Journal of MultiDisciplinary Evaluation
Volume 16, Issue 37, 2020

JMDE
Journal of MultiDisciplinary Evaluation

ISSN 1556-8180
http://www.jmde.com

Journey "Back Over the Line": Critical Pedagogies of Curriculum Evaluation

Allyson Tintiangco-Cubales
Department of Asian American Studies, San Francisco State University

Patricia Espiritu Halagao
Department of Curriculum Studies, University of Hawai'i, Mānoa

JoanMay Timtiman Cordova
Graduate School, Silliman University, Philippines

Background: We re-trace our liberatory journey in developing a Critical Framework of Review to evaluate K-12 Filipina/x/o American curricula. Our framework is rooted in our positionality and epistemology as Filipina educational scholars engaged in confronting oppression that impacts our community. It responds to the need for evaluation methods grounded in culturally responsive and critical pedagogies.

Purpose: The purpose is to provide a critical and cultural method of evaluation to assess curriculum and pedagogy of, by, and about our communities.

Setting: The research takes place in the Filipinx/a/o American community in the United States. The authors are from three academic institutions in California, Hawai'i and the Philippines.

Intervention: Our Critical Framework of Review attempts to counter the predominance of Eurocentric, male, objective, and uncritical models of curricula evaluation.

Research design: This research deconstructs how we developed and applied our framework, which was used to evaluate thirty-three Filipina/x/o American K-12 curricula in critical content, critical instruction, and critical impact, by asking 20 questions that reflected critical and cultural theories and pedagogies.

Data collection and analysis: We asked: Who and what informed our evaluation framework? How was it developed? How do we use it? How could our framework be further applied? We referenced diverse scholars and used critical race, feminist, indigenous, and deolonizing pedagogies as guidelines to establish our evaluation framework and standards.

Findings: The framework is an example of standards-based and responsive-based evaluation with a checklist of indicators to evaluate curricula for culture, race, positionality, and social justice. Although created for Filipina/x/o, the framework can be used to evaluate curriculum for other marginalized groups.

Keywords: *critical pedagogy; critical evaluation; framework of review; K-12 curriculum; curriculum evaluation*

> Every colonized intellectual who crosses back over the line is a radical condemnation of the method and the regime, and the uproar it causes justifies his abdication and encourages him to persevere (Fanon, 1963, p. 158).

Fanon challenges us to rethink, reevaluate, and reconfigure our positionality as "colonized intellectuals." As educational academicians, we are highly trained in the traditional methodologies that value "objective" knowledge. Objectivity is historically rooted in the centrality of white supremacy and patriarchal frameworks that privilege positivist thinking that do not value the first person voices of racialized and marginalized communities. We were taught to develop standards and measure education's effectiveness through outcomes and evaluation based on those standards. We had accepted our roles as thinkers versus doers. We had convinced ourselves that people who create and educate are not empowered to evaluate their own work. We had learned to distance ourselves from those whom we are studying, especially when they resemble ourselves. We had stepped further and further over the fabricated line that separated us as experts and those whom we had come to believe need our expertise. In some ways, we had drawn the line so deep with great permanence so as to solidify our position away from the communities that we claim to serve. Fanon (1963, p. 158) urges us to return home "back over the line."

Fueled by today's uprising led by the movement for Black lives and liberation, we are inspired by the critique of white supremacy to retrace our liberatory journey "back over the line." The purpose of this article is to counter the predominance of Eurocentric, male, objective, and uncritical models of curricula evaluation. It is rare to find three educational scholars who are Filipina, who all developed curriculum focused on the histories and experiences of Filipina/x/o Americans. Admittedly, the three of us came together by our own design. We sought each other's companionship in a lonely world of academia where our experiences as Filipinas are often marginalized, silenced, or invisible. We also learned that returning back over the line as a collective was much more, powerful, meaningful, and courageous than journeying as individuals.

As we will describe later, each of our journeys "back over the line," may have started in different places but somehow we ended up here together trying to understand the power in imagining, developing, and evaluating curriculum that is critical, responsive, and rigorous. What began as a project to search for K-12 curriculum focused on Filipina/x/o American Studies—curriculum by and about our own ethnic community—transformed into a robust evaluation framework, which we have entitled "Critical Framework of Review" (Halagao, Tintiangco-Cubales, & Cordova, 2009b). We found our framework had the possibility of being generalizable across diverse Ethnic Studies curricula and disciplines. What became clear to us during the development of an evaluation tool was the need to first identify what we thought was the goal of education and subsequently the purpose of our curriculum and pedagogy. We then needed to look deeper at what informed our evaluation framework, how it was developed, how we used it, and how our framework could be further applied. Throughout this article and especially in the section on curriculum evaluation frameworks—to counter the overrepresentation of white, male scholars recognized in the Western canon (Alkin & Christie, 2012)—we deliberately sought out Black, Brown, indigenous, and women of color scholars to reference.

Pedagogy takes into account the critical relationships between the purpose of education, the context of education, the content of what is being taught, and the methods of how it is taught. It also includes who is being taught, who is teaching, their relationship to each other, and their relationship to structure and power (Tintiangco-Cubales, 2010c). In this age of standards-based teaching and assessments, the goal of education, and consequently the focus of curriculum and pedagogy, has become more about preparing children for "college and career readiness." While a worthy and important goal, the goal is too narrow, and the goals of education must also include the

education of fostering engaged citizens motivated and equipped to uplift their communities. We aim for K-12 Ethnic Studies and multicultural curriculum and pedagogy that engage young people to learn about themselves and their histories, and also encourages them to become agents of social change in their communities (Cuauhtin et.al, 2019).

With these goals in mind, when we measure Filipina/x/o American K-12 curricula against narrow standards, our curriculum is undervalued and underappreciated for its purpose. If we understand evaluation to be judging the merit and worth of curricula or programs, how do we arrive at measuring or understanding their value? Who makes the decision and what do we consider valuable? So we took matters into our own hands. Together, we determined our own rubric to highlight the worth and strengths of our curriculum, as well as reveal its limitations or gaps. We identified the critical theories that informed curriculum development and used these as guidelines to establish evaluation framework and standards. In essence, we as "racial minority evaluators" were empowered to take back the field of evaluation methodologies to benefit ourselves and our communities (Prado, 2011). If our ultimate goal is to free our people from oppression and promote emancipation, then we needed to review curricula with this in sight. This led us to realize the importance of infusing personal epistemologies and critical pedagogies into our evaluation methodology. In examining our roles and the effects of three Filipina researchers collaborating on this research, we are Pinay[1] professors from three different academic institutions from the West coast, Hawai'i, and the Philippines. We identify as curricularists, teacher educators, researchers representing the fields of Asian American studies, Ethnic Studies, multicultural education, and social studies education. As active and involved participants in the Filipina/x/o American community and beyond, we consider ourselves "community engaged scholars." These factors led us all down the path to draw our work from the critical pedagogies of decolonizing pedagogy, feminist and critical race theory in the development of a more critical method toward curriculum evaluation.

Locating our Positionalities

In developing our framework of review, we started with trusting our own epistemologies, "cultural intuition" (Delgado Bernal, 1998 as cited in Huber, 2009, p. 646), and building on each other's expertise as practitioners, teachers, and activists. As Pinayists our positionality is rooted in struggle, resistance, and movement. Our experiences cannot be divorced from the experiences of our Filipino ancestral narrative that consists of over 300 years of Spanish colonialism and continuing colonial/imperial relationship with the United States. This must include the counter narrative of resistance against colonial powers. Beyond physical resistance, Filipinos fought to maintain control over their culture, ideology, and history. This resistance shapes how we viewed the "effectiveness" of the curriculum that we presented about the Filipina/x/o American experiences. It was necessary that we did not perceive ourselves as passive recipients of history but as active agents and authors of our past, present, and future.

These sentiments go beyond the experiences of Filipinos in the Philippines. Inspired by the social movements in the United States that began in the 1960's along with the movements for justice around the world, our review of the curriculum was from a perspective of social change. Therefore, the San Francisco State student strike led by the Black Student Union and the Third World Liberation Front's that fought to institutionalize ethnic studies both at the college level and in secondary schools, became central to how we conceived the review questions that maintained the need to look at how the content in the curriculum that we reviewed encouraged young people to analyze their world and take action toward positive change.

[1] *Pinay* is a shortened name coined in the early 1920s that refers to Filipinas. *Pin@y* is a gender-neutral term popularized by Filipina/o American students at UC Berkeley in the 1990s.

All three of us who contributed to the development of these evaluation methods, see ourselves as "insiders" in the field Filipina/x/o American Studies and "insiders" in the world of education. We all consciously identify ourselves as "teachers" first, particularly women of color teachers, and more specifically Pinay teachers. We are also curriculum designers of lesson plans, units, and activities that contribute heavily to the birth, growth, and critical nature of Filipina/x/o American studies. We believe that it is greatly significant that all three of us have taught what we have designed to elementary, middle, and high school and college youth at schools, on college/university campuses, and in our communities. Along with the details of our practice, we are also trained scholars who engage in research, theory, and pedagogical development in the field of education. And lastly, we are members of the community in which we all serve.

Although we all describe ourselves collectively as "Pinay community engaged scholars," we each arrived at this destination differently. In this section, we locate our positionalities rooted in our personal experiences. It is important to share our unique stories to disband a monolithic identity of "us."

Pinay 1 story: I have had a love/hate relationship with education. I almost dropped out of high school and I didn't see higher education in my future. I entered into post-secondary schooling out of necessity and in essence, I went to school to be eligible for health insurance. I was coerced to go to Ohlone community college because my mother insisted that I get a full load of units to get on my father's health insurance plan, since he was a janitor at Kaiser Permanente. Despite my forced entry into college, my life's path took an inadvertent turn when I landed in an Ethnic Studies course. For the first time in my life, I saw myself and people like me in the curriculum. I distinctly remember in the middle of the semester, the professor gave me a book to read, which he said was about "my people." On the cover it read, *America is the Heart* by Carlos Bulosan, a suspicious title for a book that a radical teacher would share with his student. Ironically the book showed the harshness that America dealt to Filipinos. It was eye-opening and despite the myriad of controversies that the book has sparked, it served as a politicizing moment that has somersaulted me into the world of activism, community organizing, and critical pedagogy. This was only the first of ethnic studies experiences that has saved my life.

Pinay 2 story: Growing up, I didn't want to be Brown. I wanted to be White. I was born in the Philippines, but moved to the United States when I was six weeks old. I was raised in a largely White community in the Midwest and I felt contradictions on a daily basis. As a child of two Filipino physicians, I belonged to a privileged socio economic class, but I never felt like I fit in. Though my family practiced Filipino culture and traditions at home, I always downplayed being Filipino in school. Stereotypes and discriminatory experiences further dug away at my ethnic pride and confidence. My life turned around when we moved to Stockton, California, where diversity abounded. But I later realized as a teacher in an inner-city public school that diversity didn't matter without equity and justice. I saw inequities all around my students—the same kind of cultural denigration I faced, but more systemic. I pursued my doctorate in multicultural education to confront this problem and enrolled in a Filipino American studies course, where it was the first time I learned about myself as Filipino American. Through an oral history project, I discovered that my great granduncle, Dr. Macario Bautista was the first Filipino doctor in Central Valley California and a farm labor leader. His life of struggle, perseverance, and activism has rooted my work and given purpose to my educational work and since then has sent me on a trajectory that allows me to proudly insert my Filipino identity and perspective in the curriculum, pedagogy and research that I do everyday.

Pinay 3 story: Influenced by legacies of Filipino immigrant parents, my farmworker father's large clan in the US since the early 1900s and my mother's grad student work of the 1950s, I grew up in extended family communities where kababayan[2] took care of

[2] Kababayan means fellow Filipino, countryman, or townmate in the Tagalog language.

each other. We second and third generation Filipino Americans grew up as cousins, nurtured by our vast network of community aunts and uncles—activists, organizers, farmworkers, teachers, and community leaders—who created churches, organizations, networks, scholarships and programs for us. Ever-inspired by elders' generosity of spirit, I learned much of all I value: To take stands. To work for a better world. To teach. To do oral history. To have faith, amidst struggles. Always. Spirits/ memories of beloved communities ground me as I work across geographic and cultural boundaries.

Consequently, our collective and individual positionality as "insider in collaboration with other insiders" determined how we framed our epistemological, methodological, and ethical issues (Herr & Anderson, 2014). It deliberately affected why we chose to evaluate K-12 curriculum as our scholarship, what curriculum we chose to evaluate, and for whom and what purpose we evaluated the curriculum for. Building on our epistemologies, we drew from a range of critical pedagogies that aligned with our educational values, which we outlined below that influenced our evaluation methodological framework.

Theoretical Framework

Stake (2004) provides an approach to understanding the field of evaluation. He distinguishes evaluation into two broad camps—standards-based evaluation and responsive evaluation. Standards-based evaluation promotes the idea that a program or curricula's worth is measured against a set predetermined criteria at different levels of standards. This approach is more focused on identifying curricular goals at the onset and evaluating whether its goals are met. On the other hand, responsive evaluation is more attentive to the discovery of the merit or shortcoming of a program or curriculum. It relies on multiple forms of standards from different stakeholder groups, which may at times clash. Its approach is responsive to evaluating the issues or problems identified by the stakeholders.

While standards-based evaluation identifies a clear set of criteria to measure a program or curriculum's worth, responsive evaluation is more concerned with understanding the issues and concerns of a program or curriculum activities at more of a subjective level. Instead of beginning with the goals of a curriculum, responsive evaluation begins with the issues and concerns of the stakeholders. Determining merit is not measured by a predetermined criteria, but depends on judgment and interpretation among stakeholders and evaluators.

Culturally responsive evaluation is one example of responsive evaluation. A model originated with Stafford Hood, culturally responsive evaluation is a holistic approach to grounding evaluation in culture (Hood, Hopson, & Kirkhart, 2015). Ryan, Chandler, and Samuels (2007, p.201) define it as an effort to "…[honor] the cultural context in which the program takes place by bringing needed shared lived experiences and understanding to the program." According to Frierson, Hood and Hughes' (2010) "Guide to Conducting Culturally Responsive Evaluation," each step of the method centralizes culture in its aims. The first step begins with knowing your community and its needs to incorporate them into the evaluation study. The next step is collaboration. It is key to involve the community as stakeholders in determining questions, issues and identifying the purpose of the evaluation to promote a more horizontal and beneficial relationship between evaluator and evaluand. There is more of an effort to pay attention to distribution of power and inclusion of multiple voices. At this stage, evaluators pay attention to cultural protocols and instruments that respect cultural context and values. When analyzing the data, the cultural context is used to interpret the data. Data might be disaggregated according to diverse variables. Finally, the findings must be reported in different forms (i.e. chants, visuals, performances) to the community so it is beneficial and accessible.

Marginalized groups, who have been overstudied, yet under-involved in the research process, are finding ways to develop more responsive evaluation methods. Kanaka Maoli (Hawaiian) and Maori evaluators promote a conceptual framework for

indigenous evaluation practice where the "gaze be returned now and we do our own gazing" (Kawakami, Aton, Cram, Lai & Porima, 2007, p.329). Maori evaluator Hayley Cavino (2013) examines the role of the evaluator and indigenous people within colonial and decolonization contexts. The purpose of evaluation to them was more than merit and worth, but the self-actualizing of a people and program and where "evaluation praxis is framed within the broader struggles for sovereignty and self-determination" (Cavino, 2013, p. 334).

LaFrance & Nichols (2009) critiqued traditional forms of evaluation approaches by co-developing with the American Indian Higher Education Consortium (AIHEC) an Indigenous Evaluation Framework grounded in the community, Indigenous ways of knowing and four core values. The stakeholders began by "taking ownership" or telling a story from their communities perspective and setting their own standards, which go beyond mainstream expectations, but include culture, language. Another theme was the importance of drawing on traditional forms of community reflection and assessment, which include elder wisdom and knowledge . There was also a need to acknowledge that evaluation takes time and the importance of involving stakeholders from the beginning. The four values that emerged and shaped their framework were "1) being a people of a place 2) recognizing gifts and strengths 3) honoring family and community and 4) respecting sovereignty" (La France & Nichols, 2009, p. 22).

Critical Theories and Pedagogies

> What is considered theory in the dominant academic community is not necessarily what counts as theory for women-of-color. Theory produces effects that change people and the way they perceive the world. Thus we need teor`ias that will enable us to interpret what happens in the world, that will explain how and why we relate to certain people in specific ways…Necesitamos teor`ias that will rewrite history using race, class, gender, and ethnicity as categories of analysis, theories that cross borders, that blur boundaries—new kinds of theories with new theorizing methods…And we need to find practical applications for those theories. We need to de-academize theory and to connect the community to the academy…We need to give up the notion that there is a "correct" way to write theory (Anzaldúa, 1990, p. xxv-xxvi).

Anzaldúa speaks volumes about the need to challenge theories and methods that do not necessarily speak to the experiences of communities of color. Theories, methods, and the relationship between the two should be tools that enable us to read our worlds and provide opportunities for transformative application. Métis researcher Weber-Pillwax (1999, 42-43) writes that theories will "spring from the people themselves—theories that explain the many facets and connections of our individual and collective lives." Educators of color, feminists scholars, and particularly women of color have pushed against the falsely objective and narrow boundaries of evaluation to value openness that exposes one's positionality, social political orientation, particularly that of standpoint epistemology with an aim for social justice (Podem, 2010; Brisolara et al., 2013). Huber (2009, p. 646), a Chicana feminist educational researcher promotes that we must utilize "multiple sources of knowledge to inform the research process—from the research questions we ask, the theoretical frameworks we use, the methodologies we employ, to how we write about our findings."

Since we view education and curriculum as a means of personal liberation and to combat institutional oppression, our evaluation theory and methodology challenged standards-based approaches like curricular and textbook analysis (Roseman, Ellen, Kesidou & Stern, 1996; Weinbrenner, 1992), "Lists of Criteria for Analysis" (Stradling, 2001; Pingel, 1999), and general curriculum frameworks and evaluations (National Research Council, 2004; Crawford, 2001; Foster & Morris, 1994). Instead our framework drew heavily from critical, decolonizing, feminist, and responsive theories and pedagogies because the purposes of our curriculum were more directly aligned. Woelders & Abma (2015, p. 10) state: "Critical theory can be helpful in interpreting power issues and in shining a light on social justice

in the practice that is evaluated." Recognizing that curricula can have a plurality of critical aims can help evaluators modify their instrument accordingly (Collin et al., 2010).

Critical Pedagogy

> Critical Pedagogy is concerned with the elimination of oppression, the resurgence of hope and possibility—in short, with the making of a better world in which to live. A better world for all. (Shaw, 2000).

One of the most influential minds in the development of critical pedagogy is Paulo Freire. The nexus of Freire's *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (1970) is the notion of critical pedagogy through the development of problem-posing education, which is opposed to the banking model of schooling based on teachers "depositing" information into the minds of students. Freire's work is part of a larger social movement that fought against oppression. Historically, communities of color in the United States and poor communities around the world were putting into question the use of education to maintain the inequitable relationship between those who had power and those who were dispossessed. As a result Paulo Freire developed a problem-posing education that creates spaces for students and teachers to develop a critical understanding of the problems in their world, including finding ways to pursue decolonization, freedom, and liberation (Duncan-Andrade & Morrell, 2008).

Drawing from critical theories and pedagogy our "Critical Framework of Review" placed high value on curriculum that "eliminates oppression" and pursues social justice and equity for historically marginalized students. Curriculum that builds on critical pedagogy's systemic analysis of power allows for a deep dive into the root causes of oppression. Critical pedagogy's focus on problem solving provided a productive purpose and process that decentered Eurocentric knowledge and instead centered counternarratives that have been ignored or silenced in the American schooling. To further the development of our methodology, we drew from the perspectives of critical pedagogies like decolonizing and feminist stances while also centralizing the Filipino American historical, cultural experience and identity.

Decolonizing Pedagogies and Methodologies

Decolonizing pedagogy aims to emancipate students from ignorance, develop a critical decolonizing consciousness and ignite a commitment to social change (Tejeda, Espinoza & Gutierrez, 2003). Similarly, its methodologies begin with becoming critical, particularly about our positionality as researchers who have been trained in the modes of Western conduct and method. As Filipina/x/o Americans who have a history of Spanish and U.S. colonialism, our work was often rooted in a search for decolonization, which Filipina scholar, Strobel (2001) characterizes into three stages: naming, reflecting and acting. The first step is what she described as a healing process that required us, "to learn to love ourselves again" (p.50). To adequately "heal" there was a need to take risks as "native" intellectuals, which was a process that Fanon (1963) described as a journey, "back over the line."

Maori researcher Smith (1999, p. 70) (2012) described Fanon's phases of going "back over the line," as recognizing our assimilation, remembering who we actually are, and awakening to produce revolutionary literature for our people. There was a need to explore how these phases affected how we as "native" intellectuals engaged in the critical review of curriculum that was created about Filipina/x/o Americans, particularly because of our history with colonialism. In our review of the curriculum, we were often searching for both content and methods that aimed to put into question the valorization of imperial powers and counters what Berry (2009, p. 747) described as "curriculum of oppression." Based on Laenui's (2000) decolonization framework, the last stages focus on dreaming, commitment, and action. The final step to decolonization is to become a leader and to "give back to the Filipino American community" by ongoing questioning and spreading "one's story" (Strobel, 2001, p. 123). In the end, we looked for decolonizing curriculum and pedagogy that fostered

commitment and social action to improve and impact the lives of our community.

Critical Race Pedagogies

When we evaluated Filipina/x/o American curriculum, we sought for curricula that exemplified the five elements of critical race pedagogy as identified by Solórzano (1997, 1998):

1. centrality of race, racism and their intersectionality with other forms of subordination;
2. challenge to dominant ideology;
3. commitment to social justice;
4. importance of experiential knowledge; and
5. transdisciplinary perspective (the use of interdisciplinary perspectives).

Centralizing race in our critical framework allowed us to draw from scholarship generated from our community. Filipina American theorist, Strobel (2001) writes, "To decolonize is to tell and write one's own story." The telling of Filipina/x/o American stories that was counter narrative to mainstream curricula was central to our critical framework of review. We looked at how curriculum engaged "historical knowledge [that] can continue to serve each generation as a source of strength and pride" (Lawsin, 1998, p. 187).

Epistemologies

Epistemological pedagogy values the experiences, standpoints, and positionalities of those involved in a particular educational context. In the classroom this was "an exploration of how we know what we know" (Tintiangco-Cubales, 2007a). In research and curricular review, epistemological pedagogy valued the emic, "the insider view;" a scholar's work as a practitioner and involvement in the field in which they were evaluating were seen as advantages rather than seeing their participation as overly biasing their results or a conflict of interest. This challenged traditional notions of positivist deductive methods that often result in what is assumed to be from an etic and "objective" perspective. This also combated the often inequitable relationship between a subject's "opinions" and the researcher's analysis which was favored as "truth" because epistemological pedagogy allowed the subject to become participatory in the research or become the researcher themselves. Epistemological pedagogy also refuteed white supremacist or colonial beliefs that communities of color need "more knowledgeable" outsiders to tell us if we are effective in educating or evaluating ourselves.

Feminist Pedagogy and Methodology

> For women, the need and desire to nurture each other is not pathological but redemptive, and it is within that knowledge that our real power is rediscovered. It is this real connection which is so feared by a patriarchal world (Lorde, 1984, p. 111).

Lorde's acknowledgement of nurturing and connecting was integral to our framework of review. In the curricula, we built on feminism to ensure that both the experiences of men and women were included in the ways in which Filipina/x/o American studies is presented but we also reviewed the curriculum to see how it createed a community.

We drew on the development of Pinayist pedagogy, which "aims to uncover challenges that Pinays face, while creating plans of action that pursue social change for the betterment of their lives. Pinayist pedagogy resisted oppression both in the content and the methods of the curriculum and called for a commitment to social justice, making the classroom a space of 'transformational resistance'" (Tintiangco-Cubales & Sacramento, 2009b, p. 180). Our framework was influenced by Pinayist pedagogy's goals which were two-fold: 1) teaching and learning critical Pinay studies with the central purpose to develop the capacity of Pinays to confront global, local, and personal problems that face them and their community; and 2) mentoring, reproducing, and creating a community of Pinayists (Tintiangco-Cubales & Sacramento, 2009b).

Our curricular content analysis did not just search for the experiences of Filipinos in general which has often been occupied by the male narratives, we also deliberately look at how the curricula represented and centralized

the diversity of Pinay experiences. Along with how we reviewed the curricula, how we worked together as three Pinays from very different backgrounds was a testament to how Pinay pedagogy can be operationalized.

Culturally and Community Responsive Pedagogies

Culturally responsive pedagogy encouraged a critical dialogue about cultural past/preservation, cultural production/growth, and cultural power/wealth as a way to not only to connect students to the curriculum but also encouraged them to exercise their agency to shape how culture is represented in the curriculum" (Tintiangco-Cubales, Kohli, Sacramento, Henning, Agarwal-Rangnath, & Sleeter, 2015d).

Community responsive pedagogy aimed to provide students with the opportunities to look deeply at the problems in their communities and find ways to address them through practices that promote humanization, hope, and healing. This responsive pedagogy also saw the multitude of ways "community" can be defined beyond borders and boundaries. Community responsive pedagogy aimed to create genuine and loving communities in classrooms, schools, neighborhoods, cities, online, in diaspora, and throughout the world (Tintiangco-Cubales,Kohli, Sacramento, Henning, Agarwal-Rangnath, & Sleeter, 2015d).

We also reviewed how curricula creates community and draws on Lawsin's concept of "barangay pedagogy". Lawsin (1998, p. 189) describes "….we not only learn about the concepts of colonialism, racism, capitalism, and imperialism, but we also set a foundation for employing indigenous concepts of a communal society, a barangay. The students learned that barangays were, at the most basic level, small, egalitarian, Pre-Spanish communities based on kinship, common economic interests, and shared rituals. They identified with this concept and agreed to treat our classroom as a barangay where we practice a collaborative approach to education, rather than reinforce the practice of individualistic competition for grades."

Drawing from Filipina/x/o American educators and scholars allowed for a unique perspective that provided us a lens to look deeply at the nuances of the curricula but was also fundamentally translatable to curricula that aimed to be social justice-focused.

Methodology

Development of Framework

In Alkin and Patton's (2020) article, "Birth and adaptation of evaluation theories," they reflect on how evaluation theories are created out of something not there, personal experience, and collegial interactions. Similarly, our theory of evaluation was derived from the absence of culturally responsive and critical evaluation models related to our experience. So we relied on our backgrounds as curricularists, teacher educators, and community engaged researchers representing the fields of Asian American studies, ethnic studies, multicultural education, and social studies education to shape the construction of our "Critical Framework of Review" to help us evaluate curriculum about and for our Filipina/o community. Drawing from this and the critical dialogues in education, we aimed to find ways that Filipina/x/o American curricula pursued culturally responsive and critical pedagogies that incorporated decolonizing and feminist pedagogy and methodology through the development of three major areas:

A. Critical Content: Content and usage of resources that challenged historical and cultural hegemony through the centralization of Filipina/o American resistance and counter-hegemonic narratives.
B. Critical Instruction: Instruction that implemented critical praxis in Filipina/o American and underserved communities. Instruction that engaged in conscientization, "deepening awareness of the social realities which shaped their lives and discovered their own capacities to recreate them (Darder, Baltodano, & Torres, 2009).

C. **Critical Impact:** Impact that happened at the individual and community levels—the building of the capacity of youth to read and transform themselves, their communities, and the world in which they live.

Based on the three categories above, we developed our Critical Framework of Review with twenty (20) questions to evaluate the content, instruction and impact of Filipina/x/o American curricula (see Table 1). The framework was developed separately from the curricular examples and then applied to evaluate the curricula.

Table 1
Critical Framework of Review

CRITICAL CONTENT	YES	NO	Unable TBD
1. Does the content include counter-narratives?			
2. Does the content reflect micro and macro levels of analysis of Filipina/o American experience?			
3. Is the content grounded in the growing body of historical, literary, and multimedia resources on Filipina/x/o Americans?			
4. Does the content utilize community based research and sources of knowledge?			
5. Does the content include primary sources?			
6. Does the content include multiple subjectivities?			
7. Does the content address controversial topics?			
8. Does the content promote dialogue and critical thinking about Filipina/o Americans?			
9. Does the content engage students in constructing new knowledge about Filipina/o Americans?			
10. Does the content reflect connections to universal themes, issues, concepts, events?			
11. Does the content meet or exceed respective state or national standards?			
12. Does the content engage students in critically reflecting on themes of 1) identity; 2) the struggle for justice; 3) giving back to the community; 4) contributions to humanity? (Cordova, 2003)			
CRITICAL INSTRUCTION			
13. Do the methods encourage the sharing of counternarratives?			
14. Do the methods implement inquiry-based cyclical processes of critical praxis?			

CRITICAL CONTENT	YES	NO	Unable TBD
15. Do the methods of instruction encourage a process of decolonization, the liberatory praxis of unlearning colonial mentality?			
16. Do the methods promote empathy and perspective-taking?			
17. Do the methods engage students to connect Filipina/o American history to their personal experiences?			
18. Do the methods of instruction provide spaces, projects, assignments, and dialogue that "encourage(s) students to become social agents and develop their capacity to confront real-world problems that face them and communities?" (Duncan-Andrade & Morell, 2008, p. 25)			
CRITICAL IMPACT			
19. Does the curriculum impact one's identity? If so, how?			
20. Does the curriculum impact the community and society? If so, how?			

Application of the Critical Framework of Review

When using the Critical Framework of Review, we reviewed thirty-three (33) K-12 Filipina/x/o American curricula gathered from our prior knowledge, online search tools, and Filipino community organizations around the nation. The curricula represented a diverse array of authors, audiences, content, and pedagogical approaches (five of the thirty-three curricula were developed by the authors of this evaluation study). The curricula included formal educational programs ($N = 4$), community curriculum ($N = 9$), curriculum guides ($N = 3$), oral histories ($N = 4$), published curricula ($N = 9$), and unpublished curricula ($N = 4$). We identified each curriculas' authors, inception date, location, and description of purpose/vision/mission, content, instructional methods from existing documents and associated websites. We provide a summary of our results in a narrative below according to curricular content, instruction and impact. A full description of our review can be found in *Critical review of K-12 Filipina/o American curriculum* (Halagao et al., 2009b).

Curricular Content

When we used our framework of review, the content revealed four major themes: historical context, collaboration, counternarratives, and controversial topics. Filipino American curricula had been existent since the founding of ethnic studies at San Francisco State in 1969, some 40 years ago. Much of our curricular content was developed in university and community collaborations. This pattern of university-community partnerships and internships, student developed curricula, and teaching Filipina/o American Studies in local communities would continue in the following decades.

Themes of equality, struggle, and empowerment across race, class, gender, and religion were central to curriculum content (Cordova, 2003). Our framework pulled out counternarratives, controversial topics, and multiple perspectives in Filipino American curriculum and pedagogy especially in the historical time period of Philippine Revolution and Philippine American War. Yet other curricula aimed to provide critical, anti-imperialist perspectives on Filipina/x/o American history and while also encouraging students to connect their experiences to Filipinas/x/os in diaspora.

Curricular Instruction

Critical instruction implemented critical pedagogies through the methods in which one taught "critical content" with the purpose of achieving "critical impact." Important to our work was Freire's development of *praxis*, which is the process that combines theory, practice, and reflection. In the reviewed curriculum we looked for the teacher and students "to tell and write one's own story, that in the telling and writing others may be encouraged to tell their own" (Strobel, 2001). We looked at methods that furthered Tejeda, Espinoza, and Gutierrez' (2003) "social justice reconsidered," engagement in anti-imperialist community histories and how to apply Filipina/x/o American studies to the current problems in their lives.

When we used our review, we found that instructional methods ranged from direct instruction to more constructivist and collaborative learning to achieve the desired learning outcome. Some met and in most cases went beyond national standards. We discovered methods that built cognitive and socio-emotional skills that led to student involvement in their communities. We also discovered emerging pedagogies that were uniquely Filipina/x/o American and had curricular implications to the field of education.

One of the biggest challenges in teaching Filipina/x/o American Studies in schools was "how" to teach it. Critical instruction was not as simple as adding a Filipina/x/o day to learn "traditional" songs and dances or eat lumpia. We noticed challenges on how to critically include Filipina/x/os and Filipina/x/o Americans particularly at the elementary school level ranging from Banks (2014) contributions to transformative and social actions approach, where students as early as elementary school were being trained in Critical Leadership Praxis (Tintiangco-Cubales & Sacramento, 2009b).

To explore the counternarratives of Filipina/x/os, the favored method of instruction was storytelling. Jocson (2009, p. 244) named this as a practice of k*uwento "*as a pedagogical tool to construct as well as challenge existing forms (or lack) of knowledge about Filipina/x/o American history in the classroom." Related to the oral tradition of kuwento, Pin@y Educational Partnerships (PEP) used *critical performance pedagogy* drawing from Augusto Boal's "Theatre of the Oppressed" interactive theatre (Tintiangco-Cubales & Sacramento, 2009b).

Curricular Impact

Critical impact aimed to affect the individual, community and greater society. For people from colonized backgrounds, a curriculum might help them move away from self-denigration to "shedding the jacket of imperialism", enlightenment and hope to social action. Sleeter & Grant (2009, p.219) discussed "multicultural social justice" as a way of moving beyond cultural and ethnic representation in a curriculum to enabling students to "work together collectively, speak out, be heard and effect change."

The final level of review was open ended: "Does the curriculum impact the individual, community or society? If so, how?" This study found that all of the curricula under review indeed impacted the individual, family, community and/or society in some way. At the most basic level, curricula impacted a person's awareness, identity, and pride. Most curricula identified ethnic pride as an important outcome. The move from individual transformation to community impact was reflected in a curriculum's mission statement and culminating activities that promoted social action.

This review revealed four curricula that had an explicit track record of academic and community impact. This kind of partnership has existed since 1976 with Field Resource of the Third World Teaching Resource Center at UC Santa Cruz (Canillo, Casuga, Cordova, Cortez & Menor, 1975; Cordova, 1976). The tradition was carried on in Pinoy Teach Cordova & Espiritu , 1996), PEP (Tintiangco-Cubales, 2007), and at Paaralang Pilipino where college students learned content and pedagogy in University education or Asian American studies courses and then taught it in public schools. In these cases, ethnic identity and pride were linked to self-efficacy and social action (Halagao, 2004a).

The PEP Pipeline Teaching Project was one avenue that allowed students to go into their

communities to teach Filipina/o American History and spread information about the issues in their communities. In this intergenerational project, San Francisco State University students taught high, middle, and elementary school youth year-round and each level thus taught the level below.

In the review of the instructional elements, there was an undeniable contribution that Filipina/x/o American curriculum is making. The development of a Filipina/x/o critical instruction and its relationship to critical content and a purpose of social justice have birthed pedagogies. This pedagogy is rooted in what Emily Lawsin names "Bayanihan Spirit" and what PEP calls Barangay Pedagogy or *PEPagogies*, which calls for curriculum to be instructed in a way to ensure that students learn the importance of community.

Societal impact of curricula was mainly seen in the field of education. Curricula affected student's professional choices and led to the production of more teachers from Pinoy Teach (Halagao, 2010c) and PEP. Impact was also measured in the national recognition, reuse and proliferation of the curricula. The study found a considerable number of curricula being reused and adapted across the country in afterschool programs, community organizations, summer camps, and mainstream social studies classrooms.

Discussion

Our Critical Framework of Review drew on mixed approaches to evaluation and diverse critical pedagogies. We used what critical theorists describe as a "bricolage" approach drawing upon methodologies that served the purpose (Kincheloe et. al, 2011). Therefore, we found our work an example of both standards-based and responsive-based evaluation. While the evaluation framework was formatted in a standards-based approach with criteria set by us, it was developed responsively. We begin with: What is our standard? What are our goals for curriculum? What are the issues in our community that we want our curricula to address?

As community-based critical theorists, our standard was addressing critical theory, impacting society, and creating critical and creative citizens who advocated and pushed for change. With this standard in mind, we measured our curriculum to this. We were explicit about the goals of critical pedagogy and clearly outlined ways in which we measured our content, practice and impacts. We emphasized the "objective" use of scales, criterion instruments, and in this case—frameworks. We made our criterion picture clear. Our framework also had a strong orientation for justice. As Stake (2009, p. 46) stated, "Critical studies are studies in which the investigator starts with the ideological frame of reference, such as a feminist perspective or global market advocacy and holds the evaluand up to the sharp scrutiny."

At the same time, as community-based evaluators, we recognized our subjectivities and its influence on the decisions we make. We were a part of the evaluation not only because we were conducting it, but we were conducting it on ourselves and the work we do. We held up a mirror to ourselves and were upfront about our insider status (Herr & Anderson, 2014). And for that, our framework was also responsive. Our evaluation was issue-driven in that we were responding to the issues in our community and field of education. In addition, how we developed our framework was itself a culture-based activity. Not one sole person controlled our process. We discussed our analysis of curriculum and how we were going to display our findings. When analyzing the data, our team was highly interpretative. It was not about penalizing those who did not represent critical pedagogy, but identifying models that exuded its different aspects. Evaluation was intended to focus on the opportunity in learning. We became "an advocate for those people, because you want them to shine" (La France & Nichols, 2010), which was different from traditional standards of assessments.

At the same time, we found the responsive approach was limiting. Woelders and Abma (2015) showed the shortcomings of a responsive approach and the importance of using critical methods in their study of disability participants. While their responsive evaluation methods included their disability perspective, it failed to acknowledge the system structures preventing disability participants from being fully involved in the study. Only after viewing research from a critical lens, Foucault's framework on

normalization, were they able to identify these barriers.

Using our Critical Framework of Review allowed us to also synthesize different forms of critical pedagogies such as decolonization, feminist, culturally and community-based responsive, and Filipina/x/o America pedagogies in ways that other frameworks of review did not. Like Black Feminist author Patricia Hill Collins (2000) we rejected grounding our analysis on any single theoretical tradition. We centralized culture, race, positionality, and social justice (Thomas & Madison, 2010)–all important concepts in the development, implementation, and evaluation of ethnic studies and multicultural curriculum.

Our critical evaluation framework also extended the work of other culturally responsive evaluation frameworks. Previous responsive models like the Indigenous evaluation framework offered ways to re-examine programs and curriculum from a cultural standpoint. They provided principles of indigenous ways of knowing and core values that would be useful when evaluating indigenous curriculum and pedagogy. While theirs offered a taxonomy of themes, our framework provided a checklist of indicators to critically examine curriculum and programs based on a number of critical pedagogical lenses.

In this study, we applied our critical framework to curriculum created by and for our community to evaluate its worth and value. Had we evaluated it based on the rigid standards and expectations of common core curriculum, its worth, value and contributions would have been entirely missed. Our framework was dynamic enough to reveal aspects of curricula that we did not intend to find. For example, we found our curricula emerged from partnerships across generations, community and academia. Curriculum materials were grounded in academic theoretical frameworks, community knowledge and often student-driven. Our deliberate intent to leave the final two questions in our framework open-ended allowed impact responses to be unbounded by preconceived notions.

Using this framework allowed us to see the vast amount of resources and range of approaches to Filipina/o American curricula. We acknowledged the diversity and strengths of Filipina/o American curricula. We found the goals, content and methodology depended on the audience it was serving and the critical stance of the curricularist. Finally, our framework revealed a practical and concrete side to critical pedagogy, decolonization and feminist pedagogy and methodology and allowed us to ask: What would curricula that were rooted in these perspectives look like? By using these critical pedagogies as the basis of our Framework of Review, we showed it was possible to apply these lenses through the use of specific questions when analyzing K-12 curriculum.

Conclusion & Implications

Smith (1999), author of "Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples" reminds us to recognize the significance of ourselves, our politics, and positionalties as researchers of formerly colonized peoples. She recounted her personal journey in contributing to the development of indigenous methodologies. She discussed finding "nothing which helped me think about and frame what I wanted to do within my own cultural context," (1999, p. 197), the tension of challenging the western paradigm, and finally her acceptance of her role as a community-based researcher. Anzaldúa (1998, p. xxv) stressed: "it is vital that we occupy theorizing space, that we not allow whitemen and women to occupy it. By bringing approaches and methodologies, we transform the theorizing space." In the field of evaluation, Carden & Alkin (2012) recognized the need to add traditionally considered outside perspectives, like non-Western evaluator theories, to Alkin's original "evaluation theory tree."

For many of us women scholars of color, who find our scholarship and approaches to research on the fringes of academia, these womens' words inspired us. In this departure from traditional methods, it was a "radical condemnation" to what we viewed as an oppressive methodology of evaluation. Our work may cause "uproar"but it pushes us to persevere.

We began our paper with our own histories that led us to our positionalities as women of

color and engaged scholars in our communities. In finding our voice, we asserted the need for more critical and cultural approaches to evaluation to assess aspects of curriculum and pedagogy meaningful to our communities. We presented our counter-methodology based on a bricolage of critical theories and pedagogies. Our framework of review challenged traditionally held assumptions about the purposes and approaches to curricula especially as it related to marginalized and oppressed groups who have been traditionally absent from curricula.

Our Critical Framework of Review contributes to evaluation research as an example of a culturally responsive and critical method and has theoretical and pedagogical implications for other groups. We propose the following two recommendations to others when using our framework or when developing their own. Adapt the framework and use it in their particular context. This means incorporating elements in the framework unique to the community. Finally, understand that the process of developing the critical framework is as important as the product of the framework. When reviewing curricula be up front about one's socio-political orientation, positionality, philosophy and epistemology.

We recognize our methodological approach privileged the Filipina/x/o perspective. Although our framework was aimed to evaluate Filipina/x/o American curriculum—which in many ways is marginalized in mainstream education—our Critical Framework of Review that challenged methodological boundaries can greatly inform what is needed in the center of education. It responds to the need for more of a "critical" education that encourages and enables students to analyze the challenges in their communities while also providing them experiences to make change in their worlds.

Our framework can be "generic" enough so that other ethnic groups, marginalized groups can supplant Filipino with their own. One indigenous researcher found use in our framework to critically review food education programs/curriculum engaging college students in Hawaiian aina-based food education programs (i.e. Kanewai lo`i, Mao Organic Farms) in Hawai'i (Maunakea, 2014). Another Ilokano researcher used it to evaluate a high school heritage language program (Soria, 2014). In the future, we would like to gather more qualitative stories on how our evaluation methodology is being used. Particularly, we hope to target more experiential reporting from our own Filipina/x/o community in which the tools were being used, especially since we are community-engaged scholars.

Finally, our work may have implications on the standards-based movement in K-12 education, where the voices of people of color as a whole have been largely absent. As the standards-based movement has become central to assessing student progress and determining what curriculum and pedagogies often get taught in schools, we cannot afford to sit on the sidelines and accept what is handed down to us. We need to be involved in shaping and interpreting what learning means and this means providing concrete ways to assess what is important to traditionally marginalized communities. If we do not push back, then we will be left behind.

Incorporating a critical and culture-based approach to evaluations allows responsiveness to a group's core values and is situated within context. Perhaps schools should be given the opportunity to develop their evaluation methods and approach specifically for the culture and context of the schools so as to "tell their story" of growth and development in other ways besides measuring up against standardized test scores. This paints a richer picture of progress and educational experience and allows schools to define themselves and make improvements.

We recognize that our research methodology is not without limitations. Some may view our methodology as subjective and biased since we developed the critical framework and evaluated curricula that we had a role in developing. The framework also requires more theoretical development and testing. It perhaps might be a more responsive tool if we provide feedback on the K-12 curricula to its creators and potential users of the program. Also, we ask: how might it be used to evaluate more traditional curricula. It is our hope that we show an evaluation methodology that breaks down binaries and can be both standards-based and responsive, objective and subjective, theoretical and practical, specific and general.

We aim for critical research that Shields (2012, p. 3) describes as "research that is both rigorous and activist, that has the potential to inform both policy and practice and, at the same time, to empower both researcher and participants alike." We see our culturally responsive and critical curriculum evaluation as academic activism, a resistance to the tools that never really meant for us to exercise self-determination. We have revisited what is important to us and our communities so we can take our curriculum back and evaluate its usefulness to our communities. This is essential to our journey crossing "back over the line" as community-engaged evaluators. It forced us to balance and move fluidly between our different worlds of academia and community so that we ultimately reach our goal of making a difference in the world.

References

Alkin, M. C. & Christie, C. (2012) An evaluation theory tree. In Alkin, M. (Ed). *Evaluation roots: A wider perspective of theorists' views and influences* (2nd ed., pp. 12-65). Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publication.

Alkin, M. C. & Patton, M. Q. (2020). The birth and adaptation of evaluation theories. *Journal of MultiDisciplinary Evaluation*, 16 (35), 1-13.

Anzaldúa, G. (Ed.). (1998). *Making face, making soul*. San Francisco: Aunt Lute.

Banks, J. 2014. *Introduction to multicultural education*. 5th ed. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Berry, T. R. (2009). Women of color in a bilingual/dialectical dilemma: critical race feminism against a curriculum of oppression in teacher education. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education,* 22, 745-753.

Canillo, A., Casuga, E., Cordova, J., Cortez, C., Menor, B. (1975). Pinoy know yourself: An Introduction to the Filipino American experience. University of California, Santa Cruz: Third World Teaching Resource Center.

Carden, F. & Alkin, M. C. (2012). Evaluation roots: An international perspective. *Journal of MultiDisciplinary Evaluation*, 8(17), 102-118.

Cavino, H. (2013). Across the colonial divide conversations about evaluation in Indigenous contexts. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 34 (3), 339-355.

Collins, M. (2000). Critical perspectives on evaluation. *Canadian Journal of Program,* Special Issue, 111–135.

Collins, P. H. (2000). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment* (2nd ed.). NY: Routledge.

Cordova, J. (1976). Field resource of the third world teaching resource center. UC Santa Cruz.

Cordova, T., & Espiritu, P. (1996). *Pinoy Teach: A multicultural curriculum.* Seattle: Filipino Youth Activities.

Cordova, J. (2003). *Our story will strengthen the future": Portraits of second generation Filipinos.* Unpublished dissertation. Harvard University Graduate School of Education.

Crawford, K. (2001). Constructing national memory: The 1940/41 blitz in British history textbooks. *Internationale Schulbuchforschung*, 23, Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 323-38.

Cuauhtin, R. T., Zavala, M., Sleeter, C., Au, W. (Eds.) (2019). *Rethinking Ethnic Studies.* Milwaukee: Rethinking Schools.

Darder, A., Baltodano, M.P, & Torres, R. (2009). *The critical pedagogy reader*. New York and London: Routledge.

Duncan-Andrade, J. & Morrell, E. (2008). *The art of critical pedagogy: Possibilities for moving theory to practice in urban schools.* New York: Peter Lang Publishing.

Fanon, Frantz, (1963). *Wretched of the earth.* New York: Grove Press.

Foster, S. and Morris, J. (1994) Arsenal of righteousness? –Treatment of the atomic bombing of Hiroshima in English and U.S. history textbooks. *Curriculum*, 15 (3), 163-173.

Freeman, M., & Vasconcelos, E.F.S. (2010). Critical social theory: Core tenets, inherent issues. In M. Freeman (Ed.), Critical social theory and evaluation practice. *New Directions for Evaluation*, 127, 7–19.

Freire, Paulo. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum.

Frierson, H. T., Hood, S., Hughes, G. B. & Thomas, V. G. (2010). *A guide to conducting culturally-responsive evaluations.* In Frechtling, J., The 2010

user-friendly handbook for project evaluation (pp. 75-96). Arlington, VA: National Science Foundation.

Halagao, P. E. (2004a). Holding up the mirror: The complexity of seeing your ethnic self in history. *Theory and Research in Social Education* 32(4), 459-483.

Halagao, P. E., Tintiangco-Cubales, A., Cordova, J.M. (2009b). Critical review of K-12 Filipina/o American curriculum. *AAPI Nexus*, 7(1), 1-26.

Halagao, P. E. (2010c). Liberating Filipino Americans through decolonizing curriculum. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 13 (4), 495–512.

Herr, K. & Anderson (2014). *The Action Research Dissertation: A Guide for Students and Faculty.* Los Angeles: SAGE.

Hood, S., Hopson, R. & Kirkhart, K. (2015). Culturally responsive evaluation: Theory, practice, and future implications. In K.E. Newcomer, H.P. Hatry & J.S. Wholey (Eds.), Handbook of practical program evaluation, Fourth edition (pp. 281-317). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Huber, L. (2009). Disrupting apartheid of knowledge: testimonio as methodology in Latina/o critical race research in education. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 22 (6), 639-654.

Jocson, K. (2009). Kuwento as multicultural pedagogy in high school Ethnic Studies. *Pedagogies: An International Journal*, 3, 241-253.

Kawakami, A., Aton, K., Cram, F., Lai, M., & Porima, L. (2007). Improving the practice of evaluation through Indigenous values and methods: Decolonizing evaluation practice—Returning the gaze From Hawai'i and Aotearoa. *Hulili: Multidisciplinary Research on Hawaiian Well-Being*, 4(1), 319-348.

Kincheloe, J. L., McLaren, P., & Steinberg, S. (2011). Critical pedagogy and qualitative research: Moving to the bricolage. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (4th ed., pp. 163-178). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Lawsin, Emily. 1998. Empowering the Bayanihan spirit: Teaching Filipina/o American studies. In Hirbayashi. L. (Ed). *Teaching Asian America: Diversity and the Problem of Community* (pp. 187-197). Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

La France, J. & Nichols, R. (2009). *Indigenous evaluation framework: Telling our story in our place and time.* Alexandria: American Indian Higher Education Consortium.

Laenui, P. 2000. Process of decolonization. In M. Battiste (Ed), *Reclaiming indigenous voice and vision,* (pp.150–60). Vancouver: UBC Press.

Lorde, A. (1984). Sister outsider: Essays and Speeches by Audre Lorde. Trumansburg, NY: The Crossing Press.

Maunakea, S. (2014). *"A critical review of culture-based education at Ka Papa Lo'i 'O Kānewai."* Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, Philadelphia, PA.

National Research Council. 2004. *On evaluating curricular effectiveness: Judging the quality of K-12 mathematics evaluations*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. https://doi.org/10.17226/11025.

Pingel, F. (1999). *UNESCO Guidebook on textbook research and textbook revision*, Hannover, Verlag Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 9-11.

Podems, D (2010). Feminist evaluation and gender approaches: There's a difference? *Journal of MultiDisciplinary Evaluation*, 6 (14), 1-17.

Prado, J. (2011). "Honor the context" opening lines for a critical multicultural evaluative practice. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 32 (3), 418-427.

Roseman, J.E., Kesidou, S., & Stern, L. (1996). *Identifying curriculum materials for science literacy: A project 2061 evaluation Tool.* Paper presented at the Colloquium, National Research Council, Washington, DC. November.

Ryan, K., Chandler, M., Samuels, M. (2007). What should school-based evaluation look like? *Studies in Educational Evaluation* 33, 197–212.

Shaw, Anne. Electronic dissertation of Anne Shaw, doctoral student at the University of Texas on critical pedagogy and critical media literacy http://www.21stcenturyschools.com/Possibilities.htm Accessed 2015.

Smith, L. T. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and Indigenous peoples.* London: Zed Books.

Solórzano, D. & Delgado-Bernal, D. (2001). Examining transformational resistance through a critical race and LatCrit theory framework. *Urban Education,* 36(3), 308-342.

Solórzano, D. G. (1998). Critical race theory, racial and gender microaggressions, and the experiences of Chicana and Chicano scholars. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 11, 121-136.

Solórzano, D. G. (1997). Images and words that wound: Critical race theory, racial stereotyping, and teacher education. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 24, 5-19.

Soria, J. (2014). *Creating educational space through heritage language learning and teaching: The case of Ilokano in a secondary classroom in Hawaii*. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, Philadelphia, PA.

Stake, R. (2004). Standards-based and responsive evaluation. Washington D.C.: SAGE.

Stradling, R. (2001). *Teaching 20th – Century European History*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.

Strobel, L.M (2001). *Coming full circle: The process of decolonization among post-1965 Filipino Americans.* Quezon City: Giraffe.

Strobel, L.M. (1994). The cultural identity of third-Wave Filipino Americans. *Journal of the American association for Philippine psychology*, 1(1), 37 – 54.

Tejeda, C, Espinoza, M., Gutierrez, K. (2003). "Toward a decolonizing pedagogy: Social justice reconsidered." In Trifonas, P. (Ed). *Pedagogies of difference: Rethinking education for social justice*. New York: Routledge Falmer.

Thomas, V. & Madison, A. (2010). Integration of social justice into the teaching of evaluation. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 31 (4), 570-583.

Tintiangco-Cubales, A. (2007) *Pin@y educational partnerships: A Filipina/o American studies sourcebook. Volume I: Philippine and Filipina/o American history.* Santa Clara, CA: Phoenix Publishing House International.

Tintiangco-Cubales, A. (2007a). "Final project runway: In the I's of Asian American women." In Stahly, G. (Ed). (pp. 25-41), *Gender Identity, Equity and Violence: Multidisciplinary perspectives through service learning.* Stylus Publishing.

Tintiangco-Cubales, A & Sacramento, J. (2009b). Practicing Pinayist pedagogy. *Amerasia Journal,* 35, 179-187.

Tintiangco-Cubales, A. (2010) What is Ethnic Studies? Presentation at San Francisco State University 2010. In Editor's Comments In A. Tintiangco-Cubales, P. Kiang, & S. D. Museus, (Eds.) *AAPI Nexus Asian Americans & Pacific Islanders policy, practice and community*, 76-100.*AAPI Nexus* 8 (1), v-xvii.

Tintiangco-Cubales, A., Kohli, R., Sacramento, J., Henning, N., Agarwal-Rangnath, R., & Sleeter, C. (2015d). Toward an Ethnic Studies pedagogy: Implications for K-12 schools from the research. *Urban Review,* 47 (1), 104-125.

Woelders, S., & Abma, T. (2015). A different light on normalization: Critical theory and responsive evaluation studying social justice in participation practices. In B. Rosenstein & H. Desivilya Syna (Eds.), Evaluation and social justice in complex sociopolitical contexts. *New Directions for Evaluation*, 146, 9–18.

Weber-Pillwax C. (1999). Indigenous research methodology: Exploratory discussion of an elusive subject. *JET*, 33(1), 31-45.

Weinbrenner, P. (1992). Methodologies of textbook analysis used to date. In Bourdillon, H. (Ed). *History and social studies – Methodologies of textbook Analysis*. (pp. 21-34). Amsterdam: Swets and Zeitlinger.