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Executive Summary: Indigenisation of the Curriculum, CALE

Review Context and Methods
This literature review was commissioned to inform the formulation of a framework for Indigenising the curriculum within the College of Arts, Law and Education (CALE). It provides an overview of the context and concepts of Indigenisation and explores the process, illustrated by a set of Australian case studies of curricula Indigenisation. Literature was sourced using key word searches in academic databases and search engines and close to 100 items, scholarly articles, reports and grey literature, were examined. This review was limited by the voluminous nature of the literature and limited time frame. The review was undertaken in tandem with a mapping of the Indigenous content and knowledge inclusion in CALE units. 114 of the 261 units listed in the Bachelor of Arts 2018 handbook were examined. A summary of this mapping is included in this Executive Summary.

Context and Concept of Curricula Indigenisation
The curricula Indigenisation movement acquired momentum during 1990s, recommended in formal inquiries such as the 2012 Behrendt Review (Behrendt et al. 2012). Curricula Indigenisation is a core component of the reorganisation of universities to be more inclusive and representative of Indigenous Peoples, perspectives and place. The definition of curricula Indigenisation used at the University is that: every subject at every level is examined to consider how and to what extent current content and pedagogy reflect the presence of Indigenous peoples and the valid contribution of Indigenous knowledge (Castellano 2014).

Indigenisation involves the integration of Indigenous knowledge, epistemologies (perspectives), scholars, research and culture within university curricula. It places these alongside Western disciplinary equivalents. Curricula Indigenisation is more than a ‘bolt-on’ exercise, involving ‘learning from’ rather than solely ‘about’ Indigenous people (Hart et al. 2012:717; Harvey and Russell-Mundine 2019: 800-801). Curricula Indigenisation is also more than the inclusion of cultural knowledge or experiences; it is a scholarly endeavour framed around Indigenous scholarship.

The Process of Curricula Indigenisation
There is no universally agreed process for curricula Indigenisation, but a review of the literature suggests that it tends to involve the following stages:

- **Commitment**: A commitment at a faculty university-governance level, accompanied by the appointment of relevant accountable staff and setting of timelines and policies.
- **Consultation and Collaboration**: Undertaken with Indigenous knowledge holders, scholars, University’s Indigenous support unit staff, elders and community members.
- **Planning and Creation**: Audits undertaken to identify how courses can be Indigenised and who can assist in this process at the departmental/school-level.
- **Implementation**: Introduced over time in collaboration with Indigenous scholars
- **Reassessment/Revision**: Evaluation and revision from students and Indigenous and non-Indigenous academic staff in collaboration with wider collaborative group.

More specifically the process involves the integration of:

- **Indigenous knowledge and perspectives**: i.e. learning from Indigenous people.
- **Discipline-specific Indigenous content**: i.e. Indigenous criminology professional practice
- **Reflexive Practice**: To encourage critical reflexivity amongst students on their engagement with and relation to Indigenous knowledge, people and concerns.
• **Evaluative Assessment**: i.e. presence of student understanding of Indigenous worldview
• **Graduate Attributes**: To have units oriented towards having students trained in cultural competency and familiar with Indigenous content and issues.
• **Pedagogy**: Use of Indigenous pedagogy such as yarning circles and storytelling.

**Hindrances to Indigenising the Academy**

There are several identified hindrances to the process including but not limited to:

- Exclusionist culture towards Indigenous scholarship, demeaning Indigenous knowledges.
- Overburdening of Indigenous staff/or Indigenous staff seen as responsible for the task
- Inadequate time commitment and/or lack of recognition of workload involved.
- Turf wars whereby Indigenisation perceived as a threat academic/disciplinary autonomy
- Quick-fix mentality: Rushing measures, creating inconsistent, inadequate results.
- Inadequate training, support and expertise
- Fears of making mistakes paralysing action
- Process fatigue and inadequate resourcing
- Seen as challenge to Western knowledges and incurring (some) student dissatisfaction.

**Examples of Curricula Indigenisation**

Australian universities have undertaken a variety of processes to Indigenise the curriculum usually at the disciple level such as English, Business and Law. An emphasis is given to introducing discipline-specific Indigenous knowledge within the form of case studies

**Recommendations Emerging from Literature Review**

- **Recommendation 1**: That the University establish a curricula Indigenisation committee and that individuals be appointed/seconded to each of the Colleges to assist in the process. Workshops should be run for College faculty, led by these personnel
- **Recommendation 2**: That each College undertake an audit of Indigenous content and perspectives noting how their units could receive the embedding of such material (e.g. education including Indigenous pedagogy).
- **Recommendation 3**: That Tasmanian Aboriginal knowledge holders and elders, in collaboration with Indigenous scholars at the University are consulted on perspectives and epistemes to be incorporated into units.
- **Recommendation 4**: That Colleges consider introducing a mandatory first-year unit to provide instruction into Indigenous epistemes and culture. The largely on-line unit XBR113 Indigenous Lifeworlds: Local to the Global, could serve as a model.
- **Recommendation 5**: That Colleges consider implementing Indigenous graduate attributes across their degrees and diplomas to further encourage curricula Indigenisation efforts.
- **Recommendation 6**: That the University commits ongoing financial resources to Indigenisation efforts in its budgeting, the permanent presence of Indigenisation on the Academic Senate’s agenda, and endorsement of Indigenisation at a governance level.
Executive Summary: Mapping Indigenous Content, Bachelor of Arts (2018)

This mapping exercise analysed unit outlines and reading lists of units listed in the 2018 Bachelor of Arts handbook. Unit outlines were provided by the Curriculum Innovation and Quality team, and readings from Library Reading Lists website.

261 units were listed in an excel spreadsheet and their unit outlines and unit reading lists units were systematically analysed to identify the presence of Indigenous topics/content and scholarship (knowledge). Each unit’s weekly content and reading titles were examined for terms indicating inclusion of Indigenous content, including ‘Indigenous’, ‘Aboriginal’, ‘Torres Strait Islander’ and ‘race’. The following rules guided the examination and tallying:

- Readings listed more than once within a unit were only counted as one item;
- Authors were only counted once, even where they had multiple readings listed;
- Individually-listed readings from books were counted as separate readings;
- For law cases, it was noted where the case involved Indigenous content;
- For media (movies) directors and screenwriters were treated as authors for these texts.

A total of 115 units were mapped, as indicated in Table 1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Units of Measurement</th>
<th>Frequency (n value)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Units with Indigenous Content in Teaching</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units with Indigenous Content in Readings</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units with Readings by Indigenous Scholars</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units with Presumed Indigenous Content</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Unit Count for Indigenous Content and readings from Indigenous Scholars

A total of 18 units included Indigenous topics as detailed in Figure 1 below. Four of these from Aboriginal Studies included Indigenous content in 10+ teaching weeks. The remaining 14 units included discussion on Indigenous content in 1- 4 weeks of their semester teaching.

Figure 1: Units with Indigenous Content in Teaching by week

Twenty-two units included Indigenous content related readings. There were few texts listed that focussed primarily on Indigenous topics (>3 readings per unit) and the majority of these were journal articles. Several units included readings which discussed de-colonisation, touching on Indigenous people generically, rather than Indigenous Australians.
16 units included readings with Indigenous scholars as authors. In all instances, Indigenous authors were in minority (e.g. HGA372 1 Indigenous author vs 35 non-Indigenous authors).

Some titles of weekly teaching topics read as though they could include content on Indigenous people but were not definitive. For example, HGA339 in week 4 examine the topic of ‘social class and health’ a topic related to Indigenous health disadvantage.

Discussion

Overall, the mapping exercise indicates that most units offered within the Bachelor of Arts for 2018 did not include Indigenous content. Where included, Indigenous content tend to be concentrated in Aboriginal Studies, Sociology and Criminology. Aboriginal Studies units taught Indigenous content most weeks. Social Sciences units tended to teach on Indigenous people as points of comparison within an examination of a broader sociological phenomena or, in some cases, within a dedicated lecture on Indigenous peoples.

Indigenous knowledge as represented by readings by Indigenous scholars was also largely absent from the 2018 units. This absence is likely the product of the limited Indigenous content throughout the units. When the readings of Indigenous scholars were included, they typically were isolated texts, used in conjunction with teaching on Indigenous content. The unit HAB213/313 Indigenous Australian Health and Well Being is the exception to this pattern, including 13 Indigenous scholars as authors in its reading list.
Literature Review Context and Methods

This literature review was undertaken for the University of Tasmania’s Pro-Vice Chancellor of Aboriginal Leadership Professor Greg Lehman. The review was commissioned by Professor Lehman’s predecessor, Distinguished Professor Maggie Walter, to provide an overview of methods of best practice in embedding Indigenous content (also known as “Indigenising the curricula”). The review contributes to the foundations of a framework for curricula Indigenisation within the College of Arts, Law and Education; one of the goals set out in the Strategic Plan for Aboriginal Engagement 2017-2020.

For this review, key word searches were run through several databases (Scopus, Web of Science, Informit, Google Scholar) and search engines (Google, UTAS Library Megasearch) to identify scholarly sources (books, journals), reports and grey literature on Indigenising the curricula. Close to 100 texts were examined based on the following search terms:

- Indigenising higher education;
- Indigenising the curricula;
- De-colonising education;
- Indigenisation;
- Curricula Indigenisation;
- University Curricula Indigenisation;
- Embedding Indigenous content university curricula.

Whilst endeavouring to be comprehensive, it is acknowledged that the review is not exhaustive. This is due to the voluminous nature of the scholarly literature on this topic and the limited time frame available.

The report opens with an overview of key definitions including Indigenisation, the interrelated but separate concept of de-colonisation, Indigenous knowledge and epistemology. This is accompanied by a brief summary of the historical developments contributing to process.

Curricula Indigenisation, pinpointing key milestones in the Australian context. This is followed by a synthesis of located approaches to curricula Indigenisation, which is complemented by identification of some of the typical hindrances to Indigenisation. The final component of the report presents several case studies of the practice of curricula Indigenisation at Australian universities. It will conclude with some recommendations for the consideration of the Pro-Vice Chancellor of Aboriginal Leadership and other University officials in respect to the

---

1 In using the term ‘Indigenous’ we concur with the position of Acton et al. (2017: 1315) who write: “… the term ‘Indigenous’ is not intended to signify a pan-Indigenous identity which disguises the plural nature of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander knowledges. Rather, it is used with full acknowledgement of diverse and unique knowledge frameworks, values and philosophies of both convergent and divergent groups and peoples that are distinct from Western knowledge systems and which are necessary in ‘developing curriculum that encompasses both discipline – and Indigenous – specific cultural content’ (Behrendt et al., 2012, p. 196) to enable cultural sustainability.”

2 It will cover curricula Indigenisation within coursework degrees at both an undergraduate and postgraduate level, though will primarily focus on undergraduate degrees. Whilst research is important, it is beyond the scope of this review.
Introduction
Fuelled by the political and social engagement and activism of Indigenous Australians, efforts to shape universities and their curricula to be more inclusive, supportive and representative of Indigenous people, culture and knowledge has been an ongoing process intensifying across the decades of the late 20th and early 21st centuries (Bullen and Flavell 2017; Battiste 2013). In Australia, the 1990s saw this movement acquire momentum, with some university courses (e.g. medicine) starting to include specific content on Indigenous people, particularly in respect to professional practice (Delaney et al. 2018). In the 2000s, some Australian institutions commenced conducting audits and implementing some curricula changes within the humanities and social sciences, for example the Queensland University of Technology in 2001, the University of South Australia in 2004 (and later 2012-2015), Macquarie University in 2012, and James Cook University in 2009 (see Nursey-Bray 2019; Rigney 2017; Matthews et al. 2016).

National reviews, such as the 2008 Bradley Review (Bradley et al. 2008), the 2011 Universities Australia Review (Universities Australia 2011), and the 2012 Behrendt Review (Behrendt et al. 2012) have each called for greater support, representation and commitment be given to Indigenous people. Such attention has assisted to spur the securing of further amelioration of university curricula, structures and processes across Australian universities, as enshrined within the joint commitment to the Universities Australia’s Indigenous Strategy 2017-2018 (Rigney 2017: 46; Gerald, Gainsford and Bailey 2018: 6). Universities typically have produced their own Indigenous policies and strategy documents, which include commitments to and means of introducing these into practice at a university level, which is then reproduced at a college/faculty/departmental level (Nursey-Bray 2019). Professional associations in Australia have too made similar commitments within their accreditation requirements, for example, the Australian Social Work Education and Accreditation Standards (see Zubrzycki et al. 2014).

Delineating Indigenisation and Decolonisation
The literature tends to include the use of two key terms in describing the process altering universities for the benefit of Indigenous people, namely ‘Indigenisation’ and ‘Decolonisation’. Neither concept has a universal definition and the terminology and foci of these terms generally overlap to some extent. Both recognise how universities have been conducive to the entrenchment of Indigenous inequality in tertiary education, they each differ in their approach to educational reform (Riley et al. 2013; Yellow Bird 2008: 286; Anderson 2019; Rigney 2017: 46; Dudgeon and Walker 2017). Both concepts also have region-specific manifestations around the world, for instance within Africa and Asia (see Gray et al. 2013; Morelli, Mataira and Kaulukukui 2013; Knight 2018; Higgs 2016: 89; Janetius, Workie and Mini 2012; le Grange 2018). McNamara and Naepi (2018) provide a simplified manner of differentiating, explaining that de-colonisation involves the removal of colonial influences and structures from a university, whilst Indigenisation entails the integration of elements to the university. A more detailed overview is provided below to clarify what approach the University of Tasmania should follow, commencing with Indigenisation.

---

3 Some seek to make them interchangeable. Yellow Bird (2008:286) for instance defines Indigenisation as ‘the personal and collective process of decolonizing Indigenous life and restoring true self-determination based on traditional Indigenous values’.
Indigenisation

Indigenisation can be defined as a multilayered and holistic university-level and university-wide organisational change initiative. It is guided by the respect for and recognition of Indigenous people, culture and knowledge, involving the reorganisation of the university to be more inclusive and representative of Indigenous persons, perspectives and place (see Rigney 2017: 45; Louie et al. 2017). It includes the incorporation of Indigenous perspectives, content and knowledges within the curriculum (including pedagogy), structures (provision of Indigenous facilitates on campuses and space on boards and committees), personnel (a shift in values and attitudes) and governance (strategy, organisational culture, see Antoine et al. 2018: 14; Alfred 2004:88). It also involves implementing change to make the university more inclusive of Indigenous people, both in terms of its academic (e.g. teaching and research), professional (e.g. HR and IT) and leadership staff (e.g. Pro-Vice Chancellors, Deans, Heads of Schools), students, and life of the university (e.g. via welcoming ceremonies, Aboriginal engagement initiatives, see Gerald, Gainsford and Bailey 2018). Indeed, for universities to change it is vital that the organisation itself experience a “changing of the guard”, with the inclusion of Indigenous people and allies (non-Indigenous people who are genuinely committed to Indigenisation) be placed in positions where they can instigate change (see Pidgeon 2015).

Institutional change requires a shift in the organisational culture and, in turn, a change of mind (viz. values, attitudes) and practice of those who work within the university (see Schein 2014; Louie et al. 2017). It is not solely a matter of procedure alone, such as instigating welcome to country, observation of NAIDOC week or installing Aboriginal scholars across various departments (though these are important features). Instead that there must be a valuing of Indigenous people, cultures, epistemes, methodologies, and history amongst staff; which is then modelled to students and the outside world (Harvey and Russell-Mundine 2019; Bodkin-Andrews and Carlson 2016: 791; Hook 2013). There must be ongoing oversight and intentional agenda-setting of Indigenisation at a university-level and faculty/college-level to prevent the process fizzling out, or otherwise being slowly re-framed through a ‘recognition’ lens. The recognition lens, whilst appearing progressive and overall support of Indigenous people (via provision of words of affirmation and some means of support) eventually leads to the sustaining of colonial power and privilege in framing the attention to non-Indigenous people “doing right” (viz. periodically or once-off) rather than

---

4 Pidgeon (2015:88) states ‘Indigenization of the academy has truly transformed higher education when Indigenous students leave the institution more empowered in who they are as Indigenous peoples and when non-Indigenous peoples have a better understanding of the complexities, rich-ness, and diversity of Indigenous peoples, histories, cultures, and lived experiences’.

5 This differs from the original meaning of the term which Gray and Coates (2008), social work scholars, observe that it was used to describe localisation, the process by which foreign concepts and ideas were collected in order to respond to the particular needs in the (Indigenous, local) community. Later, the term evolved to describe the alteration of practices (e.g. social work) to be appropriated to the socio-cultural (i.e. traditional Indigenous) context.

6 Indigenisation involves the negotiation of relationships, not solely procedure alone (see Harvey and Russell-Mundine 2019).

7 The recognition lens describes the paradigm through which Indigenous issues are reframed according to the terms of the colonial entity (Antoine 2017:117). This results in states maintaining power over Indigenous people through accommodation and recognition, rather than truly granting self-determination in domains such as the provision of sovereignty, the return of traditional lands, and economic independence. Coulthard (2009: 213) describes these negotiations as colonial because ‘it remains structurally oriented around the dispossession of Indigenous peoples of their lands and self-determining authority’, whilst assuming the guise of governments acknowledging and responding. In the same way we see organisations who ‘strive to reconcile’ but fail to truly grant self-determination or assist in the wellbeing of Indigenous people (Coulthard 2009: 213). I argued that this orientation to the reconciliation of Indigenous nationhood with state sovereignty can be characterized as colonial insofar as

In this regard, universities (primarily through its teachings staff and course content) play an important role in the shaping of attitudes and behaviours of future generations towards Indigenous people, knowledge, culture. Tertiary education, it is argued, also ought contribute to the corrosion of derogatory and false Indigenous stereotypes and the ‘race bind’ which is systemic in Australian society (Walter 2014; O’Dowd 2012; Yishak and Gumbo 2015; Biermann and Townsend-Cross 2008; Hart et al 2012; see Harrison and Greenfield 2011). Similarly, Acton et al. (2017: 1314) argue that universities have a key responsibility in ensuring that students have exposure and access to Indigenous culture and knowledges.

As with any form of organisational change, the literature details variations to the nature and extent of this Indigenisation process, Gaudry and Lorenz (2018) argue that there are three forms of Indigenisation:

(I) **Indigenous Inclusion**: Oriented to the recruitment of additions of Indigenous staff and students at the university and assist them integrate into the university (which often has animosity or indifference towards Indigenous people).

(II) **Reconciliation Indigenisation**: Oriented to the establishment of wider and more inclusive consensus on what constitutes knowledge, the reconciliation of Indigenous and non-Indigenous knowledge, and determining what relationships should exist between the academy and Indigenous communities. This goes beyond Indigenous inclusion and involves the sharing of power in leadership, teaching, policy making and governance roles to stimulate these changes. In Canada, this form of Indigenisation is spurred by the Truth and Reconciliation Commission 94 Calls to Action, incorporating the creation of Indigenous committees to oversee and advise the reconciliation process (see also Battiste 2013: 170-174).

(III) **Decolonial Indigenisation**: Defined as the total reconstruction of the university to change, at a fundamental-level, the knowledge produced and power dynamics to essentially establish a new and dynamic institution. Two forms are identified:

a. **Treaty-based decolonial Indigenization**: Where the operations of the university are undertaken on the foundation of a treaty with Indigenous people as a means of forcing change.

---

8 Walter (2014: 44; 45) describes the race bind as follows ‘a racialised discourse that maintains the racial stratification system and its accompanying disparate access to social, economic, political and cultural resources while simultaneously denying the existence of race-based privilege or disadvantage. This discourse is achieved by merging newer discourses of individualism and free market capitalism with older colonial discourses on Aboriginal peoples as underdeveloped culturally and morally and, therefore, undeserving. The resultant discursive paradox denies the concept of race itself, blaming or crediting racially differentiated life trajectories on individual choices, while contradictorily but simultaneously justifying racially differentiated social and political positioning…. The social problems burdening Aboriginal peoples, including high levels of welfare receipt, low school attendance and alcohol and drug abuse, are increasingly attributed not to chronic poverty and marginalisation, but to a lack of individual effort, low aspirations and poor attitudes and values’.

9 The weakness of this approach, the scholars argue, is that it does not lead to change in the teaching and inner workings of the university and leaves any such change as the responsibility of these individual Indigenous staff.
b. Resurgence-based decolonial Indigenisation: Where institutional structures are redeveloped to be more inclusive of Indigenous knowledges, culture and political directions.\textsuperscript{10}

\textbf{Curricula Indigenisation}

Curricula Indigenisation, as one arm of university Indigenisation, involves the incorporation of Indigenous epistemes and content within the units of a discipline and the overarching degree as a whole (le Grange 2018; Marlene Brant Castellano 2014).\textsuperscript{11} These two concepts, whilst interrelated are often confused. The key distinction is that Indigenous epistemology involves students ‘learning from’ Indigenous people whilst content involves ‘learning about’ Indigenous people (Hart et al. 2012:717; Harvey and Russell-Mundine 2019: 800-801).

\textbf{Indigenous epistemology} incorporates the catalogue or depository of the knowledge of a traditional group (e.g. hunting, history), the medium through which knowledge is held (e.g. through songs, stories or art), by whom it may be held (e.g. women, elders, men) and how it may be utilised (e.g. ceremonial, fishing). Importantly, this knowledge is from the perspective of Indigenous people and typically is geographically or socially situated (e.g. from one community from a certain region). These characteristics necessitate consultation with and the involvement of local traditional knowledge holders in the Indigenisation process (Morgan and Golding 2010; Battiste 2013; Yunkaporta 2019). Traditional knowledge holders, it is argued, can and should be seen as experts in their field of cultural knowledge, in the same way that Western scholars are, (McGloin Marshall and Adams 2009: 9).

For Indigenous cultures, pedagogy is not seen solely as a means by which knowledge or expertise is acquired but rather, as a holistic person-forming process; again involving spiritual, relational (or social) and environmental (connexion to the land) considerations within this framework (Antoine et al. 2018; Acton et al. 2017). Given the distinctions between Indigenous and Western epistemological and pedagogical paradigms and foci, it is important that learning environments be shaped to permit the exploration of students’ epistemological, ontological and axiological standpoints within an open sharing environment. (Acton et al. 2017: 1321).

\textbf{Indigenous Content} includes material on or pertaining to Indigenous people, not necessarily from the Indigenous perspective, integrated across a discipline or within a specific unit. For example, the discipline of sociology may include content on Indigenous people within discussions of health, family, education and inequality as a means of investigating Indigenous people, or a sole unit within criminology may incorporate a case study of Indigenous incarceration and recidivism rates.

Scholars within this space provide some caveats as to what curricula Indigenisation is not:

- \textit{Abrogation}: Curricula Indigenisation is not the erosion or replacement of existing Western disciplinary knowledge and systems by Indigenous equivalents,\textsuperscript{12} nor a

\textsuperscript{10} Gaudry and Lorenz (2018: 225) state bluntly that ‘If indigenization does not strengthen Indigenous communities and support the resurgence of Indigenous intellectual traditions, then it is not indigenization’.

\textsuperscript{11} Some argue that it too involves the inclusion of Indigenous pedagogy, this is explored below on page 20.

\textsuperscript{12} Unlike has been historically undertaken against Indigenous people and their knowledges in what is referred to as ‘cognitive imperialism’, see Battiste 2013: 26-27.
hybrid of these two separate pools of knowledge into one unified approach (Nakata 2007, 2017). Indigenisation seeks complementarity, the presentation of knowledge systems in a parallel manner to instigate the reception of and respect for each of the knowledge systems (Antoine et al. 2018: 17; Morelli, Mataora and Kaulukukui 2013: 214; Harvey and Russell-Mundine 2019). It involves the shift from a ‘Eurocentric curriculum’ to one that is inclusive of Indigenous knowledge and positions (see Nakata 2007).

- **Tokenism:** Curricula Indigenisation is a move beyond tokenistic endeavours (e.g. “bolt on” lecture slide and mentioning of Indigenous heroes, landmark events and cultural components). Instead, the aim is to produce a ‘Deliberate coming together of Indigenous and non-Indigenous ways of knowing’ (Antoine et al. 2018:17; Hook 2013; Acton et al. 2017).

- **Artefacts:** Indigenous knowledge and content is more than items of antiquity or cross-cultural case studies. Indigenous epistemes are continuous and evolving, and should be framed in a way that demonstrates and defends how Indigenous epistemes and knowledges are not only valid and meaningful per se, but are also conducive to the resolution of leading world issues (Higgs 2016: 95; Yunkaporta 2019). For this to occur, Zubrzyycki et al. (2014: 17) states that lecturers ought teach that ‘Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander ways of knowing, while different, have equal value and status as systems of knowledges and thus deserve epistemological equality’.

- **Irrelevant:** It is not uncommon for students to complain that Indigenous content and perspectives are irrelevant to their area of study (Collins-Gearing and Smith 2016). In the Tasmanian context, students are known to complain that training on Indigenous people is particularly “irrelevant” because of the myth of there being no Indigenous people in Tasmania. There has been an observed flow-on effect in the graduate’s working life where tertiary courses has failed to include Indigenous content and knowledge, for instance medical students not having understanding to relate to Indigenous patients (McLaughlin, Whatman and Nielson. 2013).

- **Part of Multiculturalism:** There is increasing pressure upon social institutions to be more representative and supportive of diverse cultural, racial and social groups, perspectives and interests (Kuokkanen 2007). The risk is that Indigenisation is perceived as an act of favouritism (Antoine et al. 2018). For example, within development of curriculum at a law faculty, arguments may be made that if customary law is studied that other legal systems (such as Sharia Law) should too be included within some facet of the LLB. Antoine et al. (2018) respond by arguing that Indigenisation initiatives should be distinguished from multiculturalism strategies on the basis that the lands upon which Western institutions stand were taken from the rightful traditional owners, and that by extension, because of this dispossession traditional knowledge and customs were eroded and lost. The argument also fails to recognise the almost complete privileging of Western knowledge and culture.
De-Colonisation
De-colonisation encompasses the removal and/or reorganisation of structures, ideologies and discourses within a social institution which historically have perpetuated the privileging Western people, ideologies and practices to the detriment and discrimination of (both directly and indirectly) Indigenous people, ideologies, customs and practices (Antoine et al. 2018; Wane, Shahjahan & Wagner 2004; Kuokkanen 2007). This process is typically actioned against practice and perspectives of particular professions, for example social work or psychology (Dudgeon and Walker 2017). It is often accompanied by an empowering and promotion of Indigenous persons, structures, ideologies and discourses (Harvey and Russell-Mundine 2019).

A key pedagogical feature of de-colonisation involves emphasising the development of critical thinking and reflexivity skills, alongside a challenging of the Western/disciplinary predispositions on Indigenous people, culture and knowledge. This must be modelled by lecturers and tutors as key influencers of students; it is counterproductive to have staff instruct this “on paper” but in practice articulate or convey a disregard for these areas (Nakata 2017; Bodkin-Andrews and Carlson 2016; Antoine et al. 2018). Zubrzycki et al. (2014: 20) provide the following comment on this matter ‘Unless educators have the skills to respond actively and appropriately to the presentation of these issues, graduates will struggle to know how to manage the same issues in practice… [within] culturally safe learning environments’.

Why Indigenisation over De-colonisation?
The Office of Pro-Vice Chancellor for Aboriginal Leadership preferences Indigenisation over de-colonisation for practical and collaborative reasons. Although some scholars argue that decolonisation reverses the discarding of traditional epistemological and ontological frameworks (Wane, Shahjahan & Wagner 2004; Kuokkanen 2007) a complete realisation of de-colonisation is unlikely. To be truly actualised decolonisation requires the complete re-structuring of the university, an institution inherently Western in its structures, hierarchy, pedagogy and ideology (Tlostanova 2019; Nursey-Bray 2019; Alfred 2012).13

Indigenisation is thereby preferred in that it recognises the difficulty of changing the fabric of the university per se, accepting that whilst it cannot be entirely changed14 it can instead be shaped to be more supportive of Indigenous people and knowledge, and subsequently prepare Indigenous students to “go out into other sectors as agents of change” (Alfred 2012).

Process: What does Curricula Indigenisation Entail in Higher Education?
Curricula Indigenisation is a multifaceted and gradual process which requires thorough evaluation, collegial collaboration, and sequential implementation (see Yunkaporta 2009; Zubrzycki et al. 2014; Calvez 2020). There exists no single formula or paradigm to instigate curricula Indigenisation, although it is agreed it must be operative at both a governance level and teaching level (Morelli, Mataria and Kaulukukui 2013; Gorrie, Mahood and Ashley 2017). The diversity in practice, coupled with the dearth in evaluative studies, complicates evaluation of strategy efficacy and hinders the formulation of a reliable approach to curricula

13 Scholars like Alfred (2012) point out that for de-colonisation and Indigenisation to occur completely it would result in the academy not only being called something (e.g. an Indigenous name) but also alter the very fabric of the institution; making it something it was “never designed to be”. For this reason he is sceptical as to whether it can be achieved.
14 Because it is intrinsically Western and not, contrary to popular belief, a ‘neutral space’ see Battiste (2013: 161) and Kuokkanen 2007.
Indigenisation (Nakata 2017). Page, Trudgett and Bodkin-Andrews (2019) advise cautiousness in being too prescriptive, but also argue that there should be a systematically-set minimum standard across the university (see also Matthews et al. 2016). These scholars further argue that their framework is useful in safeguarding the risk of add-on lectures and an otherwise poor standard of the curriculum (Page, Trudgett and Bodkin-Andrews 2019).

Indigenisation is more than an intellectual affirmation of the importance of Indigenous knowledge (Gorski 2008) and the addition of Indigenous content into the curricula (Pidgeon 2015). Rather, it is the selective inclusion and synthesis of Indigenous epistemes and content (Nakata 2007). It is underpinned by a recognition of and respect for Indigenous practice and knowledges, structural support for initiatives to incorporate such content (finance, teaching relief, mentoring) (McLaughlin, Whatman and Nielson. 2013: 38). This ought include an overview of Indigenous history and colonisation, and how the latter shapes contemporary understanding (Zubrzycki et al. 2014). It also involves the integration of place-based learning (on country), through the inclusion of Indigenous languages (both in content and as teaching language), the studying of Indigenous scholars as key theorists and research based within and lead by community members (Anderson 2019; Hart et al. 2012). Ideally, it should be present consistently across the entirety of the curricula, and regularly included within assessment (Gerald, Gainsford and Bailey 2018: Power et al. 2016). Indigenous scholars, knowledge holders and guest lecturers should be involved, it is not expected that they know, nor be depicted by non-Indigenous staff as knowing, all the answers or otherwise to be the embodied repository of all traditional knowledge (Zubrzycki et al. 2014: 36). As such, it will involve ‘unlearning’ Western predispositions and biases, (Bullen and Flavell 2017; Gainsford and Evans 2017).

**Stages of Curricula Indigenisation**

Curricula Indigenisation literature suggests the process involves the following stages (see also Bopp, Brown and Robb 2017:2-3; Rigney 2017: 49; Pete 2016; Zubrzycki et al. 2014: 89-90; Young et al. 2013):

- **Commitment**: A commitment is made at the faculty/departmental and/or at the university-governance-level. Ideally, a tentative timeline and allocation of duties/responsibilities is drafted, with relevant persons, committees and work groups ideally commissioned to provide oversight and commencement of the Indigenisation process, including Indigenous knowledge holders, faculty members, and staff from Indigenous support units (Rigney 2017). Some universities appoint specific positions to oversee the Indigenisation process (see Universities Australia 2020). The commitment should be enshrined within policy documents and be accompanied by the provision of appropriated resources (Gerald, Gainsford and Bailey 2018). Importantly, it is aided by an organisational culture which encourages reconciliation, as well as continual learning and development (Bopp, Brown and Robb 2017).

---

15 Rigney (2017) highlights the importance of the following institutional features which are conducive to the Indigenisation of curricula: supportive Indigenous culture; appropriate financial support; committed and strong leadership; a institutionally-wide strategy; supportive community; regular tracking of staff; valuing and respecting of Indigenous epistemologies and knowledge; Indigenous staff; committed and skilled faculty.

16 Zubrzycki et al. (2014) reason that it is essential for students to develop and demonstrate appropriate knowledge and practice in respect to key areas such as racism, white guilt, resistance, lateral violence, immobilisation and fear.

17 For Young et al.’s 2013 framework see Appendix E.
Consultation and Collaboration: Following the declaration of commitment, formal and informal consultation is undertaken with Indigenous knowledge holders, scholars, staff from the university’s Indigenous support unit, elders and appropriate community members (Lewis and Prunuski 2017; see Morelli, Mataira and Kaulukukui 2013). These persons will provide counsel, recommend individuals from who further direction and input could be received and refer persons who could serve as guest lecturers or seminar/workshop facilitators. Importantly, these consulted individuals ought be appropriately paid for their service (Zubrzycki et al. 2014: 36; Gainsford and Evans 2017). Some literature advises the establishment of an oversight or consultancy committee comprising of Indigenous knowledge holders, community members and/or scholars to serve as a point of reference (Bullen and Flavell 2017; Williamson and Dalal 2007; Gerald, Gainsford and Bailey 2018; Hauser, Howlett and Matthews 2009; Nash, Meiklejohn and Sacre 2006); Morelli, Mataira and Kaulukukui 2013, see Appendix C). 18 Such a committee is useful insofar as is ensures that material is formulated and implemented in ways that are relevant (viz. discipline-specific), respectful (viz. not culturally appropriated) and accurate (McNamara and Naepi 2018; Pete 2016; Young, Sibson and Maguire 2017: 142). Yarning can be used to ease interaction for Indigenous people (Power et al. 2016).

- Planning and Creation: It is recommended that each department (viz. discipline) issues an internal audit of the units offered, their content and structure, and teaching staff expertise to identify how curricula Indigenisation may take place and what additional resources are required (Knight 2018; Zubrzycki et al. 2014). 19 To this end, some scholars (Nash, Meiklejohn and Sacre 2006) advise departments to commission a ‘mapping exercise’ of the offered units to see what existing Indigenous epistemes and content were included, and thereby assist in the determination as to what could be integrated, both within each unit and across the degree (or major) as a whole (see also Matthews et al. 2016). This should involve planning with community and Indigenous knowledge holders (Gerald, Gainsford and Bailey 2018; Bopp, Brown and Robb 2017).

Such a partnership is useful in preventing unnecessary duplication of content across a degree, as well as ensure that material is discipline-specific and integrated in good faith (McLaughlin, Whatman and Nielson. 2013; Gainsford and Evans 2017). It enables the mentoring of staff and Indigenous knowledge-holders alike to teach Indigenous content (Bopp, Brown and Robb 2017; Zubrzycki et al. 2014). Having planning as a department is beneficial in encouraging a holistic examination of what can be Indigenised and how it may be enacted (Zubrzycki et al. 2014).

- Implementation: Local knowledge ought be introduced into the course/degree, over time from the ‘teaching in partnership’ between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people (Zubrzycki et al. 2014). This can be done via a horizontal or vertical approach. The former involves an implementation of material across a degree, whilst the latter involves the introduction of a core unit on Indigenous matters being implemented into
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18 That is, as partners in curriculum development, rather than solely governance as some suggest for the Commitment stage.
19 For a good set of audit questions see Anning (2010).
the system (e.g. ‘Indigenous Australians and the Law’ within the LLB, see Page, Trudgett and Bodkin-Andrews 2019; Ranzin 2008). Matthews et al. (2016) suggest two specific Indigenous units, one pertaining to the profession, whilst the other focuses on shaping students epistemological and ontological standpoints.

- **Reassessment/Revision**: The review the process, involving the evaluation from students, Indigenous knowledge holders, and even relevant Indigenous professions (for instance lawyers, see Rigney 2017). It is advised that this could involve meeting with the consultancy committee and/or with disciplinary colleagues to reflect on the integration process and what could be undertaken in future to improve the overall program and the embedded Indigenous content. Further Indigenisation should be integrated within the revision process for teaching staff (Morelli, Mataira and Kaulukukui 2013). There ought too be an effort to further the reflexive abilities of teaching staff and academics to assist in this process (Riley et al. 2013: 263).

Detail as to suggested content creation is outlined below, however it is advised that it incorporate Indigenous epistemes and methodologies, potentially conveyed through Indigenous pedagogies (Zubrzycki et al. 2014). Material ought develop graduates so that they have the knowledge and ability to respectfully, empathetically and knowledgeably live and work alongside Indigenous people (particularly those who work in certain professions, such as social workers and teachers); each of which ought be measurable in some form (Rigney 2017; Page, Trudgett and Bodkin-Andrews 2019). It is suggested that it ought include cultural knowledge, sourced from the appropriate knowledge holders (viz. local), and delivered in a way that appreciates the complexities of the cultural interface (Nakata 2007), and an overall prioritisation of Indigenous epistemologies and voices, noting too the plethora of traditional knowledges in Australia (Riley et al. 2013:263; Zubrzycki et al. 2014).

**The Process Proper or the Process in Practice**

The following principles are required in the Indigenisation of curriculum:

**Indigenous Knowledge and Perspectives (Epistemes)**

Indigenous epistemologies should reflect that Indigenous knowledge is linked to specific communities and traditions (thereby not generalisable), is functional and experiential insofar as designed to be used in specific means (e.g. govern.), is evolving, reproduced and lost, is often fragmented (due to colonisation and the passing of time), is handed on orally and may thereby be difficult to codify (in some respects tacit knowledge). Antoine et al. (2018: 21-22) encourages asking the following questions when reflecting on the inclusion of Indigenous epistemologies within tertiary courses, namely:

- **Goals** (Is a holistic growth in the student intended in the course?)
- **Learning Outcomes** (Does the unit seek a multi-dimensional development in the student? E.g. spiritual, psychical, emotional and cognitive?)
- **Activities** (Are there activities which require learning on the land or use of narrative?)
- **Assessment** (Reflexive tasks)
- **Relationships** (is community-based intergenerational learning and land-based learning integrated within your unit?)

---
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• **Format** (land-based learning, getting outside of the classroom in the learning process).

The inclusion of Indigenous epistemes is to be more than the simple comparison of two perspectives. Doing so this hinders the exploration of the richness of Indigenous worldviews and interaction with these by non-Indigenous people (Williamson and Dalal 2007). There must be a willingness to engage in such de-constructive efforts by students, and from the educators themselves; a willingness to uphold epistemological equality (e.g. that Indigenous knowledges are valued as equal to normative social work practice). Similarly, students must be encouraged to think critically about Eurocentric epistemes and "understand the Eurocentric assumptions of superiority within the context of history and to recognise the continued dominance of these in all forms of contemporary knowledge (Battiste 2013: 186).

**Discipline-Specific Indigenous Content**

Content ought to pertain to Indigenous people contextually, as well as specific to the course and the overarching discipline. Where possible, this content should pertain to professional practice (e.g. medical practice). Ranzin et al. (2008) provide the following recommendations in respect to the Indigenisation of psychology courses, outlining that educators ought:

(I) Provide an overview of Indigenous issues (e.g. colonisation, mental health, relationship to the psychology profession);

(II) Critique the nature and normative practice of the profession, particularly in respect to Indigenous people;

(III) Provide Indigenous-specific professional practice content;

(IV) Provide reflexive content for students;

(V) Ensure content is readily integrated across the course as a whole;

(VI) Ensure the material has instantaneous relevance to their learning and practice now and in the future as practitioners (e.g. interacting with Indigenous clients);

(VII) Provide teaching in partnership with Indigenous persons in lecture and seminar form to enable student interaction with them (e.g. Indigenous clinical psychologists);

(VIII) Provide professional development for staff, including cultural competency courses (see Harvey and Russell-Mundine 2019: 802; Pete 2016; Power et al. 2016).

Zubrzycki et al. (2014) adds the following suggested components:

(I) Incorporate development of cultural responsiveness (awareness of and respectful practices in respect to a community’s culture, history, knowledge and practices) and link it to specific professions with examples or case studies;

(II) The inclusion of material on lateral violence, racism, whiteness and inequality;

(III) Include content on Indigenous contemporary resilience; with an emphasis afforded to local histories and contexts;

(IV) Attention be given to transferable skills, for example, interacting with Indigenous persons and rapport (e.g. in legal practice), yarning, cross-cultural partnerships, and deep listening.

Maguire and Young (2016) outline that ideally multiple Indigenous perspectives should be included within the course to prevent essentialism, and hinder students developing the
viewpoint that the content was being “coercively” placed upon them. The scholars give the following recommendations for content (Maguire and Young 2016: 103-104):

(I) ‘Provide broader context to cases where the subject matter involves Indigenous people.

(II) Draw on the political nature of course topics such as administrative law to assess Indigenous policy.

(III) Include non-competitive moots that require students to engage with current Indigenous legal issues.

(IV) Invite Indigenous presenters into classrooms. Such presenters need not be academics, as many traditional owners and custodians of

(V) Indigenous knowledge are located outside the tertiary sector.

(VI) Show a provocative video to start discussion.

(VII) Present students with material written created by Indigenous people.

(VIII) In smaller classes, divide students into groups or pairs to prepare a brief to advise on different positions or perspectives on Indigenous issues.

(IX) Take smaller groups of students on field trips to sites such as the Native Title Tribunal.’

It is important to note that some disciplines will require care when Indigenising their content, acknowledging that historically their discipline has been conducive to the colonisation and harm of Indigenous people, culture and knowledge (Baskin 2005). Similarly, educators must be careful in their instruction to ensure respect and complementarity, not cultural appropriation (Baskin 2005; Bullen and Flavell 2017; Williamson and Dalal 2007). Educators require cultural awareness training and be themselves changed in attitude and practice towards Indigenous culture, knowledge and persons (Bullen and Flavell 2017). With the lack of Indigenous staff, there is risk that over time content may revert to more Western-oriented perspectives (Bullen and Flavell (2017). This may not necessarily be influenced by malice, academics may be afraid of teaching Indigenous perspectives, especially when they are not Indigenous and such knowledge is outside the field of their experience and training (Nakata 2017). Others will have differing levels of interest in and commitment to the Indigenisation process influencing how much content is amended (Williamson and Dalal (2007).

A component of Indigenisation is the inclusion of material to provide students a thorough understanding of colonial history (national and local level) and its consequences on Indigenous people, knowledges and culture (Bodkin-Andrews and Carlson 2016: 788; Hart et al. 2012; Clarke and Orford 1998). This material should not be culturally appropriated, nor should it be ‘watered down’ to be comfortable for non-Indigenous audiences (Pidgeon 2015; Hook 2013). Attention to white privilege, and the resultant manifestations of this privilege should also be included (see Bodkin-Andrews and Carlson 2016: 793-794, 798; Hollinsworth 2016). For non-Indigenous Australians, it is important to be taught of the normalisation of whiteness and the inherent and invisible privileges it bestows (Hook 2013). Film is a useful tool for exploring whiteness and colonisation due to its indirect means of challenging the

---


22 Hollinsworth (2016: 422) recommends the knapsack by Peggy McIntosh (2005) for this process.
viewer, inviting empathy rather than evasiveness (Hook 2013). Care must also be taken to ensure that Indigenous staff are not exposed to overt whiteness practices and hostility.

Evans (2006) describes how at UTS education degrees had the inclusion of a mandatory Indigenous Studies unit, within which students were required to communicate with a member of the Indigenous community and/or undergo a placement to a school with a large Indigenous population. The assessment included having to understate a ‘situational analysis’ requiring students to identify and become acquainted with various Indigenous community stakeholders, persons and organisations or draft a welcome to country (Evans 2006). It is argued that this task contributes to the integration of Indigenous concerns to students and facilitates the creation of local networks within Indigenous communities (Evans 2006).

**Reflexive Practice**

Williamson and Dalal (2007) advises that the Indigenisation process is to encompass continual self-reflection on the part of educators and students alike, paying attention to the need to on an on-going basis unsettle Western superiority and authority. This should stimulate respect for and acknowledgement of Indigenous epistemologies and ontologies in teaching, and seek to engage responses that involve the heart, and not solely the mind, as well as impede the appropriation of knowledge. The courses need to stimulate required reflection on the part of the students, an engagement with reflexivity as a means of not only stimulating an involvement from students within the new worldviews, but also to hopefully crystallise a shift in one’s own epistemological, ontological and axiological paradigms (Williamson and Dalal 2007; le Grange 2018: 13).

Such processes must encourage ‘critical reflexivity’, nestled within a ‘culturally sustainable pedagogy which]… must move beyond the simplistic binary or oppositional positioning of Indigenous versus Western understandings (Carey & Prince, 2015) to permit multiple perspectives to be compared and reflexively explored’ (Acton et al. 2017: 1322; see also Loueie et al. 2017:19; Dudgeon and Walker 2017; Gerald, Gainsford and Bailey 2018). The fruits of reflexivity are seen when an individual perceives their privileges, the means by which these are bestowed by socialisation, the effects these have in the shaping of attitudes and behaviours (habitus) and effort to challenge these as normative (Harvey and Russell-Mundine 2019: 797-798). It too incorporates the development of cross-cultural partnership skills and the ability to empathise with Indigenous people (Loueie et al. 2017:19).

**Assessment**

It is suggested that units evaluate whether students have experienced a shift in their epistemological and ontological positions and their understanding of key concepts. This can be undertaken by reflective tasks, or via role playing of professional practice with intercultural development (Bullen and Flavell 2017; Zubrzycki et al. 2014: 52). Others recommend discipline-specific assessments, for instance a moot on an Indigenous matter within criminal law (see Maguire and Young 2016).

Some scholars argue that it is not feasible to hold Indigenous content and its instruction to quality measurement paradigms given the ideological and pedagogical separation between Western and Indigenous forms (Bullen and Flavell 2017). Other scholars such as Mihesuah (2004) disagree, whilst Pidgeon (2015:85) encourage reflections of change. That is, is
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Indigenous material being included within the curricula, and is it changing the experiences of staff and students in their every-day lives? Has it shifted the direction of flagship programs, and the strategies of the university as a whole?

In research, it is recommended that scholars collaborate with Indigenous researchers and communities and promote the utilisation of Indigenous methodologies, such as yarning (Antione 2017; Baskin 2005; Bodkin-Andrews and Carlson 2016). Louie et al. (2017) share how in their teaching (Schools of Education) they utilise story telling and negotiation and in so doing emphasise the survival of First Peoples in teaching (see also Matsuoka, Morelli and McCubbin 2013: 286-288).

Graduate Attributes
The introduction of a cultural competency graduate attribute within degrees and courses can help facilitate attention to Indigenous content and issues and aid in the establishment of these alongside assessments on Indigenous epistemes and topics (Power et al. 2016; Page, Trudgett and Bodkin-Andrews 2019). In 2020 there are 14 Australian universities with an Indigenous graduate attribute requirements, with another 17 having a cultural graduate attribute (see Universities Australia 2020: 29). This is elaborated further on page 34.

Pedagogy
Some scholars commend the use of Indigenous pedagogy within the curricula Indigenisation process, although this is not seen as a mandatory inclusion (although lectures or workshops from Indigenous knowledge holders may utilise these traditional mediums of instruction). Acton et al. (2017: 1319-1320) provides the following strategies for Indigenisation:

- ‘Storytelling: reflecting Indigenous ontologies, storytelling may include sharing narratives of personal experience, including personal stories, recount and dialogue from both local and external Indigenous perspectives (Power, 2004 in Morgan & Golding, 2010) or ‘counter-storytelling’, underpinned by critical race theory and aiming to enable analysis and reflection (DeCuir & Dixson, 2004, p. 27 in Universities Australia, 2011b, p. 78)

- Modelling: appropriate respectful cultural interaction can be demonstrated between presenters of differing cultural heritages – authentic learning from each other, in a safe space ‘because of the immediacy of being able to question each other’s opinions’ (Morgan & Golding, 2010, p. 12; Universities Australia, 2011b)

- Viewing: using film to present personal Indigenous narratives and histories, such as Bringing them home (2007) to introduce the National inquiry into the separation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children from their families (as described in Morgan & Golding, 2010), or using video scenarios and film excerpts which are then discussed and analysed (Universities Australia, 2011b).

- Yarning Circles: these may involve tutorial discussions on racism (Morgan & Golding, 2010), panel presentations that include Indigenous community members or student prepared and presented workshops (Universities Australia, 2011b, p. 75).

- Guest Presenters: fostering community engagement by inviting and encouraging Indigenous guest presenters allows a nuanced understanding of the impact of European settlement and government policies (Universities Australia, 2011b), as
demonstrated in Morgan and Golding’s (2010) research when two Indigenous presenters shared personal stories, narratives and experiences of racist behaviour.24

- Experiential learning: learning on, with and about Country in a hands-on way (Santoro et al., 2011; Whitehouse et al., 2014); cultural immersion activities such as field trips to Indigenous communities or organisations; informal meetings with local Indigenous organisations; guided cultural field trips to museums or art centres provide opportunities to develop relationships with individual Indigenous people and rethink understandings about culture and identity (Universities Australia, 2011b, p. 75).25

- Collaborative learning: lectures and tutorials which ask questions and encourage student involvement and collaboration (Morgan & Golding, 2010)

- Reflection: personal reflection (for staff and students) is promoted by Morgan and Golding (2010), with Johnson (2002), an advocate for autobiographical narrative writing, as a pedagogic tool for reflecting on and developing awareness of cultural divides. Universities Australia (2011b) describes ongoing reflective activities including journaling, identity narratives (regarding self and others), and reflections on readings and presentations as important strategies for developing intercultural skills;

- Analysis: may include using portfolios as a tool for analysing diverse media texts, reflecting on personal critical incidents or analysing texts for dominant ‘cultural scripts’ (Universities Australia, 2011b);

- Role play: this offers opportunities to practise different interviewing skills or to explore and experience being positioned in different ways in a safe environment (Universities Australia, 2011b);

- Games: can simulate cross-cultural encounters to expand students’ understanding of culture (e.g., BaFa BaFa; Welcome to the State of Poverty) (Universities Australia, 2011b).’

Hindrances to Indigenising the Academy

There are a number of identified hindrances to the Indigenisation of curricula (Ranzin et al. 2008; Gainsford and Evans (2017: 3).26 Some of these include but are not limited to:

Racist and/or exclusionist cultures towards Indigenous scholars and scholarship

Historically Indigenous scholarship has not been seen as of the same value or quality as non-Indigenous scholarship within University systems or structures (Deloria 2004; Hart et al. 2012).27 This belittling has been committed overtly e.g. scorning of certain scholars or failing to create disciplinary space for Indigenous scholarship or covertly such as failing to include Indigenous scholarship in taught courses and published research (see Higgs 2016) or hostile
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24 See also Young, Sibson and Maguire (2017: 142).
26 Nakata (2017) identifies several issues to the Indigenisation process: (I) What is the best manner in which to consolidate and tailor units to accommodate the most Indigenous material; (II) what material is to be selected in order to be most efficacious; (III) What pedagogical practices are to be employed; (IV) How is student competency and knowledge to be evaluated?
27 Deloria 2004 states that there are allegations that since Indigenous scholars study Indigenous topics this demonstrates their work is biased and not scholarly.
reviews of scholarship and rejection from publication (James 2007). Alfred (2004:92), a Mohawk scholar from the United States, depicts the situation as follows:

‘Colonialism continues ideologically, Indigenous scholars must be wary of and resistant to the conquest to erode Indigenous values, ideologies and plans for the future of communities and culture. This must be the focus, rather than on the skirmishes on promotions, scholarly self-advancement, and acquisition of unit resourcing’

Baltra-Ulloa (2013) notes that within the Australian context, part of the resistance against decolonist teaching, teachings of whiteness and the privileges it bestows, and criticisms of the “Australian-way” and normative social work practice, may be understood by the belief in the ‘multicultural Australia’ which, in effect, is instead neo-racism or ‘politics of silence’ (2013: 89; see also O’Dowd 2012, Hollinsworth 2016). This is perpetuated through the belief that Australia is culturally-neutral which encourages plurality of culture, religion and peoples, as a result this ideal, shrouded in political correctness and silence, obfuscatory.

Racialised comments, it is argued, are increasingly crafted in such a manner as to have the appearance of being legitimate and reasonable, a means of guarding one from accusations of racism; which too complicates (even taboos) accusing another of racism (Hollinsworth 2016; see Battiste 2013: 137). There are efforts to disregard or otherwise downplay whiteness, pressing a need to “move on” from racial distinctions, and seek other means of discriminating on matters of race whilst not using such discourse (see Walter 2014; Hollinsworth 2016). One manifestation is the depiction of Indigenous culture as a static phenomenon to be studied, rather than lived knowledge systems (Hart et al. 2012).

**Overburdening of Indigenous staff/Indigenous staff do all the work**

Deloria (2004) writes that the university system has historically (and continues to) hinder the careers of Indigenous scholars. This is done by the over-labouring of such staff via obligations for teaching, governance (committees), in-house consultancy (Indigenous ‘go-to’ person), and community responsibilities (point of contact, advocate) which non-Indigenous scholars typically do not have to experience. This is a particular risk of the Indigenisation process where Indigenous staff may be expected to do the majority of the work for unit coordinators (Gainsford and Evans 2017: 3). As such there is a ‘denial of responsibility’ (Sykes and Matza 1957), with staff contesting curricula Indigenisation i.e. “I am a historian not an Indigenous expert” (Gainsford and Evans 2017: 3).
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28 Hollinsworth (2016: 413) writes ‘a fundamental strategy for denial of racism is the adoption of egalitarian or ‘color blind’ discourse that condemns the focus on racism and oppression as ‘provoking’ division and resentment’.

29 Battiste (2013:135-136) observes a similar phenomenon in Canada ‘Canada remains a racist society. It is racist in the sense both of its residual cultural and biological superiority, and in subtle and systemic forms… Canadian society has failed to rid itself of this founding construction of racism wrapped in colonialism and Eurocentricism; it remains the deep structure of Canadian thought and contexts’.

30 Hollinsworth (2016: 421) states ‘Given this approach, can I rebuke students for statements that deny white privilege or racism or that justify or minimize inequality? Conversely, when (male, white, older) staff (appear to) criticize a student, other students are prone to support their peers even when they disagree with the student’s pronouncements. While not always successful, I try to remain calm, respectful and engaged, using critical reflection, quality research evidence, alternative anecdotes, and humour to refute false beliefs and ill-informed arguments. When this doesn’t work I do resort to more forceful approaches to shut down any obviously traumatic exchanges, although this can result in negative Student Feedback on Teaching evaluations that our management have too high a regard for.’

31 This can be instigated or exacerbated by organisational culture, see Harvey and Russell-Mundine (2019: 801-802).
**Time commitment**
Curricula Indigenisation, as demonstrated above, is time intensive which requires unit coordinators and other support staff to carve out time from already busy schedules. This can dissuade scholars from being involved, as it means it is “something else” they have to complete (Deloria 2004). It is noted that Indigenisation can be quite costly for Indigenous faculty members in drawing them away from their own career development, and other key initiatives such as supporting and mentoring Indigenous HDR students (Nakata 2017).

**Turf wars and content blindness**
Characterised as a conflict for ideological supremacy whereby academics fight to keep their units “their way” and contest inclusion of material seen as irrelevant to the core component or focus of the unit or discipline writ large (Bopp, Brown and Robb 2017; Ranzin et al. 2008; Bullen and Flavell 2017; Hart et al. 2012). Collins-Gearing and Smith (2016) comment on how in their experience of Indigenisation, this turf-war manifested as staff expressing their difficulty in perceiving how Indigenous content was applicable to their offered courses within English and receiving similar negative responses from students in unit evaluations following the commencement of Indigenisation. Fears of academics having their disciplinary knowledge and content de-valued is not insurmountable however, and has been shown to have been remedied by on-going discussion and re-assurance with discussions and consultations (Morelli, Mataira and Kaulukukui 2013).

**Quick-Fix Mentality**
Band aid and isolated Indigenisation measures also hinder Indigenisation. This occurs when Indigenisation is approached without support of central administration or at the faculty level, or in a manner where Indigenous knowledge and content is haphazardly ‘bolted-on’ or ‘add and stir approach’ to the unit to satisfy policy requirements (Bopp, Brown and Robb 2017; Battiste 2013: 28). This bolt-on approach produces inconsistency in the knowledge and content included within degrees, and seldom facilitates the challenging of existing stereotypes and the development of cultural competency amongst students (Page, Trudgett and Bodkin-Andrews 2019; Battiste 2013: 28; McGloin Marshall and Adams 2009; Power et al. 2016).

**Inadequate training and expertise**
Not all staff are sufficiently trained or qualified to lead and implement Indigenisation (Bopp, Brown and Robb 2017). Howlett et al. (2013) comment that lecturers may not know how to introduce Indigenous material into their courses or where to access such content, nor are acquainted with appropriate contacts to assist in the process (see also Ranzin et al. 2008). Maguire and Young (2016) note that, similarly, not all Indigenous staff have the experience and qualifications to teach across the disciplines. Indigenous scholars may also be appointed to fill quotas, rather than on merit (Deloria 2004; Mihesuah 2004). Conversely, the university may have some suitably experienced staff but fail to invest in locating and
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32 Power et al. (2016: 8), describes that the cultural competency component involves the facilitation of the development of: respect, engagement and sharing (viz. knowledge, perspectives, stories), moving forward (a commitment to change practice and behaviour).

33 Alfred (2004: 92) makes an insightful observation of the university and the Indigenous scholar’s role in that space: ‘The university is contentious ground… a battlefield. I mean this in a different, profound sense, and in a way that should cause Indigenous scholars to refocus their view of the role they are playing and on the battles they are fighting… Indigenous scholars have for the most part proven unprepared mentally, emotionally and physically to take on the struggles of their nations…. for the most part [they have] escaped to the university and insulated themselves from any accountability to the conflicts and challenges being faced by their people in the communities’.
training suitable replacements, so that when these persons leave the university there is risk of indigenising processes being dismantled (Bullen and Flavell 2017; Matthews et al. 2016).

**Fears of making mistakes**

Another hindrance is staff (particularly non-Indigenous staff) feeling inexperienced, and subsequently are paralysed by fear of making mistakes (Harvey and Russell-Mundine 2019: 801-802). There is fear of committing acts of cultural appropriation, offending Indigenous people, misrepresenting knowledge, or otherwise failing to do it properly (Harvey and Russell-Mundine 2019: 801-802). On the other hand, it has been observed that using this narrative of fear as a means of exercising White privilege, excusing staff from taking responsibility to Indigenise and collaborate with Indigenous people (Nursey-Bray 2019: 328).

**Process fatigue and Inadequate Resourcing**

Hargreaves and Goodson (2006) observe that universities are difficult to change, with the reform-cycle generally running for a period up to and including 5 years, thereafter dissipating due to institutional change fatigue. Alternatively, there can be an absence of support from central administration (Bopp, Brown and Robb 2017; Gorrie, Mahood and Ashley 2017). 

This was demonstrated by Griffith University’s efforts in the early 2000s to Indigenise their law curricula. This program folded after the Indigenous Law Program was not given recognition by the faculty and the Indigenous academic subsequently left the institution (see Matthews et al. 2016: 20-21).

**Neo-liberalism and Student Enrolments**

Some research has identified that the broader social context of universities within the neo-liberal landscape affects the Indigenisation process amidst the emphasis on the securing and retaining students (Gorski 2008; Connell 2013). Within this environment, academics are mindful of student resistance and the pressure upon educators to challenge prevailing ideologies in order to win and maintain the favour of students, conform to the political correctness expectations of a faculty or university overall, and minimise any resistance from students (Ranzin et al. 2008; Hollinsworth 2016; Baltra-Ulloa 2013: 96).

**Examples of Curricula Indigenisation**

What follows is a summary of some examples of curricula Indigenisation at Australian universities. It is by no means exhaustive, but instead seeks to give an overview of measures which could be undertaken within the College of Arts, Law and Education.

**Charles Sturt University**

Gerald, Gainsford and Bailey (2018) describe the curricula Indigenisation process undertaken at Charles Sturt University’s School of Law, particularly within the unit on Torts. It is explained that this curricula redevelopment is in line with implementing the University’s Graduate Learning Outcome for the development of the cultural competence of its students. 

At the university-level, staff receive a cultural-training program involving elders, Indigenous

---

34 Pidgeon (2015) argues that Indigenisation should be given equal resources to internationalisation efforts and engagement with international students.

35 Conversely, it is possible to have committees and agreement on Indigenisation, but no action (see Knight 2018).

36 Gainsford and Evans (2017: 15) describe that the Indigenous Education Strategy, approved in 2008, part of the University’s Graduate Learning Outcomes, was a ‘top-down’ measure, to enable agenda setting to undertake the difficult project of Indigenisation. As such, it was ‘to act as a framework for staff to gain professional development in the area of Indigenous cultural competency; and to actively embed meaningful Indigenous perspectives and pedagogy in curriculum content for all undergraduate students’ (Gainsford and Evans 2017: 9).
sich's and Indigenous persons within industry; which is then complemented by the presence of an Elder-in-residence, and an Indigenous scholar as a member of staff at the School. This has been complemented by amendments to the curricula to, as the authors describe (Gerald, Gainsford and Bailey 2018: 2):

‘the embedding of Indigenous cultural competence, alongside the inclusion of content relevant to CSU’s footprint – regional, rural and remote Australia. Whilst the latter content includes legal issues and concepts such as environmental and mining law, native title and dispute resolution, the embedding of Indigenous cultural competence entails educating law students on the richness of Indigenous cultures, the impact of history and its contemporary social realities, and the fostering of critical reflexivity around the role of the law and the legal profession’

The scholars recognise that, to date, one of the key concerns in curricula Indigenisation has been the introduction of material pertaining to Indigenous people but is otherwise not inclusive of Indigenous perspectives; that is, the inclusion of Indigenous legal cases alone. This is compounded by the fact that legal text books reportedly do not contain Indigenous perspectives, and cover few Indigenous cases. For example, a case such as Cubillo v Commonwealth (2001) 103 FCR 1 may be included in a Torts textbook, but used only as an example of false imprisonment, without explaining the socio-historical context of the parties to the case, nor providing an emphasis on Indigenous perspectives to the case (Gerald, Gainsford and Bailey 2018: 17).

The Law School reportedly has adopted the cases of State of South Australia v Lampard-Trevorrow (2010) 106 SASC 361 and Trevorrow v State of South Australia [No 5] (2007) 98 SASR 136 as case studies in negligence law to explain the liability held by statutory (viz. legislatively ordered) authorities. It is argued that the case provide an opportunity for legal students to be shown and, as much as possible empathise with, the parties involved in the case and how Indigenous people perceive damage and loss according to the facts of the case. The course seeks to introduce students to this by walking them through on-line sources (e.g. Stolen Generations Testimonies) which explain the specific Indigenous contexts of inequality and abuse. This is supplemented by a guest speaker, a barrister who served in that case (although is not Indigenous). The course then has Indigenous subject matter included within the assessment, requiring students to not only demonstrate knowledge and understanding of torts and the studied cases, but also to reflect and detail on how the law of torts can be used for the advocacy for and amelioration of harms suffered by Indigenous Australians.

Gainsford and Evans (2017) provide a case study of the embedding of Indigenous content within the university’s Faculty of Business, an initiative funded by an internal grant. It was guided by the principles of the Cultural Competence Pedagogical Framework of 2009, and involved several stages, facilitated by an Indigenous consultant:

1. Preliminary work: Having the consultant establish rapport and relationships with academics, undertaking conversations concerning culture and seeking to initiate mutual learning. This was key to opening the door for Indigenisation and reducing the resistance from what has been described as a top-down approach. However, some scholars who disagreed with the Indigenisation process targeted the consultant as the person to vent against. Cultural competency of staff was seen as essential component

37 For a summary of other structural Indigenisation initiatives at the university, see Matthews et al. (2016).
to provide the means of Indigenisation at the faculty level, to move people beyond simple compliance, and creating compassion and care for Indigenous people, culture and epistemes.

2. Curricula Indigenisation: The Indigenous consultant oversaw the Indigenisation process. Discipline-specific content was developed in collaboration and consultation with Indigenous businesses and practitioners, including filming and resource development; namely in respect to the role and use of Reconciliation Action Plans, and the meeting of Indigenous requirements of the Australian Procurement Covenant. The consultant assisted teaching staff acquire understanding of and locate content as to business commitment to Indigenous people and its interconnexion with ameliorating structural disadvantages caused by colonisation. Case studies tailored to the unit were deemed particularly valuable, as was the formation of partnerships with Indigenous businesses and practitioners. This aided the understanding and valuing of Indigenous knowledge in businesses. Simultaneously, this foci is said to benefit Indigenous people in having environments where they feel valued and supported.

3. Implementation of Indigenous Content Embedding: This is achieved via changes to curricula content, education of teaching staff, and establishment of supportive teaching environments.

Overall these two papers are demonstrative of ways in which curricula Indigenisation may commence within tertiary education, whilst noting that Indigenous perspectives are not strictly related to the implemented content.

**Edith Cowan University**

Young, Sibson and Maguire (2017) describe the Indigenisation of Edith Cowan University’s Sport, Recreation and Event Management program subsequent to the enactment of the Reconciliation Action Plan 2015/2016 – 2017/2018 and its commitment to the integration of components of cultural competency across the units it offers. The authors describe the Indigenisation efforts into two units, two introductory units (Introduction to recreation/leisure) and the (Introduction to sport management).

In the Introduction to recreation/leisure, students are required to read a textbook chapter on Indigenous modes of leisure (for instance music, storytelling, art and games) which provides an overview of perspectives of Indigenous culture to sport. A seminar in the week following is on people groups who do not have high involvement in sport, Indigenous people being only one of several groups. The session is facilitated by a guest lecturer from the Department of Sports and Recreation to provide an overview of government strategies used to improve the participation of Indigenous people in sport activities and sport more generally. One of the student assessments are given a opportunity to select Indigenous people in sport as the assessment focus.

In the Introduction to sport management, teaching investigates strategies to greater equity for Indigenous people within sport, with one of the case studies covered includes the efforts of Cricket Australia to create more diversity in the sport; Indigenous people being one of the targeted groups. A reference to a similar initiative is noted to be included within the unit’s textbook (Shilbury and Kellett (2011) Sport Management in Australia: An Organisational Overview). One of the unit’s assessment involves the requirement to develop a brochure on the topic of a chosen sport seek to be one for all people. The second piece of assessment involves a case study of preeminent Australian sportsmen/sportswomen. Collectively the authors note, this provides students an opportunity to focus on Indigenous Australians.
The scholars describe the degree as ‘appropriately embedding Aboriginal knowledge and cultural perspectives into its curriculum’ with graduates being ‘able to demonstrate “broad and coherent knowledge in inclusive practices encompassing cross-cultural awareness and Indigenous cultural competence and its application to sport, recreation and event management”’ notwithstanding that ‘the area of event management practices per se could be an underrepresented part in the whole’ (Young, Sibson and Maguire 2017: 140). It is stressed that there is a need for students to understand and conceptualise the role of disadvantage and racism in sport and leisure and how these variables limit Indigenous people’s involvement in sport.

It ought be considered that the set textbooks are not written by Indigenous scholars, and it is not stated as to whether these texts include perspective from Indigenous people. If no Indigenous perspective are included therein, and the representative of the Department of Sports and Recreation is not Indigenous, it is not clear how students are to receive the Indigenous voice in these courses. Instead it seems that whilst some degree of content has been included, it has been done so marginally; Indigenous people whilst being the focus of some of the taught content, is nestled within discussion of other marginalised groups. This is similarly the case for the assessment tasks, casting into doubt the Indigenisation claimed to have been undertaken.

James Cook University
Loban (2011) writes that what was the then Faculty of Law, Business and Creative Arts (now the College of Business, Law and Governance and the College of Arts, Society and Education) was undergoing curricula Indigenisation in alignment with the Reconciliation Action Plan (released in 2008). Attention is afforded within this paper to the subject ‘Business Law and Ethics’, a first-year introductory unit, with subheadings addressing three embedding techniques:

- **Integration of case law**: This is described as a means by which teachers may embed Indigenous perspectives ‘immediately’ (Loban 2011: 15) through introducing cases pertaining to Indigenous persons and matters. Three cases are listed, namely Australian Competition and Consumer Commission v Keshow [2005] ATPR (Digest) 46-265 (unconscionable behaviour in trading, deceptive and misleading, to an Indigenous rural woman NT), Bulun Bulun v R & T Textiles (1998) 157 A LR 193 and Milpurruru v Indofurn Pty Ltd (1994) 130 ALR 659 (copyright infringement of an Indigenous artist’s work).

- **Integration of case studies**: This is broader than specific case law, examining current affairs, policies and practice within businesses and government departments pertaining to Indigenous people. The examples listed include the Australia Securities and Investment Commission, the Queensland Office of Fair Trading, Indigenous Consumer Assistance Network and the Australian Communications Consumer Action Network.

- **Integration of Experience from Professionals**: The use of real-world experience of teaching staff. In this instance, the author used experience in property law lease work they had undertaken with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people.

- **Expert guest lecturers**: Loban (2011) endorses this option for non-Indigenous academics who are unable to provide Indigenous perspectives due to a lack of expertise or time. The example provided is that of having an individual who worked with Indigenous corporations and councils in annual report preparation. Attention was
afforded to the complexities of book keeping, auditing and accounting in remote areas.

- **Assessment:** This is advised to incorporate the examination of Indigenous perspectives. The unit incorporated an assessment considering the Keshow case above, with application to business ethics and consent in situations with people who live remotely, limited financial capital, and may not have English as their primary language.

- **Community engagement:** This is achieved through community initiatives such as through consultancy experience.

Whilst Loban (2011) here is attentive to the processes of curricula Indigenisation, from the descriptions provided there appears to be a divergence between theory and practice. There is the integration of Indigenous content, although whilst repeatedly outlining the importance of Indigenous perspectives and partnership with Indigenous people (viz. experts/knowledge holders), this is lacking. Indeed, there is little evidence within the article provided that would indicate that Indigenous perspectives are in fact incorporated within the course, but rather, content about Indigenous people. Whilst this is an improvement, it does not realise the intended potential of Indigenisation and runs the risk of appearing as a ‘bolt-on’. 38

**Queensland University of Technology**

Nash, Meiklejohn and Sacre (2006) describe the process of embedding Indigenous perspectives within the nursing curricula at QUT, stemming from its commitment within the 2001 Reconciliation Action Statement, in alignment with the process set-out within the Teaching and Learning Committee for Indigenisation released in the same year. It provides a thorough explanation of the structural processes undertaken, and in doing so provides a template for institutions to adopt. The process was guided by ‘an explicit strategy to systematically promote students’ understanding and appreciation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander perspectives and their application within health care practice settings’ (namely to integrate into formulation of best practice), with the focus on the development of cultural competence amongst students (Nash, Meiklejohn and Sacre 2006: 298). 39

The team audited nursing students for their understanding of skills and knowledge pertaining to Indigenous people, a total of 60 students taking part. The department had both a Project Team (including Indigenous Support Unit staff and an Indigenous faculty member) and a Reference Committee comprising community members alongside scholars with experience in embedding Indigenous perspectives. Seven units were selected to be Indigenised, 1 being an introductory nursing unit, another a medical/surgery second-year unit, and the other 5 placement units which were oriented to be practical in nature. An Indigenisation plan was established by a team following the ‘Graduate Capabilities and Core Concepts grids, which guided the design of how and where it was appropriate to map different themes and content across the whole course’ (Nash, Meiklejohn and Sacre 2006: 307), which established a guide for unit co-ordinators. Learning circles assisted the development of content and resources, including Indigenous health specialists and those of the project team, to assist the teaching staff. These entities were shown the changes made to curricula and provided comment to unit co-ordinators. Staff were further supported by the creation of a resources website (the Yapunyah website) and professional development workshops facilitated by an Indigenous scholar, incorporating reflexive activities, alongside instruction in cultural competency and

38 For a summary of other structural Indigenisation initiatives see Matthews et al. (2016).

39 See also Bullen and Flavell (2017).
safety. Staff were surveyed prior to and following the workshop in respect to the understanding of and competency with Indigenous perspectives.

Williamson and Dalal (2007), also from the Queensland University of Technology and recipients of an internal grant, describe efforts to indigenise the human services and humanities curricula, and facilitate the formation of best practice in the units offered under Indigenous studies. Williamson and Dalal (2007) describe that this process commenced with an audit, involved professional development for staff and made available resources on-line. The curricula development process, arranged with the support of the university’s Indigenous centre the Oodgeroo Unit, comprised the following guiding principles:

- Recognises and subjects to critical analysis the knowledge and core cultural frameworks operative within a society and how each contribute to the overarching culture.
- Acknowledges the difficulties of facilitating understanding between cultures but nevertheless seeks to be accommodating and inclusive of Indigenous knowledge, thereby challenging normative assumptions towards Australian identity.
- Contextualised and thorough evaluations of Indigenous culture, knowledge, procedures and values, recognising their significance historically and at present times (viz. rejecting assumptions of static culture).
- Recognises and contributes to the formation of sensitive and respectful practices in respect to ethics and Indigenous people.
- Integrates attention to Indigenous social justice issues and the formation of professionals to be active agents for change in this respect.
- Considers the positioning of Indigenous people and their engagement in a globalised world.
- Integrate Indigenous pedagogy and assessments, with counsel from Indigenous people.
- Understanding that curricula Indigenisation is not simply a ‘bolt-on’ exercise, but rather, necessitates a reconceptualization and reorganisation of curricula overall.

This was accompanied by the graduate capability outcomes requiring they be able to demonstrate the capacity to:

- Develop critical awareness of and capacity to deconstruct their ontological and epistemological standpoint in respect to Indigenous people, knowledge et cetera.
- Develop a sensitivity to cross-cultural matters and a conscientiousness of the complexities of the acquisition of cross-cultural knowledge.
- Engagement and valuing of other (namely Indigenous) epistemes and the overflowing practices.
- Understanding of Indigenous axiologies and culture, recognising that these exist not as one single monolithic entity but are unique to each Indigenous community
- Contribute to debate on Indigenous social justice issues
- Have knowledge of and be able to execute, tailored to their profession, skills in respect to Indigenous people.\(^40\)

\(^40\) The expanded performance standards used by Williamson and Dalal (2007) can be found in Appendix A.
University of Adelaide

The University of Adelaide commenced investigating curricula Indigenisation in the early 2000s, formalised in response to recommendation 1041 from the 2013 Tarrkarri Tirrka Project (hereinafter ‘the Project’) and launched via the Indigenous Enrichment of Curricula imitative between 2015-2018 (Nursey-Bray 2019; Rigney 2017; see The University of Adelaide 2013). The university appointed a Dean of Indigenous Education coincided with the launching of the Tarrkarri Tirrka Integrated Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Education Strategy 2013–2023 who, with the assistance of a Project Officer, oversaw the execution of the Indigenisation review and implementation process as one of its priority areas alongside recruitment of Indigenous staff and students and the bolstering of Indigenous research (Rigney 2017: 48; Nursey-Bray 2019). Nursey-Bray (2019: 328) discusses that this was a three staged process involving:

I. Locate and converse the Indigenous organisations, TAFE and Regional Training Organisations to establish access avenues into university enrolment;
II. Audit units to advocate and improve the Indigenous Knowledge content;
III. Formulate Faculty-specific three-year plans to introduce Indigenous perspectives and knowledge into offered courses, utilising engagement with community and existing (non-specified) faculty strengths.

An internal audit of the Indigenous programs offered resulted with a faculty-wide improvement approach in partnership with key community stakeholders (viz. Kaurna Elders). It was found that there were a limited number of courses (24/4500) which included Indigenous content, these placed within education, health, history, law and linguistics; mostly Aboriginal Studies (The University of Adelaide 2013: 14).42 The Tirrka strategy was integrated within the portfolio of each department and faculty, all having their own Gender and Equity Diversity Committee, established tailored goals and timelines, committees being chaired by an Associate Dean of Diversity and Inclusion. Inter-cultural competence and ‘professional learning community’ workshops were established and run to assist staff understand and implement curricula Indigenisation (Rigney 2017: 53). In the latter workshops, staff were instructed in and shared research methodologies, pedagogical techniques and theory (Rigney 2017: 53).

In terms of curricula Indigenisation, a Major within the Bachelor of Arts was established, called the Indigenous Knowledges and Society Studies’, run by the Indigenous student equity centre, with an Indigenous University Preparatory Program to improve student enrolment (Rigney 2017: 53). Nursey-Bray (2019) describes the Indigenisation of 6 Geography units at The University of Adelaide, ranging over an undergraduate and postgraduate level, guided by an Indigenous reference group. This group, comprising of Indigenous scholars, one student and an Arabanan knowledge holder, analysed the units and discussed potential Indigenisation approaches (Nursey-Bray 2019). The Indigenisation process encompassed four components, namely (Nursey-Bray 2019: 331):

I. **Embedding of key narratives and storylines:** Use of stories, particularly counter-narratives, to engage students emotionally and stimulate discussion and reconsideration of common racialized misconceptions and prejudices. For example,

---

41 That is, ‘Fund competitive grants for faculty pilot projects to increase Indigenous content into curriculum’ see The University of Adelaide 2013.
42 As has shown to be the case within the Bachelor of Arts at the University of Tasmania.
towards Native title as land grabbing, that Australia was not invaded but “rightfully settled”, that there are no “pure” Indigenous Australians. Another approach is to utilise narratives over three epochs such as pre-colonisation, colonisation and contemporary Indigenous community. This narrative approach is cited as an effective means to ‘get to’ students;

Nursey-Bray (2019: 332-333) provides examples of how this was undertaken across two units. Within the ‘Introduction to Geography, Environment and Population’, a 1st-year foundations unit, one ‘session’ was dedicated to Indigenous people through the use of storylines and narratives, which were produced with the assistance of the Indigenous reference group, including:

‘These narratives include: (i) Indigenous peoples in Tasmania are extinct; (ii) Native Title means takeover of “Australian” freehold land; (iii) Indigenous people are primitive; (iv) that Australia was settled not invaded; and (v) Indigenous peoples should “get over it”, and move on, to name a few. I used these key discourses as motifs by which to present real stories that explored the same information I had delivered in previous sessions, but in a way that provided other information that disrupted and disproved key (often racist) assumptions’ Nursey-Bray (2019: 333).

In the unit ‘Indigenous Peoples and the Environment’ the epoch narrative approach was used, drawing from stories from time on country and work experience received there. Students were reported to provide mostly positive feedback, with some exceptions (e.g. a walk-out). In the first unit, Nursey-Bray (2019) opened the lecture on Indigenous content by naming up that students would likely be resistant to the material conveyed in that session.

II. Use of visual and aural delivery mechanisms: Use of field trips (e.g. to community and country), video clips (e.g. The First Australians) and tours (e.g. galleries, such as Tandanya) to impart knowledge. In the unit ‘Introduction to Geography, Environment and Population’ students has to examine the Indigenous country map by Tindale, assigned an Australian city and asked to research the traditional Indigenous people group and any settlements that were there previously.

III. Development of country-based assessments: Have assessments which require visiting and/or reflection on or in relation to, country and its meaning to Indigenous people. In the unit ‘Indigenous Peoples and the Environment’, students were given liberty to select and research a specific style of Indigenous art and provide a narrative of how the style is representative of Indigenous connexion to country.

IV. Use of ‘co-cultural conversations in safe spaces’: Invitation of Indigenous scholars to lecture and thereafter engage in dialogue with students on particular topics followed by a Q&A. The emphasis is on creating places where any topic can be freely raised and thereby stimulate thorough analysis.

The University of Adelaide’s (2013: 14) Faculty of Health Sciences is reportedly undertaking the inclusion of Indigenous content across each of the six years of study of the MBBS (medicine) program in collaboration with the Yaitya Purruna Indigenous Health Unit.
University of Newcastle

As a component of an audit in 2008, the University of Newcastle required its Faculties (at the time being Business and Law; Education and Arts; Engineering and the Built Environment; Health; Science and IT) to identify and report which courses did not include Indigenous content, when courses did offer content to describe the nature of the community consultation undertaken in respect to its inclusion, and identify which courses could be revised to include Indigenous content (Butler and Young 2009). The faculties reported varying commitments to Indigenisation, with some faculties indicating the introduction of a specific Indigenous unit within their degrees, whilst others more readily integrated across the courses overall (such as within the Fine Arts). The authors highlight the department of Education for its inclusion of a mandatory Aboriginal education course in their undergraduate teaching degree, and the medical department having Indigenous lecturers speak across the degree in its entirety.

Maguire and Young (2016) record the Indigenisation progress of the University’s law curriculum, noting that of the 24 units offered 15 of these included Indigenous issues within their content (e.g. fights for native title in property law), 10 included Indigenous perspectives (e.g. Indigenous scholars on the Mabo decision), and Indigenous law (e.g. law pertaining to Indigenous people such Native Title Act 1993 (Cth) and customary law). The study indicated that where Indigenous content was included within courses, it was largely through lectures (12 courses), readings (11 courses) and class (tutorial) discussions (10 courses); interestingly 6 classes included the use of case studies on key legal matters. Undertaking a review of the literature, Maguire and Young (2016) demonstrate how several legal subjects (Property Law, Administrative Law, Constitutional Law, and Criminal Law and Procedure) can be Indigenised, primarily via the introduction of Indigenous cases, having Indigenous perspectives on these or other related legal issues embedded, have students approach Indigenous legal issues with the task to analyse and/or consider Indigenous standpoints (in written assessments or in moots), or have students examine Indigenous law (viz. customary law).

The scholars argue that whilst there is the understandable complaints of complexity surrounding this Indigenisation process for academics, it is achievable through a structured integration of content and issues throughout legal units. This method is advised to encourage and ease the receptivity of students to Indigenous law and content, where if delivered as one-off topics may be discarded as ‘irrelevant’, commonly the case amongst students if the area of law is outside of their selected area of interest (e.g. contract law).

Collins-Gearing and Smith (2016) describe effort to Indigenise the English curricula through the gradual introduction of Indigenous texts within their English units at the University of Newcastle, with a focus on two courses. The first involved the creation of an Indigenous literature unit, wherein students would examine Indigenous texts, particularly Story About Feeling (Neidjie 1989). A children’s literature unit was selected to incorporate Indigenous content and knowledge, noting that there was not insignificant resistance from students. Within this course Indigenous literature was discussed over two weeks, including My

---

43 A count of units with and without Indigenous content was not shared in the article.
44 Graham (2009) notes that there is a difference between native title and land laws, and that students ought be walked through the different interests between these two systems, comparing Indigenous conceptualisations with property in contrast to the standpoint of common law.
Girragundji (McDonald and Pryor 1998) and Two Mates (Prewett 2012), wherein students are required to undertake a discourse analysis to examine underlying beliefs and ideologies of these texts and how it relates to Indigenous perspectives, namely to country, enabling the discussion of Indigenous issues and perspectives.

University of South Australia

Ranzin et al. (2008) describe the embedding of Indigenous content within the undergraduate psychology degree. The scholars describe the process entailed the formation of a mandatory Indigenous unit covering colonisation and culture (run by the university’s Indigenous studies department together with the psychology department, tailored specifically for psychology students), creating a first-year elective unit (‘Psychology and Indigenous Australians’, also run in partnership as above), and embedding Indigenous content throughout the other courses in the psychology units (Ranzin 2008:134). In describing the compulsory unit, roughly 40% of lectures were reportedly given by Indigenous people. Around half of the unit’s teaching time was apportioned to the exploration of Indigenous history, contemporary culture/society and colonisation, 35% afforded to examining Indigenous people and their relation with psychology (namely the history of the profession with Indigenous people, trauma etc.), and the remaining in examining issues and attitudes pertaining to racism, whiteness, reflexivity and developing competency to work with Indigenous people and communities.

Students generally provided favourable comments in their student evaluations; no one expressed negative or racist perspectives or complaints, and overview indicated a growth in their understanding of Indigenous people. This favourable response was linked to the emphasising of the importance of cultural competency at the outset of the course and subsequent encouraging and re-emphasising its importance throughout the course. The scholars argues that integration of content across a degree is important, but that there should be a strong foundational immersive course within the degree. Content that was sufficiently theorised and had much involvement of Indigenous people was seen as conducive to favourable evaluations from, and outcomes for, the students.

Ranzin et al. (2008) provide the following recommendations in the Indigenisation of psychology courses: (I) provide an overview of Indigenous issues; (II) critique the nature and normative practice of the profession, particularly in respect to Indigenous people; (III) provide Indigenous-specific professional practice content; (IV) provide reflexive content for students; (V) ensure content is readily integrated across the course; (VI) ensure the material has instantaneous relevance to their learning and practice now and in the future as practitioners; (VII) provide teaching in partnership with Indigenous persons in lecture and seminar form to enable student interaction with them; (VIII) provide professional development for staff, including cultural competency courses (see Harvey and Russell-Mundine 2019: 802).

University of Technology Sydney

The University of Technology Sydney (hereinafter ‘UTS’) approaches the Indigenisation of its curricula through the implementation of its graduate attributes (the Indigenous Graduate Attribute process, hereinafter ‘IGA’), a process overseen by the Centre for the Advancement of Indigenous Knowledges (Page, Trudgett and Bodkin-Andrews 2019; Harvey and Russell-Mundine 2019). Alongside the introduction of the Indigenous Graduate Attributes, the team

---

47 Although not Indigenous epistemes.
48 For a similar approach within the Western Sydney University see Anning (2010).
also developed an on-line Indigenous unit at the introductory level, established and ran an Indigenous graduate Attribute workshop for teaching staff, and worked to locate and train individuals to be ambassadors for the IGA at the disciplinary level. The IGA comprises three components:

- **Building knowledge foundations**: Integrating content and perspectives across a degree, commencing from the first year, which is thereafter built upon across several units within the degree structure (interrelated content). Having content in the initial stages of the degree assists in the normalisation of Indigenous knowledge. It is not specified what content should be included, nor prescriptions are set as to the extent to which it should be included, but it ought be ‘systematically and rigorously embedded in the overall curriculum’ (Page, Trudgett and Bodkin-Andrews 2019: 9). To this extent, it is advised that there be a specific Indigenous unit, which then carries over into other units.\(^4^9\) For the Indigenous Graduate Attribute Degree Framework see Appendix D.

- **Connecting to discipline**: The authors state that content must be integrated according to the overarching discipline and to enable students to thereafter apply that knowledge within the parameters of that discipline. For example, integrating Indigenous music within music degrees, or including Indigenous-specific health practice in medicine and nursing courses.

- **Applying knowledge to practice**: Interconnected to above, it is important that the degree offer opportunities to apply knowledge to modes of practice which are relevant to the professions attached to that discipline. It is noted that whilst work experience placements (e.g. social work or business students) are becoming normalised, this option is limited in respect to Indigenous organisations (often smaller with a lack resourcing to accommodate large and/or frequent influxes of students). Some degrees open such opportunities more regularly than others (e.g. law and medicine), but the authors suggest that role play activities (e.g. moots), reflexive exercises, or research assessments to investigate practice (e.g. for a community corrections officer or a teacher) are alternative avenues to facilitating the implementation of this requirement.

**University of Wollongong**

The University of Wollongong’s approach to Indigenisation rests with a staff consultation and training program by the name of *Jindaola*. *Jindaola* is the product of the partnership of the Lecturer Academic Development Indigenous Knowledges Jade Kennedy, a Yuin man who was appointed in 2017 to lead the ‘embedding Indigenous Knowledges into the curriculum’, in consultation with other Indigenous and non-Indigenous staff (Kennedy et al. 2019: 151). Its purpose is to engage faculty and academics in a ‘knowledge exchange program’ over a series of formal (5 workshops) and informal sessions (social gatherings, yarning) throughout the year, whereby Indigenous knowledge is provided to the discipline-specific knowledge of the academic through instruction from and engagement with local Elders, community members and Knowledge Holders (Kennedy et al. 2019: 155, 158). This model rests on a partnership model between faculty and Indigenous knowledge holders, rather than relying on individual staff members seeking out support or initiatives as per other models described in this report.

\(^4^9\) The following topics are listed as the ‘consensus’ on what ought be included, namely: colonisation, racism, critical reflexivity, respect and reciprocity, whiteness, decolonisation, critical race theory, and the cultural interface (for references, see Page, Trudgett and Bodkin-Andrews 2019: 8-9).

\(^5^0\)
Conclusion and Recommendations
This report has sought to provide a general introduction to curricula Indigenisation within tertiary education for the purpose of establishing a mode of practice for its undertaking at the University of Tasmania. It opened with an overview of the context and concept of Indigenisation (both university-wide and curricula-specific), what it entails, and how the process is recommended in scholarship to be enacted with reference to faculty and higher administrative (governance) levels. Consequent to the inherently political and combative nature of universities, and acknowledging resistance that may likely be encountered, a set of common hindrances to Indigenisation was listed and explained. This was followed by examples of curricula Indigenisation at a number of Australian universities, showcasing different strategies that have been employed to commence the process. Some of these focussed specifically on curricula modification, whilst others were attentive to broader issues of governance or staff training, in so doing highlighting that Indigenisation is a multifaceted and complex enterprise.

A difficulty encountered in compiling this report was that literature in this field tended to provide conceptual overviews for curricula Indigenisation (viz. content was added), rather than demonstrate specifically what was undertaken (viz. what specific perspectives were included). This somewhat limits their usefulness in guiding curricula developers as to what sort of Indigenous epistemes and content they could include within their units. This issue can is compounded as some texts call for the inclusion of Indigenous content alone rather than perspectives or epistemes. Finally, it is not always clear how content and epistemes are to be made unit specific within disciplines, although it seems that legal scholars have been able to effectively convey this in the aforementioned articles. Consequently, all disciplines have studies to look to as templates to follow (Nash, Meiklejohn and Sacre (2006).

Considering the above literature and case studies of curricula Indigenisation, this report gives the following recommendations:

- **Recommendation 1:** That the University of Tasmania establish a curricula Indigenisation committee at a university-level and that individuals be appointed/seconded to each of the Colleges to assist in the Indigenisation process. Workshops should be run for College faculty, led by these personnel;

- **Recommendation 2:** That each College undertake an audit as advised in this report, recording what units have Indigenous content and perspectives, and noting how their units could receive the embedding of such material (e.g. education courses including perspectives on Indigenous pedagogy, Fine Arts including examination of Indigenous art).

- **Recommendation 3:** That Tasmanian Aboriginal knowledge holders and elders, in collaboration with Indigenous scholars at the University of Tasmania, are consulted to inquire as to what perspectives and epistemes could be incorporated into units offered at the University.

- **Recommendation 4:** That Colleges consider introducing a mandatory first-year unit to provide instruction into Indigenous epistemes and culture. The unit XBR113 Indigenous Lifeworlds: Local to the Global, could serve in this role.

- **Recommendation 5:** That Colleges consider implementing Indigenous graduate attributes across their degrees and diplomas to further encourage curricula Indigenisation efforts.
Recommendation 6: That the University commits ongoing financial resources to Indigenisation efforts in its budgeting, the permanent presence of Indigenisation on the Academic Senate’s agenda, and endorsement of Indigenisation at a governance level.
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### Appendix A: Williamson and Dalal (2007) Graduate Capabilities

Performance standards of graduate capabilities, from Williamson and Dalal (2007:54).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate capabilities</th>
<th>Introductory</th>
<th>Enhanced</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduating students should demonstrate the capacity to:</td>
<td>Articulate an introductory understanding of the nature of their own cultural situatedness</td>
<td>Demonstrate a capacity to articulate and analyse their own situatedness and its relationships to the construction of Indigenous peoples and cultures</td>
<td>Demonstrate a comprehensive and critical understanding of their own situatedness, its relationship to Indigenous cultures and the implications of these issues for professional practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Be critically aware and capable of deconstructing their own cultural situatedness and its relationship to the construction of indigenous knowledge, peoples, etc.</td>
<td>Articulate a basic understanding of the complex issues that inform cross-cultural awareness (e.g., the culturally bound nature of particular concepts)</td>
<td>Demonstrate an increased capacity to address and analyse the complexities of cross-cultural understanding and the processes of acquiring cross-cultural sensitivity</td>
<td>Demonstrate competence and confidence in addressing the complexities of cross-cultural understanding in practical contexts and in ways the embody cross-cultural sensitivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Be critically alert to the complexities of cross-cultural understanding and the acquisition of cross-cultural sensitivity</td>
<td>Demonstrate a basic understanding of the possibilities of other forms of knowledge and other ways of knowing</td>
<td>Demonstrate an understanding and willingness to engage with other ways of knowing and their related practices</td>
<td>Demonstrate confidence and competence in articulating other ways of knowing and their related practices; capacity to apply such knowledges and practices as appropriate in professional contexts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Value and engage with diverse forms of knowing and their pertinent/related practices</td>
<td>Demostrate an increased understanding of the diversity and complexities of Indigenous cultures and cultural values and a capacity to analyse and engage with the contemporary concerns of Indigenous peoples</td>
<td>Demonstrate a deep and critical understanding of the diversity and complexity Indigenous cultures and cultural values; a capacity to analyse and actively engage in debates about the delivery of social justice for Indigenous peoples</td>
<td>Actively contribute to the delivery of social justice for Indigenous peoples, particularly in the context of professional practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Understand Indigenous cultures and cultural values including the complexity and diversity of Indigenous communities and their contemporary concerns</td>
<td>Articulate a basic understanding of Indigenous cultures and cultural values</td>
<td>Demonstrate an increased understanding of the diversity and complexities of Indigenous cultures and cultural values</td>
<td>Actively contribute to the delivery of social justice for Indigenous peoples, particularly in the context of professional practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Actively contribute to contemporary debates on the delivery of social justice for Indigenous peoples</td>
<td>Articulate an introductory understanding of contemporary social justice debates for Indigenous peoples</td>
<td>Articulate an introductory understanding of the diversity and cultural values</td>
<td>Articulate an introductory understanding of the appropriate knowledge and skills for engaging with Indigenous peoples in a variety of contexts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Recognise and practice appropriate professional skills with respect to their engagement with Indigenous peoples</td>
<td>Articulate increased understanding of the appropriate knowledge and skills for engaging with Indigenous peoples</td>
<td>Articulate increased understanding of the appropriate knowledge and skills for engaging with Indigenous peoples</td>
<td>Articulate increased understanding of the appropriate knowledge and skills for engaging with Indigenous peoples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Characteristics</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Assembling resources, actors, partnership</td>
<td>Actors and people rich</td>
<td>Create a positive organisational culture for improved results.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building engaged, supportive and collaborative environment</td>
<td>Build leadership team.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty and Indigenous partnerships established</td>
<td>Faculty financial support and/or incentives.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implement university-wide Indigenous strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Engaging learners, faculties, academics and researchers</td>
<td>Build Professional Learning communities for continuous opportunity where teachers can redesign/share curricula and pedagogy to support new alignment of ideas.</td>
<td>What culturally responsive curricula and pedagogies used?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recognition and validation of diverse epistemologies</td>
<td>Data shared.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Measurable outcomes and impact monitored and reported</td>
<td>Successes replicated and scaled up across the university.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunities for cultural competency.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Working together</td>
<td>Indigenous community partnerships.</td>
<td>What is faculty university and Indigenous community, commitment to University-wide strategy?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty and administration commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indigenous staff not left with the burden to do all the work of Indigenisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increasing visibility of Indigenous cultures across campuses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Building confidence</td>
<td>Support faculty and school leadership addresses challenges of Indigenous staff and student retention and success</td>
<td>Empowering all staff and confidence through professional learning communities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Measurable outcomes/impact</td>
<td>Sustainability of reform.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scale up and share internal successes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Excellence and equity</td>
<td>Culturally responsive curricula, teaching and research that validate Indigenous knowledges</td>
<td>Excellence and equity basis of strong Indigenous university-wide strategies. Does institutional system rise to the challenge?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High expectation relationships by all parties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indigenous STEM participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C: Morelli, Mataira and Kaulukukui’s Indigenisation process
Morelli, Mataira and Kaulukukui’s (2013: 211) Indigenisation process at the Manoa School of Social Work

Appendix D: Page, Trudgett and Bodkin-Andrews (2019) Indigenous Graduate Attribute framework

Taken from Page, Trudgett, Bodkin-Andrews (2019: 8).

Young et al.’s (2013: 192) conceptual framework for embedding Indigenous knowledge within social work curriculum, with accompanying implementations

Implications for practice
- Centralizing indigenous knowledges in social work practice and education
- Working from the center not the margins

Epistemological Equality

Implications for practice
- Implementation of indigenous knowledge systems in SW education in the academy

Indigenous Social Work Curriculum

Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Pedagogy

Implications for practice
- Implementation of Indigenous teaching and learning strategies and processes:
  - In the classroom
  - In the community
- In collaboration with the academy and Indigenous knowledge holders

Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander-Centered Social Work

Implications for practice
- Capacity to respond and work in the local context
- Understand and work with local knowledges and belief systems

Cultural Responsiveness