

2019

Inclusivity in the Archives: Expanding Undergraduate Pedagogies for Diversity and Inclusion

Amy J. Lueck
Santa Clara University, alueck@scu.edu

Beverlyn Law

Isabella Zhang

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarcommons.scu.edu/engl>

Part of the [Archival Science Commons](#), and the [English Language and Literature Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Lueck, A. J., Law, B., & Zhang, I. (2019). Inclusivity in the Archives: Expanding Undergraduate Pedagogies for Diversity and Inclusion. In R. Jeffries (Ed.), *Diversity, Equity, and Inclusivity in Contemporary Higher Education* (pp. 1-12). Hershey, PA: IGI Global. doi:10.4018/978-1-5225-5724-1.ch001

This chapter appears in *Diversity, Equity, and Inclusivity in Contemporary Higher Education* edited by Rhonda Jeffries. Copyright 2007, IGI Global, www.igi-global.com. Posted by permission of the publisher.

This Book Chapter is brought to you for free and open access by the College of Arts & Sciences at Scholar Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in English by an authorized administrator of Scholar Commons. For more information, please contact rscroggin@scu.edu.

Diversity, Equity, and Inclusivity in Contemporary Higher Education

Rhonda Jeffries
University of South Carolina, USA

A volume in the Advances in Higher Education
and Professional Development (AHEPD) Book
Series



Published in the United States of America by

IGI Global
Information Science Reference (an imprint of IGI Global)
701 E. Chocolate Avenue
Hershey PA, USA 17033
Tel: 717-533-8845
Fax: 717-533-8661
E-mail: cust@igi-global.com
Web site: <http://www.igi-global.com>

Copyright © 2019 by IGI Global. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored or distributed in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, without written permission from the publisher. Product or company names used in this set are for identification purposes only. Inclusion of the names of the products or companies does not indicate a claim of ownership by IGI Global of the trademark or registered trademark.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Jeffries, Rhonda B. (Rhonda Baynes), 1965- editor.

Title: Diversity, equity, and inclusivity in contemporary higher education / Rhonda Jeffries, editor.

Description: Hershey, PA : Information Science Reference, 2019. | Includes bibliographical references.

Identifiers: LCCN 2017055708 | ISBN 9781522557241 (hardcover) | ISBN 9781522557258 (ebook)

Subjects: LCSH: Education, Higher--Social aspects--United States. | Minorities--Education (Higher)--United States. | College teaching--Social aspects--United States. | Educational equalization--United States. | Culturally relevant pedagogy--United States. | Social justice--United States.

Classification: LCC LC191.94 .D585 2019 | DDC 378.1/982--dc23 LC record available at <https://lccn.loc.gov/2017055708>

This book is published in the IGI Global book series *Advances in Higher Education and Professional Development (AHEPD)* (ISSN: 2327-6983; eISSN: 2327-6991)

British Cataloguing in Publication Data

A Cataloguing in Publication record for this book is available from the British Library.

All work contributed to this book is new, previously-unpublished material. The views expressed in this book are those of the authors, but not necessarily of the publisher.

For electronic access to this publication, please contact: eresources@igi-global.com.

Chapter 1

Inclusivity in the Archives: Expanding Undergraduate Pedagogies for Diversity and Inclusion

Amy J. Lueck

Santa Clara University, USA

Beverlyn Law

Santa Clara University, USA

Isabella Zhang

Santa Clara University, USA

ABSTRACT

This chapter uses the experience of two undergraduate students conducting research in their university archives to consider the “hidden curriculum” entailed in archival research at some institutions. When diverse identities and experiences are not represented in our archives, we run the risk of communicating a lack of value for those identities, producing a feeling of marginalization and exclusion for some students and foreclosing an opportunity to build solidarity across difference for others. In light of the limited holdings at many university archives and the increased prevalence of archival research in the undergraduate classroom, the authors draw on research from writing studies, anthropology, archival research, and public memory to produce recommendations for students, faculty, and institutions working to compose inclusive archives and research experiences.

INTRODUCTION

Archives have the power to privilege and to marginalize. They can be a tool of hegemony; they can be a tool of resistance. They both reflect and constitute power relations ... They are the basis for and validation of the stories we tell ourselves, the story-telling narratives that give cohesion and meaning to individuals, groups, and societies. -Schwartz and Cook, 2002

DOI: 10.4018/978-1-5225-5724-1.ch001

The documents, artifacts and memorials that record and preserve the work of our universities are rich historical and pedagogical resources increasingly valued as a means to teach students about history and memory as well as research, writing, rhetoric, and representation. They provide opportunities to forge a sense of community and shared identity as members of the university. They also perpetuate legacies of colonization, marginalization, and exclusion.

This chapter addresses the experiences of marginalization and exclusion that institutional archives at many of our universities may perpetuate among undergraduate researchers because of the lack of diversity those archives often represent, particularly in relation to Native communities.. It is important that undergraduate students and other communities to whom our universities are responsible see their own lives and experiences reflected in the university's archives and other sites of memory and preservation across campus in order to break the cycle of oppression in which the U.S. university has participated and invite students into a posture of solidarity with marginalized groups. Increasing our archival holdings is one avenue for pursuing this goal, but the issue leads to other questions of diverse representation and engagement on our campuses as well. The objective of this chapter is to illustrate the "hidden curriculum" of marginalization and exclusion in university archives and to recommend policies and practices to improve archival teaching, learning, and historical engagement on our campuses.

BACKGROUND

It is well known that U.S. education systems have marginalized Native people in a number of ways, both historically and presently. Most infamous are the Native American boarding schools established in the 1870s, which forcibly removed Native children from their homes and communities in order to enculturate them in Western ways. But the marginalization of Native Americans in education has persisted into the present as well. Native Americans continue to be underrepresented in institutions of higher education, representing only 1.1 percent of the total college and university enrollment in 2006. While Native American enrollment in colleges and universities has doubled since the 1970s, still only twenty-six percent of American Indian/Alaskan Native 18- to 24-year olds were enrolled in colleges or universities in 2006 (NCES, 2008). And Native and indigenous voices and stories continue to be devalued in various ways within schools as well.

For example, the marginalization of Native experiences continues in the curricula of U.S. schools. James Loewen (2008) described some of the issues in his book *Lies My Teacher Told Me: Everything Your American History Textbook Got Wrong*, particularly emphasizing the shortcomings in ways high schools teach their students about American history. Loewen (2008) noted that the nature of history textbooks keeps students in states of ignorance because they enforce the concept that history is simply facts to be learned. Therefore, students fail to realize that history is only written by the winners. Additionally, Loewen (2008) pointed out how "textbooks employ a godlike tone, so it never occurs to most students to question them" (p. 9). Because students learn about the past in this way, they assume that the debate has been settled and all that is left is the facts. A combination of these factors leads to the general ignorance regarding Native American history that the typical American holds. With the odds already placed against them, Native Americans are only further marginalized in higher education because they are trying to work against previous misconceptions.

At first blush, university archives may seem like an unlikely place to redress these issues and to consider diversity, equity and inclusion for undergraduates. For one, archives are often thought of as

Inclusivity in the Archives

privileged institutional repositories, closed to all but the most advanced researchers or historians. But more and more, faculty across departments are bringing students into the archives to engage in authentic, project-based inquiry projects revolving around the history of their institutions and engaging complex writing and research (Enoch & VanHaitma, 2015; Hayden, 2015; VanHaitma, 2015). As archival researcher Wendy Hayden (2015) argued, the methods and practices of archival research—“the ways of reading, inquiry, lack of closure and easy resolutions of questions, relationship between student writers and their research”—have the potential to “reconfigure how we think about a pedagogy for undergraduate research,” even in first year writing courses (p. 420). As more undergraduate students engage in a range of archival research projects in their courses, it is increasingly important to consider how archival acquisition policies shape students’ experiences of marginalization or inclusion—particularly when those students are first generation college students or others who may not as readily see their identities and experiences recognized and valued by the institution.

Joining the likes of historians and librarians, scholars in the history of rhetoric and composition have long been interested in the politics of power and representation in the archive (see Octalogs, 1988; Octalogs, 1997). The archive matters to rhetoricians, in part, because it is a primary source for what Jordynn Jack and Jessica Enoch (2011) called a “revised and expanded rhetorical tradition” that embraces a broad range of rhetorical strategies from groups with a wide range of experiences and values (p. 519). As a rhetoric and writing studies professor and students using archives in their research and writing, we thus came to archives to explore the stories they tell and the traditions they represent. In the process, we also confronted silences, gaps and omissions that invited us to interrogate—as the epigraph here suggests—what “basis for and validation” of marginalized bodies and stories our archives provide for our students as members of their institution (Schwartz & Cook, 2002). We asked: Do our institutions’ archival acquisition policies and disciplinary practices foster a sense of inclusivity and solidarity with marginalized groups, and if not, how might they?

OUR CASE STUDY: SANTA CLARA UNIVERSITY

This question arose from Beverlyn and Bella’s experience as first-year writing students who went into our university archives looking for records of the Native Americans on whose land our school rests. Santa Clara University, established in 1851, is historically significant as the oldest operating institution of higher education in California. Even more historical, it is home to the Santa Clara Mission, one of twenty-one Franciscan missions established by Father Junipero Serra across the state of California in 1770s. The Mission is the centerpiece of the campus, featured prominently on publicity materials and in the school’s logo. But the school’s mission history implicates it also in a history of settler colonialism that is remembered by Indigenous communities and richly documented by anthropologists, but is less present in the public narratives of the university itself.

The Native tribe that lived on the campus’s present location is the Ohlone. According to anthropologist Russell Skowronek (1998), there were “about ten thousand Ohlone living along California’s central coast in some fifty separate and politically autonomous units” at the time the mission was established (p. 680). The Mission itself “was home to more than 1,300 indigenous neophytes—as baptized native people were called—during most of its peak years (ca. mid-1790s–1820s).” (Panich, 2015, p. 112). Like other tribes, the Ohlone have their own social, economic, religious, political, and ceremonial practices. But following the establishment of the Santa Clara Mission in 1777, “the drastic influx of foreigners,

combined with the pressures of forced missionization and disease, resulted in abrupt modifications of native traditional cultures” (Allen & Blount, 2009, p. 25). This does not mean that the indigenous cultures and peoples were eradicated. Instead, records document the “survival of traditional Ohlone ideology in the mission setting” throughout more than 60 years of missionary effort (Skowronek, 1998, p. 684; Panich, 2015). This included traditional burial practices and traditional housing structures, among other cultural practices (Allen & Blount, 2009; Hylkema, 2009; Panich, 2015). But conversion and the dominance of mission culture certainly changed life and culture for the Ohlone on this land. In the end, the:

documentary research has shown that, for all of the ‘good’ intentions of the Franciscans, the formation of the congregation and subsequent life in the missions was all too often brutally harsh and radically shortened the life of the neophytes. (Skowronek, 1998, p. 683)

The complex history of colonialism, and the presence and persistence of Native American experiences on this land, is not captured in the public image of Santa Clara University and its Mission. And Beverlyn and Bella were disappointed to find few significant records of this aspect of our history in the archives either. What records that do exist are from the perspective of the missionaries and laced with racist and imperialist ideologies. The most common images of the Mission period perpetuate this skewed frame of vision too, showing the Mission church and quadrangle complex but not the Native residences that surrounded them, thus perpetuating the image of complete Native conversion and marginalization (Allen & Blount, 2009, p. 26).

The students experienced this lack of archival records as a rejection of the significance of these stories to our university. This was, of course, not the intent of our institution or the archivists with whom we worked closely. But, at the same time, the students were not wrong to feel what they did. Instead, their experience of marginalization and dissonance was informed by both the historical acquisition policies of our archives and, more broadly, the policies and practices around disciplinarity and compartmentalization that separate the official archives of the university library from, say, archeological collections and broader historical repositories, cordoning off the institution’s story from both the natural and cultural histories with which it has engaged. Moreover, the professor, Amy, was not at first able to think of a way through this challenge to meet the needs of the students involved. Disciplined in her field’s ways of knowing and researching, she needed her students to prompt the interdisciplinary insights about how to research and represent marginalized groups and experiences in and out of the archives.

Thus, we use this experience and our own institution as a case study to consider how to create policies and practices that do not perpetuate and contribute to the silences and injustices often reflected in university archives. Through our close collaboration as students and faculty, we have developed several avenues of action that institutions and institutional agents can take to redress issues of marginalization and exclusion when working with undergraduates in the archives.

The discussion begins here with an account of the students’ and professor’s experience working together in the archives. The students’ experience provides crucial insights into the “hidden curriculum” of injustice and inequity that was activated in this moment, while the professor’s experience—particularly her initial struggle to see a way past the lack of archival evidence to help her students pursue their research questions—provides insight into the ways institutional policies and the academic cultures they support contribute to the perpetuation of inequity and marginalization. The chapter closes by forwarding recommendations for policy and practice that reflect the theoretical insights gleaned from this research and experience.

UNDERGRADUATES IN THE ARCHIVES

As an archival researcher inspired by the growing body of research on teaching writing in the archives, Amy took the students in her Critical Thinking and Writing course—a required first year writing course—to our university’s Archives and Special Collections department to conduct research into the history of their institution. The course was themed around experiences of college life, and the excursion was part of an inquiry-generating assignment, inviting students to explore the historical materials available there in order to develop an authentic curiosity and question to guide their research throughout the quarter. From there, students’ research processes branched out most often into contemporary issues or questions relating to higher education, and students were able to use archival materials as what Joseph Bizup (2008) called “exhibit” sources, evidencing, exemplifying and grounding their theoretical discussions.

As an archival researcher who studies the rhetorical histories of schools and colleges, Amy had anticipated the students examining old yearbooks and course catalogues that represent student life in the past. She had anticipated them looking at old maps and photographs to see how the campus and surrounding city had changed. She had envisioned them studying administrative records, pamphlets, and ephemera from student clubs and activities, and newspapers and manuscript records discussing major events and controversies on and off campus. This is the research she does, and she has enjoyed inviting classes of her first year students into this work.

On the day of this archival session, the archivists laid out a wide range of historical texts and artifacts representing the rich history of the oldest institution of higher learning in our state, and the students immersed themselves in this history for the day. Students researched a range of topics, from the history of scholarships to student protest activities, and from the evolution of science course offerings to the transformation of campus buildings. But in the face of this long and robust historical record dating back to the Franciscans, to the earliest days of California’s statehood and even before, two students noticed a gap: where were the Native American peoples? Where were the historical traces of the people who predated the story of this Mission and college, on whose land the library itself was built?

Beverlyn and Bella were disappointed to find that there was not a good answer to their question to be found in those archives. While there was some mention of “Indios” in an early baptismal record and other small traces, it seemed the Native people largely were not a part of the institution’s sense of identity and history, as represented in the archive. Of course, the institution’s records are shaped by years of acquisitions policies that reflect the priorities of prior administrations and cultures. But the omissions are not inconsequential either. Archives reflect *and* reinscribe power. And, while these students were not Native American themselves, the absence of Native American culture in the archives made them question the university’s values and the place of their own identities and experiences in their university’s self-conception and sense of tradition.

The students immediately saw the lack of representation of Native Americans as reflective of larger issues of diversity and inclusion important to them. For Beverlyn, the conversations about Native Americans, which had been initiated in her grade school curriculum, had itself resurfaced when she joined an activist and intersectional club on campus called Together for Ladies of Color. Dialogue was generated there about the rape of Native women and the genocide of the Ohlone people. This was the first time she remembered hearing of the Ohlone people and the first time she heard the word “genocide” used to accompany conversations about Native Americans. She was troubled by the fact that she was hearing about this topic only from fellow students and not through her academics. She was intellectually and ethically motivated to learn more.

But the students perceived that their experience in the archive and attempts to increase their knowledge on Indigenous groups were limited and halted by the lack of materials available in the archive. They were not able to pursue a topic that they were passionate about, nor were they able to develop a sense of solidarity with a community for which they cared. They felt shut down, and closed out.

Beverlyn and Bella's frustration with their own situation turned into sympathy and compassion as they imagined themselves in the shoes of a Native student. How does it feel to not see your ancestors or people like you represented? By noticing the lack of representation of Native Americans, they became more aware of the lack of representation for other minority groups and subgroups as well, such as trans women of color and people of color with mental illnesses. Who else's histories have been erased? Who is not represented in our archives? These questions have particular stakes for Native students, first generation students, and others at risk of feeling underrepresented on our campuses today. They are important, deeply ethical and political questions.

Meanwhile, Amy did not have much in the way of an answer either. Still new to the area, she did not know what other resources were available for pursuing this question, either at our own university or in the community. She invited the students to explore the *absence* of Native American documents and experiences in the archives as a topic, but that idea fell somewhat flat. The students had already learned, in that moment, what place Native American lives had in their school's conception of its own history. Beverlyn went on to research and write about the experiences of women students in the business school, and Bella went on to research the university's Multicultural Center. In this way, they were both able to pursue their commitments to issues of diversity and inclusion in their research. Nonetheless, we were left with a sense of a missed opportunity for building solidarity and truly expanding our sense of history and representation. A sense of support and value in pursuing the work of justice and inclusivity is important for students developing conceptions of themselves in relation to various communities and publics, historical and contemporary, and this moment powerfully revealed how that support and value was not there for all members of our class and community.

Although the archive and their engagements with it during this course seemed to lead to a dead-end, it also opened up opportunities for Beverlyn and Bella to look beyond the more limited confines of the archive itself and beyond the confines of the course. Thus, we worked together after the course ended to pursue their question of Native American representation, and through these conversations we began to discern connections between their experience in the archives and other issues of representation in popular culture, like the movement to change the Washington Redskins' logo because of concerns of ethnic stereotyping. Beverlyn and Bella sought out research about Native peoples from elsewhere on our campus, such as the work of an anthropology faculty on Native Americans during the Mission period of university. And they began to think about how they and others in the greater university community could help and support the Native community in the present day.

As Amy listened to the questions and the scholarly and ethical impulses of these students, she rethought her conception of these questions as well, and the boundaries and borders around her own methods and methodologies. Together, then, we began to conceptualize ways forward to address the issue of representation for ourselves as a professor and students dedicated to extending learning opportunities, increasing representation, and building solidarity between students and marginalized groups. In the recommendations that follow, the discussion focuses specifically on issues of Native American representation. This is our attempt to redress the concerns the students felt that first day working in their archives, and it represents a particularly important area of inquiry for many of our campuses. At the same time, this conversation is a launching pad for considering broader issues of diversity and inclusivity in our institutional archives as we continue to invite our undergraduates to conduct research there.

SOLUTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS: INCLUSIVITY IN AND BEYOND THE ARCHIVE

In relating this account, we hope to remind educators of the messages our students receive from our institutional practices--which are crucially important *regardless* of the messages we intend to convey. This insight has implications for writing instructors and other faculty considering engaging their undergraduates in archival research. How can we move forward as institutions and individual faculty members to support transformative, ethical student research on (and about) our campuses when working with our own limited archives? It also has implications for the commemorative history and public memory projects we engage as institutions writ large. In what follows, we have synthesized some of the wisdom we have gleaned from our experience and research and offer a series of recommendations that might improve the experience of others engaging similar work in the future. We believe these steps are possible and practical for transforming our undergraduates' experiences with underrepresented stories in the archives—stories which may well be their own.

Archival Holdings

In the first place—and most obviously, perhaps—archivists can transform the archival holdings by implementing acquisition policies that prioritize marginalized groups and experiences, working to “decolonize the archive” by interrogating “the imperialist structures informing them” (Cushman, 2013, p. 119). This involves a reconsideration of what the holdings are (or should be) as well as how those holdings are catalogued or represented in either digital or physical platforms. These choices of selection, ordering, and presenting documents and artifacts are powerfully rhetorical, shaping users' sense of narrative, history, and even time itself (Smithers, 2014, p. 6). Indeed, archivists increasingly recognize that they “have played central roles in promoting particular historical narratives and sustaining dominant power structures,” and increasingly challenge the myth of neutrality previously perpetuated in the field (Gilliland, 2011, p. 195). In response, archivists have turned to the notion of “archival activism,” which foregrounds the work of public and community history and invites professional archivists to actively seek collaboration with these projects and groups (Flinn, 2011; Vukliš & Gilliland, 2016). This archival activism might take at least two forms: 1) collecting the artifacts of diverse cultures and groups to be held within the archive, and; 2) recognizing the location of community-based archives, bringing visibility and support to those collections, while retaining them in the hands of the community. The latter approach acknowledges that expanding our institutions' archival holdings is not always possible or even desirable in relation to Native and Indigenous artifacts and documents.

The fact is that even with archival activism at hand, the politics of archiving and collecting Native American artifacts and documents are particularly complex and fraught.¹ In addition to the challenges posed to traditional archiving practices by cultures that rely less on written texts, a major issue is that Native American and Indigenous artifacts belong with the communities that created and may continue to use them. Thus, as we try—good naturedly as we may—to increase representation in the archive, we must consider the implications of dominant (and dominating) institutions like our universities having possession of those artifacts versus the descendants and communities possessing them. The First Archivists Circle's (2007) Protocols for Native American Archival Materials emphasizes the rights of Native American communities over their materials in this way, foregrounding the need for respect and trust between Native American communities and non-Native American archives in developing relationships

and agreements about accessibility. They reiterate the importance of consultation with and concurrence of Tribal communities in decisions and policies, urging archivists and librarians to consider Native American perspectives on professional policy and practice issues. Such partnerships acknowledge that the work of cultural domination is not only in our past, but is reinscribed in our current practices, highlighting records and archives not only as “contested sites of power,” but also as “dynamic technologies of rule which actually create the histories and social realities they ostensibly only describe” (Schwartz & Cook, 2002, p. 7).

By taking a stance of “archival activism”, we can work towards what Ellen Cushman (2013) called a “decolonial archive.” This operates “through the co-construction of knowledge based on interactions between storytellers and listeners that counter the imperial archive’s insistence on expert codification of knowledge” and “through linguistic and cultural perseverance rather than the imperialist agenda of preservation of cultural tradition as hermetically sealed, contained, and unchanging” (Cushman, 2013, p. 116-117). As Cushman (2013) further explained, “Continuing coexistence with peoples, in and through interactions that are rooted in place, seems a promising way to allow for an enunciation of knowledge that decolonizes the archive” (p. 130). In these ways, we can create history as living memory.

Dialoging With Communities

Generating such dialogue and involving Indigenous communities in these conversations is an important first step towards bettering our community and showing solidarity towards Native Americans and others who are underrepresented in our institutions. And this historical and archival impulse does not need to be contained by the archives either.

Recognizing that our past methods of archiving have not shown strong support for underrepresented groups, the students decided that moving forward we have an opportunity to be more inclusive, so they determined that they wanted also to connect to living stories of Indigenous and Native American experiences in order to not replicate the silencing or further colonization of them. While the Ohlone of our own campus’s history may not be federally recognized as an extant tribe today, who are the descendants whose histories we are not too late to not only preserve but also to actively engage through our research practices? In this spirit, the students sought to connect with the Native American Coalition for Change (NACC) on our own campus. Though the club members themselves may not have all the answers, the students identified them as a good resource for identifying who to contact and how to best handle the ongoing conversation regarding the uniqueness of their community.

The students were also interested in conducting focus groups to invite people of Native American descent to discuss various ways in which they want to be represented. These focus groups would also portray to students that their institution in fact does care about authentically creating a diverse realm of knowledge for future generations to look through. It is a given that the future student population at the university will grow more diverse in thoughts, ideas, race, gender, sexuality, and much more. This is a call to create the foundation that welcomes diversity amongst our archives, and it happens through dialogue between and among our students from their full range of diverse subjectivities. Together, these students can constitute their own communities within and beyond the university and consider how to record and preserve a sense of history in their own image.

Creating Structures for Visibility

The institution—faculty, staff and administrators—plays a key role in creating structures to support this work. Indeed, a major deterrent to the students' attempts to listen to Native American experiences on our campus was the lack of Native American visibility not only in the archives but also across our campus space. The sense that Indigenous stories were silenced and not valued was produced by the geography of the campus itself, and the ways we (do not) mark our diverse and complicated histories for those who pass through that space. Thus, commemorative installations or plaques are one way to recognize the Native American lives and traditions that continue to shape our campus. Commemorative efforts such as the Georgetown Memory Project have paved the way for other universities in telling their own painful and complicated institutional histories and increasing the visibility of the full range of experiences that constitute our campus histories. According to James E. Young (1993) and other public memory scholars, monuments and other commemorative opportunities contribute to a shared sense of identity for groups. In this way, commemorative events and installations on our own campuses can contribute to a shared identity for our campuses that is more inclusive, inviting groups to share their memories and their meanings for the past together.

This visibility might also be accomplished through more robust intra-institutional partnerships between our archives and other institutional repositories—such as archeology collections that may be housed and operated separately—and between the various departments invested in using these materials. Only through their experience writing this draft did we come to fully realize the robust resources for studying Native American lives available on our campus, particularly through our archaeology department. Those who have been at our institution for a long time may fail to regard the powerful silo effect of academic institutions that is often experienced by students and early career faculty alike, and the ways it forecloses avenues of research and discovery.

That silo effect is material and embodied, reflected in the organization of labor and bodies into separate buildings, and it is also intellectual, manifested in methodological norms that “discipline” our research and teaching. While faculty are certainly responsible for transmitting their own disciplinary ways of knowing, extracurricular approaches and questions need a place in our liberal arts courses as well. By expanding our methodological purviews and partnering with faculty from across disciplines, we can better support our students in developing diverse, inclusive conceptions of their campus traditions and values.

The professor has taken these lessons into her own curricular planning by offering an archival research course that begins first in our archeology department, grounded in artifacts rather than documents. Though the class is not focused on Native American experiences, the hope is that locating the course physically in this other space before moving to the archive will open up the range of questions and avenues for research that students can pursue, drawing on the variety of institutional and disciplinary resources and research traditions to pursue their questions of history, identity, representation and justice.

Seeing Absence

At the least, faculty can (and must) attend to the silences in our archives and other spaces of public memory or identity construction on our campuses, and use them as an opportunity to theorize—with our students—how institutions continue to prioritize certain populations and experiences, and to overlook (or suppress) others. The lack of representation in our archives is a phenomenon that we can purpose-

fully highlight and attend to as part of the learning that students do there, dwelling in the dissonances between what the university may profess to value and what its records suggest it has valued enough to preserve and promote. Thus, faculty can invite and equip students to not only use but also to *critique* their archives—to recognize and grapple with their partiality, positionality, and politics—and to reach beyond the confines of our courses and disciplines to find ways of addressing the limitations of these archives in ways that are meaningful to them.

FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

Scholars have suggested that we are currently in a “memory boom,” when people in and out of the university are acutely interested in the past (Winter, 2006). In turn, scholars across disciplines have shown a strong interest in using, critiquing, and even composing archives in the undergraduate classroom, working not only with physical but also with digital archives and collections. What the archivists and memory scholars cited here would have us remember in the midst of this interest is that memory and history are constructed by those here in the present. Thus, in constituting and using archives, memorials and other historical materials, we can work to construct this history and memory to more just and inclusive ends. Future research should more closely study the archival holdings of our universities and the affective and intellectual responses of diverse students to working with those materials to better understand the pedagogies and practices that foster critical, engaged research into our past for a more diverse, equitable, and inclusive future.

CONCLUSION

Overall, the experience of thinking about this paper together has raised new horizons and possibilities for undergraduate archival and historical research as we have understood it, embracing a sense of solidarity, of interdisciplinarity, of living memory and respect, and of history in the present that our institutions would benefit from further exploring. What if we were to work with both past and present accounts, oral history and archival documentation, as well as across disciplines, with both archives and artifacts? What kinds of understandings, engagements, representations, and solidarities might that approach enable?

While it is true that universities preserve and shape their histories through their institutional archives, the archive can also be a site where students are invited to help compose the history of the institution of which they are a part—to intervene in it, to extend it, to push it beyond the confines of documentary history and archival tradition, and to shape it towards more just ends. Through our ever-diversifying and ethical archival practices, we can constitute a sense of community and shared history for our students and our communities, fostering solidarity both within and beyond the archives.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

REFERENCES

- Allen, R., & Blount, C. (2009). Preliminary Report on recent Mission-era findings at Santa Clara University. *Proceedings of the Society for California Archaeology*, 21, 21–27.
- Bizup, J. (2008). BEAM: A rhetorical vocabulary for teaching research-based writing. *Rhetoric Review*, 27(1), 72–86. doi:10.1080/07350190701738858
- Cushman, E. (2013). Wampum, Sequoyan, and story: Decolonizing the digital archive. *College English*, 76(2), 115–135.
- Enoch, J., & VanHaitsma, P. (2015). Archival literacy: Reading the rhetoric of digital archives in the undergraduate classroom. *College Composition and Communication*, 67(2), 216–242.
- First Archivists Circle. (2007). Protocols for Native American archival materials. *Northern Arizona University*. Retrieved from <http://www2.nau.edu/libnap-p/protocols.html>
- Flinn, A. (2011). Archival activism: Independent and community-led archives, radical public history and the heritage professions. *InterActions: UCLA Journal of Education and Information Studies*, 7(2). Retrieved from <http://escholarship.org/uc/item/9pt2490x#main>
- Flynn, J. P., & Laderman, G. (1994). Purgatory and the powerful dead. *Religion and American Culture. Journal of Interpretation*, 4(1), 51–75.
- Gilliland, A. (2011). Neutrality, social justice and the obligations of archival education and educators in the twenty-first century. *Arch Sci*, 11(3-4), 193–209. doi:10.1007/10502-011-9147-0
- Hayden, W. (2015). “Gifts” of the archives: A pedagogy for undergraduate research. *College Composition and Communication*, 66(3), 402–426.
- Hylkema, L. (2009). Pre-contact Native American presence at Santa Clara University. *Proceedings of the Society for California Archaeology*, 21, 9–20.
- Jack, J., & Enoch, J. (2011). Remembering Sappho: New perspectives on teaching (and writing) women’s rhetorical history. *College English*, 73(5), 518–537.
- Loewen, J. W. (2008). *Lies my teacher told me: Everything your American History textbook got wrong*. New York, NY: The New Press.
- Milun, K. (2001). Keeping-while-giving-back: Computer imaging and Native American repatriation. *Political and Legal Anthropology Review*, 24(2), 39–57. doi:10.1525/pol.2001.24.2.39
- National Center for Educational Statistics. (2008). *Enrollment in Colleges and Universities. Status and trends in the education of American Indians and Alaska Natives*. Retrieved from https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2008/nativetrends/ind_6_1.asp
- Octalog, I. I. (1997). The (continuing) politics of historiography. *Rhetoric Review*, 16(1), 22–44.
- Octalog: The politics of historiography. (1988). *Rhetoric Review*, 6(2), 5–49.

- Panich, L. (2015). "Sometimes they bury the deceased's clothes and trinkets": Indigenous mortuary practices at Mission Santa Clara de Asís. *Historical Archaeology*, 49(4), 110–129. doi:10.1007/BF03376983
- Schwartz, J. M., & Cook, T. (2002). Archives, records, and power: The making of modern memory. *Archival Science*, 2(1-2), 1–19. doi:10.1007/BF02435628
- Skowronek, R. K. (1998). Sifting the evidence: Perceptions of life at the Ohlone (Costanoan) Missions of Alta California. *Ethnohistory (Columbus, Ohio)*, 45(4), 675–708. doi:10.2307/483300
- Smithers, G. D. (2014). Introduction: "What is an Indian?"--The enduring question of American Indian identity. In G. D. Smithers & B. N. Newman (Eds.), *Native diasporas: Indigenous identities and settler colonialism in the Americas* (pp. 1-27). Lincoln, NE: U of Nebraska P.
- The Georgetown Memory Project. (n.d.). Georgetown University. Retrieved from <https://www.georgetownmemoryproject.org/>
- VanHaitsma, P. (2015). New pedagogical engagements with archives: Student inquiry and composing in digital spaces. *College English*, 78(1), 34–55.
- Vukliš, V., & Gilliland, A. J. (2016). Archival activism: Emerging forms, local applications. *UCLA*. Retrieved from: <http://escholarship.org/uc/item/112790sz>
- Winter, J. (2006). Notes on the memory boom: War, remembrance, and the uses of the past. In *Memory, Trauma and World Politics* (pp. 54-73). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Young, J. E. (1993). *The texture of memory: Holocaust memorials and meaning*. New Haven, CT: Yale UP.

KEY TERMS AND DEFINITIONS

Archival Activism: An archival practice that actively seeks to redress inequity in the archives.

Archive: A repository of documents and other materials held by the universities, governments, and other institutions and organizations for the purpose of preservation and future use.

Hegemony: Power or control, particularly cultural or political in nature.

Marginalization: A lack of representation or value; to push to margins rather than the center.

Pedagogy: A theorized teaching practice.

Public Memory: A historical remembrance reflective of values and priorities of groups in the present.

Solidarity: A posture towards difference that recognizes differentials in power and privilege.

ENDNOTE

- ¹ Anthropologists have theorized and recommended best practices for preserving artifacts (Milun, 2001), sacred lands (Flynn and Ladermann, 1994), and even the circulation/articulation of identity in relation to native peoples (Smithers, 2014).