

Timeline -- Tribal-state relationship

BLUE=Dominant narrative about Wabanaki people

YELLOW=Beliefs challenging dominant narrative about Wabanaki people

GREEN=State policy or practice in regard to relationship with tribes.

PINK= Pre-ICWA Child-welfare specific statement or event

RED=ICWA compliance issue

TIMELINE 1942-1979		
Summary/context of relationship at point in time	Document citation	Notes about document's relevance
<p>"Indian problem" perspective predominates. Negative stereotypes accepted and out in the open.</p>	<p>Proctor, R. W. & State of Maine. (1942).</p>	<p>Also known as the "Proctor Report," this report was prepared for the Maine State legislature, and was referenced into the 1970s. Report gives insight into the state's narrative about tribes at the time, saying "the whole impression one gets is of slackness, lack of pride or initiative" regarding Indian Island community and of Peter Dana Point, "A general dirty appearance, even worse than at Old Town, impresses one here. The Indians are shiftless, take no care of their houses or land, and little of themselves." The report concludes with a summary in which a series of questions are asked -- presumably for the state to answer in moving forward in work with tribes. This includes the questions: "Who is an Indian?", "Is it legal to prevent Indians from voting provided they pay a poll tax?" and "Has the past and present policy of ever-extending paternalism been helpful to the Indian?"</p>
<p>Assimilation doctrine prevails. Expectation that Wabanaki tribes will disappear by being absorbed into dominant society.</p>	<p>Bangor Daily News. (1952, Apr 30).</p>	<p>Penobscot Governor Albert Nicola issued a statement of complaint in which he addressed a number of problems with state-tribal relationships. He argued that even though the state and other organizations have been preparing reports on the "Indian question," the tribe was never consulted by the state or other organizations. "In all the investigations the tribe as a whole has never been consulted as to their needs and wishes." He asserted "[r]eally we are a nation within a state" and that "we don't want to feel we have been pushed around by any department, state or government."</p>

		<p>Nicola challenged stereotypes about all Native people being alcoholics, that prostitution is prevalent over the reservation, that all Native people are lazy, and that Native people have been called the “largest parasite on the state” by someone who holds a high position in a state department. Governor Nicola also was protesting Director of Indian Affairs Stevens’ ruling that Native people should pay for medical expenses, which previously had been paid by the state.</p>
	<p>Fuller, D. W. (1952).</p>	<p>This report to the governor on a state official’s attendance at the Institute of American Indian Assimilation. Although it is presumed that the conference challenged the idea of assimilation (since this conference was organized by a Native rights group and Native leadership from around the country attended), it is not clear that the writer of the report fully realized this. Fuller still adopts a paternalistic attitude in which the problems of Native people must be solved by the state. For example, Fuller was impressed with the “high caliber of the Indians themselves who attended” (p.5) and that some of them “regularly appear before Congressional committees to support the rights of their people” (p.5). But he then goes on to say that “leaders should be found or developed within the tribes” (p.5) -- presumably found by the state. Among Fuller’s conclusions is “Assimilation is a long range goal but it is not to be reached by hasty measures” (p.7).</p>
<p>State has total control/tribes exist by the generosity of the state. No regard for tribal members’ rights. “Indian problem” still has not gone away.</p>	<p>Stevens, D. H. & State of Maine. (1952).</p>	<p>Stevens (Director of Indian Affairs) makes recommendations to solve the “Indian problem” and also addresses land ownership issues with islands on the Penobscot River and jurisdiction issues related to law enforcement. Stevens’ assessment is that the “Indian problem” is largely created by a lack of clarity in state law about the state’s obligations to the Penobscot and Passamaquoddy tribes. The obligations to the tribes are essentially social services-related -- providing for education of children and financial assistance (“caring for the needy Indians”). The tribes apparently disagree with the state about the state’s interpretation of their obligations based on past treaties. The state forestry department managed the 17,000 acres of Indian Township land “for the benefit of the Passamaquoddy tribe,” and Stevens recommends that the state take over the 146 islands owned by the Penobscot tribe to be logged because the land ownership titles held by tribal members are too confusing. Stevens writes, “In any event, the title to these lands is</p>

		<p>held by the Indians only through permission of the State Legislature and supposedly the State Legislature could withdraw this permission" (p.10).</p> <p>This report gives insight into state-tribal relationships (at one point he described the Penobscot tribal council as "very aggressive" (p.17)) and a dominant narrative about Wabanaki people, namely that "the Indians will continue to demand services and assistance not provided for in the law" (p.2).</p>
State control of tribal affairs extended even to overseeing tribal elections.	Shay, L. (1962, October).	<p>Indian Island resident Leo Shay protested the Division of Indian Affairs interference in a close tribal election, contending that the state did not like the outcome and therefore interfered with the vote. The DIA was involved in recounting the votes and reviewing the voter list. The winner of the recount later wrote a letter to the editor responding to Shay, saying that the state was appropriately involved and that Shay just didn't like the outcome of the election because a member of the younger generation won.</p> <p>Regardless of whether wrongdoing occurred or not on the part of the state, this letter highlights the relationship between the state and tribes in which the state would step in as an authority providing oversight to tribal functions as basic to sovereignty as elections.</p>
National civil rights context: pressure to not have racism out in the open. State responds by creating "Indian Day" pageant.	Bangor Daily News. (1964, July 9).	<p>This article is about the state's attempt to recognize the contribution of Native people in Maine by establishing "Indian Day." The Maine governor announced the first "Indian Day" in a ceremony with the governors of the Penobscot and Passamaquoddy tribes of Maine. Later on, the Passamaquoddy tribes refused to participate in Indian Day celebrations because of their unresolved land claims dispute with the state. While state-tribal relationships had been strained for a while, this article seems to show the state attempting to appease the tribes without actually taking any action to relate to the tribes on a more equal footing as sovereign nations.</p>
State involvement in tribal membership	Nicholas, J. (1964, Feb 27).	<p>Nicholas (state representative for the Passamaquoddy tribe at Pleasant Point) wrote to Paul McClay (the state director of Indian Affairs) to protest a recent visit from the state legislative research committee to the reservation, saying that the tribe had not been notified of the visit. And "I would also like to put in a strong opposition in the manner which of the members of the tribe were taken off the census." Although there are numerous references that I found in the archives in which someone appeals to the Maine State</p>

		Division of Indian Affairs, and then later the Department of Indian Affairs, and the state says that tribal membership is solely determined by the tribal governor and council, it seems that the state did have some role in mediating tribal membership, as indicated in this letter.
Increasing criticism of state's treatment of Wabanaki tribes. 1965 -- State creates Department of Indian Affairs.	WGUY. (1964, August 1).	This radio station editorial sets the relationship between the state of Maine and the tribes within a national civil rights context, and accuses the state of treaty infractions including selling off tribal lands to private timber corporations. The editorial was sparked by a recent incident in which the state refused to allow tribal trust fund money to spent on an attorney hired by the tribes to contest land claims. The editorial states that "in official circles, Maine's Indians are considered an [sic] nuisances and jokes," offering a perspective into a dominant narrative about Wabanaki people in Maine in the 1960s.
	Lewiston Daily Sun. (1965, June 1).	This editorial concerns claims that Princeton-area barbers were refusing to cut the hair of Native individuals, and sets these claims within the national context of civil rights. The editorial goes on to say that state policies have treated Native people as "second rate humans" and kept Native people as "unproductive, poverty-stricken wards of the state."
Slight shift in state's attitude toward tribes. Beginning of recognition that tribal identity and tribal autonomy are important. Beginning to question assimilation as a long-term goal.	State of Maine. (1965).	This report, conducted by an especially formed "interim joint committee" for the state legislature, makes recommendations for improving state administration of Indian affairs. The committee members must have interviewed tribal members and the report gives perspectives of Penobscot and Passamaquoddy community members. The report highlights a Native perception that having Indian affairs administered by the department of Health and Welfare creates an unwanted welfare-recipient stigma. The report also conveys that tribes feel that "initiative has been taken from them" (p.7) by guardianship of state and that tribes "should have a greater voice in their own affairs and perhaps ultimately a voice in the distribution of tribal monies" (p.7). Recognizes that "upon leaving the reservation some feel that they are losing their identity and are no longer a part of their people" (p.9).
State begins to recognize things need	State of Maine Department of Health and Welfare Advisory Subcommittee on Indian Affairs. (1965).	In these minutes from a committee formed by the Department of Health and Welfare in an attempt to reorganize the bureaucracy for dealing with tribes, the committee included no Wabanaki

<p>to change, but solution still maintains tight control, and is based on ingrained dominant narrative.</p>		<p>representatives, although “[s]pecial interest was shown in finding out what plans, if any, Indians have for themselves” and that eventually there would be tribal representation on the committee, but not until the committee already knew what its goals were and what its relationship would be with Health and Welfare. The minutes say that a motion to send the minutes to the tribal governors was defeated.</p>
<p>Non-state organizations continue to criticize state’s treatment of tribes, highlighting dominant narrative.</p>	<p>Diocese of Portland, Diocesan Bureau of Human Services. (Undated).</p>	<p>Although this is a proposal for an education program, it also contains what seems to be a Native ally’s perspective on the situation faced by Passamaquoddy communities in Maine. The proposal outlines “grievances” faced by Passamaquoddies relevant to child welfare and corrections-related issues: discrimination (in employment, by state police, and by state Indian agents), state control of treaty lands, absence of equal police protection and freedom from arrest, and disproportionately high school drop out rates. It was reported that no Passamaquoddy has served on a Washington County jury for 144 years. In addition, the proposal addresses an underlying assumption by many white people who work with the tribes that relocation and assimilation are the “only ‘final’ solution to the Indian ‘problem’” (p. 5), as well as a dominant cultural bias in which Native people are viewed as permissive, having no discipline, not being future-oriented, not respecting private property, and the Passamaquoddy language being considered to be more of a “jargon” than a legitimate language.</p>
<p>Complexity of understanding tribes’ views of sovereignty with regard to right to vote.</p>	<p>Hinckley, E. (1967, November 15). [</p>	<p>In this letter to Charles Kerr of the Indian Affairs branch in Ottawa, Canada, Department of Indian Affairs Commissioner Edward Hinckley describes official channels of communication with the Penobscot and Passamaquoddy tribes in Maine. Hinckley wrote that tribal members saw voting privileges as a “threat to whatever degree of tribal sovereignty that they still possessed within the state” (p.2).</p>
<p>Dominant narrative continues to be openly asserted by state committee.</p>	<p>Indian Community Assistance Committee. (1967).</p>	<p>This report, requested by the Maine governor, highlighted needs of tribes, as gathered by state ICAC committee. Although tribal members reported discriminatory hiring practices, the committee found that “[t]here is no valid evidence to support the contention” instead citing another state agency’s findings that among other factors contributing to low employment rates for Native people, “Indians are not dependable and responsible when placed,” they</p>

		<p>“lack of social responsibility in that their personal appearance, manner and attitude make referral or placement difficult” and have a “lack of initiative and motivation.” The report concludes that the need for improved housing, sewerage and educational facilities are “symptoms and effects” of a larger problem, which is that “the welfare program has nurtured an inveterate attitude of dependency.”</p>
<p>Human rights task force documents state’s institutionalized racism faced by Wabanaki people.</p>	<p>Indian Affairs Subcommittee of the Task Force on Human Rights. (1968, July 20).</p>	<p>These minutes appear to be a precursor to the actual recommendations of the subcommittee to the Task Force on Human Rights. Overall, these minutes give a picture of factors that were preventing the tribes from being able to exercise autonomy, including state control of tribal affairs through state control of tribal lands, lack of clarity around citizenship status, lack of clarity around individual land titles, the lack of voting representation for tribal communities at the legislature, the absence of tribal governments in the administration of trust funds intended for the tribes, and the inadequate training and pay for tribal law enforcement. Of relevance for the corrections issue, the subcommittee noted there is “rarely an Indian on any jury” (p. 3) in the areas around the reservations and that tribal constables do not receive full police training, and that tribal members do not have adequate access to legal counsel.</p>
<p>Outside perspectives on state’s relationship with tribes becoming more critical.</p>	<p>[Author not known]. (1968).</p>	<p>This report was the product of a meeting to prepare a grant proposal for federal housing funding for the Passamaquoddy reservations. Present at the meeting were representatives from the Passamaquoddy tribal council, the State Departments of Economic Development and Indian Affairs, and the US Department of Housing and Urban Development.</p> <p>This report summarized the state’s approach to dealing with the tribes as follows:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">For the past 300 years, with spasmodic exceptions, the thrust of Indian Affairs programming on the part of the state has been aimed towards 1) extinction of the Passamaquoddy Tribe as a physical and cultural entity; 2) maintenance of the tribe in a dependent relationship with the State; 3) elimination of the reservations as places where Tribal members might live securely and with satisfaction. (p.4)</p>

		The report also goes on to say that the tribes have been asking for improved housing, sanitation and economic development “for the past twenty years” (p.4).
Maine governor acknowledges existence of Native people in Aroostook county.	Curtis, K. M. (Undated).	Maine Governor Curtis described legal status problems facing the Association of Aroostook Indians since they had no treaties with the state of Maine. Curtis then pledged support for “all of Maine’s Indians” (p. 2).
Official invisibility of Maliseet and Micmac peoples in Maine.	Murphy, J. H. (1970, June 3).	Commissioner of Indian Affairs James Murphy plainly states in this letter: “The two largest and only Maine tribes are the Passamaquoddies and the Penobscots.”
Wabanaki people draw attention to state’s child welfare practices.	Associated press. (1971, Mar 17).	This article describes a state senate hearing on an unnamed bill that would have forced the Department of Health and Welfare to license tribal foster homes on the recommendation of tribal governments. The article alludes to a strong and vocal criticism of the department for its practices with Native children and families, including a description of the written testimony of “Mrs. Mary Yarman” (misspelling of Yarmal?) whose six children were removed by the department. The article stated that “Indian after Indian” gave testimony, in particular describing the negative impacts to a child’s cultural identity and sense of belonging when that child is removed from the Native community and returns later as an adult.
John Stevens (former Passamaquoddy tribal governor) becomes first Wabanaki individual to head Dept. of Indian Affairs.	State of Maine Department of Health and Welfare. (1972).	In section on Aroostook Region, report says that the Department did a workshop with the Association of Aroostook Indians to develop new foster homes for Indian children who were committed to the care of the state.
	Potter, B. (1974, March 21).	This article reported on an address from the Indian Affairs Commissioner John Stevens (formerly the governor of Indian Township) to the central Maine branch of the NAACP, in which Stevens outlined the current status of the relationship between the state and the tribes. Stevens said that the relationship had improved, but that lack of federal recognition for the tribes in Maine has been a barrier. Stevens specifically stated that the tribes had tried to get the state to allow the tribes to keep children who needed to be removed from their homes in foster homes on the reservations, but that the state had refused because the state-built homes on the reservation did not pass standards for foster homes. Stevens said that “when

		children are taken away from the reservation they always return with more problems than they had in the first place." This article represents the only document seen so far in the Indian Affairs archives that references the removal of Wabanaki children from the reservations by the state.
US Commission on Civil Rights criticizes Maine's child welfare practices in Wabanaki communities.	U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. (1974).	This report, based on the findings of the Maine Advisory Committee to the US Commission on Civil Rights, included a section on foster care. The report stated that one in eight Native children in Maine were being placed in foster care, which was a rate 16 times higher than that of the general population. Robert Wyllie, Director of the Bureau of Social Services, was asked by the committee why there were not more Native foster care placement options, and he said that substandard housing was the primary impediment. The report noted that many of these substandard homes were built by the state on the Passamaquoddy reservations. The committee recommended that the state seek funding to support the upgrading of homes to increase the availability of Native foster placement options and that the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights initiate a national effort to "determine if there is a massive deculturation of Indian children" as a result of child welfare removals (p. 89).
Invisibility of Micmac and Maliseet peoples in Maine, differs from state's relationship with Passamaquoddy and Penobscot Tribes.	Buesing, G. (Undated).	In this undated report, among other areas covered, Buesing described the current status and relationships of Micmacs and Maliseets with the state government in Maine. He wrote that Micmac and Maliseet treaties have been "completely ignored" by the federal and state governments (p.22) and that neither tribe had even been mentioned in state legislation until the 105 th state legislature. Buesing pointed out the significance of the bill enacted by the 105 th legislature regarding scholarships for North American Indians residing in Maine as the first state law to recognize Maliseet and Micmac people.
Wabanaki land claims issue begins heating up.	Longley, J. B. (1976, September 29).	In this letter from Maine Governor James Longley to Governor Francis Nicholas of the Passamaquoddy Tribe at Pleasant Point regarding the ramifications of the land claims law suit on municipal bonding needs, Longley pleads with Nicholas to see himself first as an American, second as a Maine citizen, and as "members of racial or ethnic groups third" (p.1). Longley uses the language of fairness and the "sacred duty" of leaders and public officials, as well as the need to avoid "bitterness and discord" within the state to appeal to

		Nicholas.
<p>State begins to acknowledge problems with child welfare practices in Wabanaki communities.</p> <p>Recognition of existence of Wabanaki culture.</p>	Wyllie, R. O. (1977).	<p>In this memo from the Acting Director of the State Bureau of Resource Development Robert Wyllie to David Smith (Commissioner of the State Department of Human Services), Wyllie evaluated the merits of a project proposal (identified but not fully explained) related to collaboration on child welfare services between Central Maine Indian Association and possibly federally-recognized tribes and the Department of Human Services. Wyllie begins by referencing a history in which tribal representatives have expressed concerns about the about the lack of Native foster home options and "the lack of sensitivity on the part of our agency to the needs of Indian foster children" and references a public demonstration at the Bangor office "six or seven years ago." Handwritten notes suggest that that demonstration was not about child welfare, but about budget cuts to the Department of Indian Affairs. Wyllie then reviews actions that had been taken to address these concerns, citing that the Bangor regional office kept a goal of increasing the number of Native foster homes (although without results). In addition, the Bangor office sometimes asked tribal leaders about appropriate placement of a Native child, with a frequent response from tribal leaders that Department should use it's "own best judgment" (p. 1). In addition, Wyllie cites that the Machias office recently hired a Native American social worker to "be more sensitive to the unique needs of the Indian children requiring protective or substitute care services" (p.1).</p> <p>Wyllie noted that the central and regional offices supported the idea of joint training "to be responsive to background, philosophy and unique needs of Indian children" (p. 2).</p>
	State of Maine Department of Human Services. (1978).	<p>The only mention of Wabanaki issues was found in the summary of public comments: "Make Northeast Indian Family Structure Research and Development project a high priority and provide \$8,000 to supplement this project." State responded that there has been no increase in Title XX funds, so no new services will be funded. CMIA was one of the partners involved in this project.</p>
	Wabanaki Alliance. (1978, December).	
	[Author not known]. (1979).	<p>This Maine Law Review article was written by an unidentified student in a Maine Law Review issue dedicated to the land claims</p>

		<p>settlement. The entire issue is available online through the Maine School of Law. The author characterizes the relationship between the state and tribes as one of complete control of the state over the tribes, writing that the “state of Maine, under the belief that no Indian country is located within its borders, has throughout its history exercised complete criminal, civil, and regulatory jurisdiction over the Passamaquoddy and Penobscot Indian Reservations” (p. 171). The author claims that the State v. Dana case “presages a dramatic shift in the federal-state balance of authority over Maine Indian affairs” (p. 211), and that federal recognition of tribes would provide an important safeguard for tribes from the state pushing the boundaries of jurisdiction.</p>
<p>Increasing power of tribes in light of land claims -- state reacting defensively and punitively. (State implies that financial support of tribes is another mechanism of state control.)</p>	<p>Paterson, J. M. R. (1979).</p>	<p>In this memo from Paterson (Deputy Attorney General) to David Flanagan (not identified in the letter but believed to be legal counsel to the governor), and Charles Rhynard (Commissioner of Indian Affairs), Paterson outlines the civil rights issues that may arise as a result of the state’s proposed defunding of the Department of Indian Affairs (DIA) in the context of unresolved land claims issues. The question of civil rights violations arose from the Penobscot tribal representative to the state legislature, to whom the state declined to answer so as to not jeopardize their negotiations over land claims. The state attorney stated in this letter to the Commissioner that it may be a violation of civil rights to defund programs selectively for Native people. These potential civil rights violations were characterized as “problems” for the plans to defund the DIA. The state attorney also warned, “the more the state disclaims financial responsibility over Indian lands, the harder it is for us to argue in law or equity for state police power jurisdiction” (p.3).</p>
	<p>Rhynard, C. (1979).</p>	<p>In this letter to the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Commissioner of Indian Affairs Charles Rhynard expressed support for a joint application for funding by the Association of Aroostook Indians (AAI) and the Central Maine Indian Association (CMIA). Rhynard commented that the “dominant society” in Maine was “reluctant to provide any services unique to Indian people” due to the land claims controversy and that he “does not anticipate any expanded support for Indian people” (p.1). Of relevance to the TRC, this letter describes a dominant attitude regarding Native people in Maine, shaped in part by the land claims</p>

		situation, suggesting a sense of hostility from the general public.
TIMELINE 1980 -2006		
Summary/context of relationship at point in time	Document citation	Notes about document's relevance
Maine governor's task force critical of DHS practices regarding Native children; state is not compliant with ICWA.	State of Maine, Governor's Task Force on Foster Care for Children. (1980).	In this report, the Maine governor's Task Force on Foster Care for Children found that "DHS has not done enough to help Native American children in foster care retain their cultural ties" (p. 75). The task force reported that 2 percent of Maine's foster children were Native American (p. 16). The report goes on to identify the lack of Native foster placement options as a problem, citing that there were 50 Native children in foster care and only 15 Native foster placement options (p. 20). The task force reported that Native families' fear of state workers' bias contributed to the problem of insufficient Native foster placements, stating that "[r]epresentatives of Indian agencies testified that Indian families are often hesitant to have state officials come into their homes and 'pass judgment' on their way of life" (p. 68). The task force recommended that DHS work with off-reservation Native Americans and tribal governments to recruit more Native foster families and license foster homes. Finally, the task force reported that much of the time, DHS did not record a child's race, or if race is noted as American Indian, the tribal affiliation is not. ICWA is referenced in this report. Published two years after the passage of ICWA, this report establishes the state government's awareness of the Indian Child Welfare Act, as well as problems with compliance. The report raises the question as to how the state child welfare system responded to the need for increased compliance, as well as the negative impact racist attitudes on relationships between Native families and state workers.
	Polchies, B. (1980, September).	
Beginning of incorporation of tribal child welfare into state system	State of Maine Department of Human Services, Bureau of Social Services. (1982).	Child welfare status codes include designation for Passamaquoddy and Penobscot tribes, but no mention of Maliseet or Micmacs.
	State of Maine Department of Health and Human Services & Penobscot Indian Nation Department of Health and Human Services. (1983).	Agreement regarding funding the tribe to provide foster care services for specifically named children: Donna Neptune, Daniel

		Neptune, and Peter Bolieau.
In aftermath of land claims, state continues to assert that tribes are not “nations within a nation.”	Flanagan, D. (1983, Feb 10).	In this letter from David Flanagan (counsel to the Maine Governor) to the Judiciary Committee, Flanagan addresses a number of bills introduced in the 111 th legislature that the state believed would erode the state’s jurisdiction in favor of the tribes. He wrote that the Maine Implementing Act “does not treat the Indian tribes as a nation within a nation. On the contrary, apart from some limited exceptions, it treats all Indians as equal citizens of the State of Maine subject to the general laws and jurisdiction of the state. You will recall that many legislator and many citizens were reluctant to grant any jurisdictional concessions to the Passamaquoddy Tribe and the Penobscot Nation” (p.1). He concludes with saying, “let me again underscore our major concern, that once any jurisdiction is conceded by this Legislature, it is gone forever for all practical purposes” (p.4).
State sets a goal of completing an ICWA policy. Unclear when/if this goal was met. Only one ICWA-related policy from the 1980s has been identified.	State of Maine Department of Human Services, Bureau of Social Services. (1984).	State child welfare services plan. Sets an administrative goal to complete/update policy for ICWA, as well as policy updates in other areas (p. 38) . Sets a completion date of Summer 1985. Later versions of this report reviewed through 1994-95 for updates on progress related to these goals did not specifically identify ICWA or services to Native Americans. FY 1994-95 plan indicated that child welfare policy manual was still in draft phase. Also sets an objective to “specify further child welfare services to be provided to Native Americans” (p. 55) . The status of this objective was listed as “in process” and a related comment was “working on clarification of child welfare services to off reservation Indians” (p. 55).
State coordination with CMIA	State of Maine Department of Human Services & Central Maine Indian Association. (1987).	Interagency agreement for coordination of child welfare services between the state and CMIA in light of ICWA.
ICWA compliance issues	Vicaire, M. L., & Dana, A. J. (1986, July 23).	CMIA wrote to DHS about problems with the DHS office in Ellsworth not responding to CMAI concerns about a specific foster care placement of Native children and not wanting to work with CMAI. The letter also says that no one from the Ellsworth office attended the ICWA training provided by CMIA. DHS responded by saying an affirmative action officer would be contacting CMIA.
State coordination with Penobscot Nation, Passamaquoddy	State of Maine Department of Human Services & Penobscot Indian Nation Department of Health and Human Services. (1987).	Agreement signed regarding roles and responsibilities for implementing ICWA and coordination of services.
	State of Maine Department of Human Services, Bureau of Social Services. (1986).	State child welfare services plan. Lists tribes (Penobscot Nation, Passamaquoddy tribes, Houlton Band of Maliseets) under summary

tribes, Houlton Band of Maliseet Indians		of child welfare services in Maine. Recognizes Penobscot Nation's and Passamaquoddy tribe's jurisdiction under ICWA. First mention of tribal child welfare services in this series of reports (first one reviewed was 1984-85).
State coordination with tribes, CMIA	State of Maine Department of Human Services, Bureau of Social Services. (1988b, September 19).	Minutes say that Central Maine Indian Association proposed expanded services.
	State of Maine Department of Human Services, Bureau of Social Services. (1988a).	State child welfare services plan lists tribes under a heading "coordination of services" and Penobscot Nation's and Passamaquoddy tribes' jurisdiction under ICWA. Specifically listed were the Penobscot Nation, Passamaquoddy tribes and Houlton Band of Maliseet Indians. Mentions soliciting input from CMIA. This is the only mention of tribes, ICWA, or Native children and families in this report.
	State of Maine Department of Human Services, Bureau of Child and Family Services. (1991).	State child welfare services plan only mentions tribes under the heading "coordination of services" and Penobscot Nation's and Passamaquoddy tribes' jurisdiction under ICWA. Identifies Penobscot Nation, Passamaquoddy Tribe and Houlton Band of Maliseets. Mentions soliciting input from CMIA. Recognizes that American Indians are largest ethnic minority in Maine. Report also includes "significant events affecting child welfare in Maine" (photographed in a different document) in which ICWA is not mentioned and "Generic characteristics" report from 1986-1991.
	Central Maine Indian Association. (1993).	Updated agreement regarding coordination of services in light of ICWA. Working agreement clearly outlines CMIA and DHS responsibilities, including that DHS is responsible for checking the "Indian status" of a child. Signed by CMIA but not signed by DHS. I am unsure whether this was ever signed by DHS, or at what point CMIA ceased to exist.
ICWA compliance issue	Hodge, S. (1993, June 11).	Hodge references a letter from BIA saying that Passamaquoddy tribe has complained of state not being responsive to requests for information. Hodge says there is no record of being asked for info from tribe.
ICWA compliance issues	Hodge, S. (1994, November 3).	The minutes reported that Nancy Goddard gave a presentation on ICWA, including ICWA's Evidentiary Standards and procedures staff must use when filing a petition, and that "[t]he information was extremely helpful as there had been some confusion about the entire matter." There was no elaboration on the nature of the confusion, however, the minutes do report that Nancy Goddard gave

		out some “updated, corrected information” implying that caseworkers previously had had incorrect information.
	Taylor, L. (1993, April 22).	Memo suggests having clearer language in TPR forms about Indian heritage, says that current form only has place to mark that someone is “not of known Indian heritage” but does not require someone to specifically ask. Taylor says that she has asked numerous times for this change to be made, and mentions ICWA.
Coordination with tribes, including Aroostook Band of Micmacs	State of Maine Department of Human Services, Bureau of Child and Family Services. (1994).	State child welfare services plan lists all four federally recognized tribes under “coordination of services.” First inclusion of Aroostook Band of Micmacs in this section. This is only mention of tribes or ICWA in this plan.
	State of Maine Department of Human Services. (1995).	Recruitment plan for foster parents required by the Multi-ethnic Placement Act (federal law). Plan mentions outreach to reservations and working with Penobscot Nation, Passamaquoddy Tribe and Houlton Band of Maliseets (but not Micmacs).
State denies tribes’ request for funding for training	State of Maine Department of Human Services, Bureau of Child and Family Services. (1998, October 30).	Minutes indicate that tribes asked for funding for training, but that BCFS is not obligated to pay for tribal training and tribes have own sources of funding for training. Says that tribes will continue to be invited to BCFS trainings.
Federal review catalyzes efforts toward improved state ICWA implementation.	U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families. (1999).	The federal government conducted a pilot review of Maine’s child welfare system that catalyzed efforts to improve state ICWA implementation.
ICWA workgroup develops first ever statewide ICWA training.	ICWA Training Workgroup. (1999).	ICWA workgroup develops a statewide training of state workers on understanding ICWA and ICWA implementation.
State pursuing working agreement with Passamaquoddy tribes’ child welfare depts	Wolverton, T. (1999, May 3).	Letter about finalizing a working agreement between “our agencies” (the state and the Passamaquoddy tribes). Says that “we have always worked very well together.” First thing I have seen that is a direct communication between state and tribal child welfare agencies. Note: The Joint Passamaquoddy Tribes have still not signed a working agreement with the State of Maine regarding child welfare.
State and Houlton Band of Maliseets sign agreement	Houlton Band of Maliseet Indians & State of Maine. (2003).	Agreement signed regarding implementation of ICWA.

Increasing collaboration between state and tribes on ICWA cases, along with continuing evidence of need for state to continue strengthening ICWA compliance.	U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families. (2003).	Federal review of Maine's child welfare system finds that state still needs to engage in more meaningful consultation of tribes.
	2006 DHHS Child and Family Services Policy Manual (Vol 1 of 2)	References to ICWA were found in the family team meetings subsection (from 2005), the subsection on petitioning for a protective order (from 1980), and the subsection on selection of substitute care placement (2005). There is an ICWA checklist as an appendix to Section V that was added in 2003. The definition of kinship care includes relationships acknowledged by tribe (2005).
	U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families. (2009).	Federal review of Maine's child welfare system again finds that state still needs to engage in more meaningful consultation of tribes.
	State of Maine Department of Health and Human Services, Office of Child and Family Services. (2009).	First ever review of state handling of cases of Native children from Wabanaki tribes in state custody. Findings supported anecdotal evidence that state was asserting control over these cases rather than co-managing cases with tribal child welfare colleagues.
	State of Maine Department of Health and Human Services, Office of Child and Family Services. (2012).	Second review of state handling of cases of Native children from Wabanaki tribes in state custody. Slight areas of improvement from 2009 review, however, overall the outcomes demonstrated that the state has yet to truly engage in co-case management with tribal child welfare staff.