Press.
- Muste, A. J. (1972). *Non-violence in an aggressive world*. New York: Ozer.
- Nibert, D. (2002). *Animal rights human rights: entanglements of oppression and liberation*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- NAME. (2001). *Resolution on Standardized and State Mandated Testing*. Resolutions and Position Papers. Retrieved on December 1, 2003 from www.nameorg.org
- National Association of Multicultural Education (NAME) Standards Committee (2002). *Criteria for evaluating state curriculum standards* (Draft).

Nieto, S. (2000). *Affirming diversity: the sociopolitical context of multicultural education*. 3rd Edition, Reading, MA: Longman.

New Paltz Education Network (2002). Statement on testing and assessment. *Community bulletin*. #3.

North American Association for Environmental Education. (1993). *The National Project for Excellence in Environmental Education*. Retrieved on November 30, 2003 at <http://naaee.org/npeee/>

Orr, D.W. (1994). *Earth in mind* Washington D.C.: Island Press.

Orr, D.W. (1992) *Ecological literacy: education and the transition to a postmodern world*. Albany: SUNY Press.

Owen, V., Neville, P., & Smith, T.J. (2001, April). Challenging representations of disability in the professional standards for special education. Paper presented at AERA, 2001.

Phillips, P. & Project Censored (2003). *Censored 2004: media democracy in action*. New York: Seven Stories Press.

Peterson, B & M. Neill. (1999). Alternatives to Standardized Tests. *Rethinking Schools*. 13:2. Retrieved on December 1, 2003 from www.rethinkingschools.org/archive/13_03/assess.shtml.

Robbins, J. (2001). *The food revolution: how your diet can help save your life and our world*. Boston: Conari Press.

Sachs, A. (1995). *Eco-justice: linking human rights and the environment*. Washington D.C.: Worldwatch Institute.

Salomon, G. & Nevo, B. (2002). *Peace education. The concept, principles, and practices around the world*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Sapon-Shevin, M. (1999). *Because we can change the world: a practical guide to building cooperative, inclusive communities*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Scaff, J.H. (September, 2002) *Living in the Sixth Extinction*, Population Press, www.popco.org

Shiva, V. (1995). *Biopiracy: the plunder of nature and knowledge*. Boston: South End Press.

Skrtic, T.L. (1995). *Disability and democracy: reconstructing (special) education for postmodernity*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Sleeter, C. & C.A. Grant (2003). *Making choices for multicultural education : five approaches to race, class, and gender*. 4th Ed. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Smith, G. & D. Williams. (1999). *Ecological Education in Action*. Albany: SUNY Press

Stauber, J. (2002). *Toxic sludge is good for you*. (Video) Northampton, MA: Media Education Foundation.

- Stomfay-Stitz, A. M. (1993). *Peace education in America, 1828-1990: Sourcebook for education and research*. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press.
- Symcox, L. (2002). *Whose history: the struggle for national standards in american classrooms*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Takaki, R. (1993). *A different mirror: a history of multicultural america*. Boston: Little, Brown, and Co.
- Talbert, S. (2000). *Subject to identity: knowledge, sexuality, and academic practices in higher education*. Albany: SUNY Press.
- TASH. (2001). Review and critique of 2001 CEC performance-based standards for special education teachers: The Association for People with Severe Handicaps – Personnel Preparation committee Subcommittee on National Standards.
- Tuhiwai Smith, L. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies: research and indigenous peoples*. London: Zed Books.
- United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (1996). *Report of the united nations high commissioner for human rights on the implementation of the plan of action for the united nations decade for human rights education*. Retrieved on August 1, 2003 at www.unhchr.org
- Vinson, K., R. Gibson, and E.W. Ross, (2001). *High-stakes testing and standardization: the threat to authenticity*. Monograph in Progressive Perspectives, University of Vermont: John Dewey Project on Progressive Education.
- World Indigenous Peoples' Conference on Education (1999). *The coolangatta statement on indigenous peoples' rights in education*.
- Young, I.M. (1990). *Justice and the politics of difference*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.