‘Which way? Talking culture, talking race’: Unpacking an Indigenous cultural competency course
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Abstract

In Australia, organisations identify Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander cross-cultural awareness training or Indigenous cultural competency training as a means to address the service needs of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples and to address the gap in disparity between Indigenous and non-Indigenous Australians. This training is also one of the strategies utilised in working towards reconciliation between Indigenous and non-Indigenous Australians. This paper presents the findings from an institutional study based on the development and implementation of an Indigenous Cultural Competency Course within an Australian university and the tensions that exist within the teaching and delivery of such a course.
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Introduction

In some parts of Australia, the words ‘which way’ are used in a general manner by Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples in conversation to find out information about a particular issue or someone, or something, or how things or people might be related, or how they are positioned, and much more (Fredericks 2008). In this paper, we focus on: ‘which way’ in relation to culture and race in teaching Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander cultural competency training courses. We share our deliberations of how we came to centre race within an Indigenous cultural competency training course and some of the issues experienced by us, both as the designers of that training and as Indigenous educators. The information gained through written feedback about the training evaluation sheets or via emails has been valuable in contributing to a deeper understanding of how training participants experienced the training course. We offer this paper, not to position ourselves as experts, but to participate in a broader conversation and ask ‘Which way culture and race, and Indigenous cultural competency courses?’ We begin with providing background information about the university in which we work and the reason why the course was developed.

Understanding the learning environment

When Central Queensland University (CQU) issued its Reconciliation Statement in 2001 (Central Queensland University 2001), it was one of the first universities in Australia to do so. This statement held the university in good stead for some time and allowed a range of education programmes and activities to use it as a platform. The Reconciliation Statement for CQU states that CQU commits to:

- being an exemplar of reconciliation to the local communities where CQU campuses are located;
- being an exemplar of reconciliation for higher education communities;
- collaboration and consultation with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities about all issues that directly or indirectly affect them;
- proactive promotion of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander participation at the university, including access to resources and services, employment and research opportunities;
- proactive promotion of understanding and cultural awareness between staff and students;
- use of the appropriate term for the local Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people in any given location; and
- actioning all of these principles, so that healing and true reconciliation will occur (Central Queensland University 2001).

In 2012, the CQU Council approved an Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Strategy to further its commitment to improving Indigenous access, reconciliation, Indigenisation of curricula and cross-cultural training of staff within the university. This paper explores the development of CQU’s Indigenous Cultural Competency Training Course and its implementation and our role, as two Indigenous Australian educators, in driving this agenda.
CQU is a large, regional Australian university with its original campus located on the lands of the Dharumbal people in Rockhampton, Central Queensland. It has 24 campuses, study centres and study hubs across Australia and is a leader in distance education in Australia, through a range of online and flexible learning platforms. These multiple campus and online learning environments influence the way in which the university works and implements any new initiatives. The Office of Indigenous Engagement (OIE) (formerly known as Nulloo Yumbah) was given the task of facilitating the university’s strategic efforts regarding the Indigenisation of curricula, Indigenous engagement and cultural competency training. In undertaking all of this work, it was also important to build on the evidence in the field (Anning 2010; Asmar 2011; Butler and Young 2009; Fredericks 2006, 2008; Fredericks and Thompson 2010; Kinnane et al. 2014; McLaughlin & Whatman 2007, 2008, 2011) and the recommended suggestions put forward by the sector (Behrendt, Larkin, Griew & Kelly 2012; Bradley, Noonan, Nugent & Scales 2008; Universities Australia 2011). As the OIE started the development and pilot of an Indigenous cultural competency training course specifically for CQU staff, we began to look at the work that has been undertaken in other Australian universities (Adams 2010; Anderson 2011; Arthur et al. 2005; University of Sydney (2012)) and draw on our experiences within higher education and other sectors (Fredericks 2008, 2009; Fredericks and Thompson 2010).

Getting started

We began to explore the evidence with regards to what other Australian universities and universities in the international context had done, who was involved and, importantly, we asked, ‘what were the outcomes?’ (Sherwood & Edwards 2006; Westwood & Westwood 2010; Yang 2000). Over many years, we have been engaged in rolling out cultural awareness training in a variety of settings, including government departments and large organisations. We came to the conclusion that more was required than just delivering cultural awareness training. There is little evidence to demonstrate that this approach had achieved much in terms of addressing issues or changing behaviours towards bettering the lives of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples despite being rolled out over the past 20 to 30 years in Australia. Our discussions with others, who had delivered such training in the past, confirmed this reality.

The literature demonstrates that the term ‘cultural competence’ has been part of transcultural learning since the early 1970s (Nash, Meiklejohn & Sacre 2006; Spencer & Archer 2008). It was first incorporated into the health and education curriculum by scholars from those disciplines, but other disciplines have now also adopted the term and practices (Campinha-Bacote 1999; Downing & Kowal 2010; Nash et al. 2006; Sargent, Sedlak & Martsolf 2005; Stewart 2006). While the terms ‘cultural awareness’ (Fredericks 2008; Westwood & Westwood 2010), ‘cultural safety’ (Sherwood & Edwards 2003) and ‘cultural respect’ (Fredericks & Thompson 2010) might have been used since the 1970s, and still are today, Ranzijn et al. (2009) identify cultural competence as including cultural awareness, cultural safety (Bin-Sallik 2003) and cultural respect. They explain that cultural competence requires people to reflect on their own cultures and come to a deeper understanding about themselves prior to understanding another culture (Ranzijn et al. 2008; Ranzijn et.al. 2009).

We knew that some people may not so reflect and that, if we waited for it, then we could be waiting for a long time to offer Indigenous cultural competency training. We concluded that we could incorporate self-reflection and self-learning activities within the course, to develop cultural competency. From the beginning, we developed the course based on the
evidence and coupled this with our experience. We held the belief that cultural competence can be learned by undertaking cultural competency training.

Through the OIE, we led a consultation process to engage staff across CQU in discussions about what should be included in the training in terms of content, together with course length, mode of delivery, training locations, catering, resources, and engagement with external stakeholders. We were determined to ensure that the result would be a strengths-based model for the course, and not a rehash of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander history or solely cultural elements that situate Indigenous people within romanticist notions of culture and pre-colonial history. We were keen not to be the objects of the training. We learnt from the work of Bond (2010) that, as Indigenous educators, we could be easily objectified in the learning environment and we focused on addressing some of markers of objectification. At times, not always, we have seen the focus on exotic elements played out through ‘Welcome to Country’ sessions, requests for traditional dancers, smoking ceremonies, singers, dancers, and Elders talking about Aboriginal ‘Dreamtime’ stories, which can reinforce romanticised notions of Indigenous people. Most often, people reported that they enjoyed this type of training (Fredericks 2008; Fredericks & Thompson 2010; Hollinsworth 2013; Westwood & Westwood 2010; Young 1999), but that does not mean that the training changed behaviour or challenged the way business was done, nor even the way in which participants saw themselves. Furthermore, this type of training has little relevance in terms of application to participants’ day-to-day work environments and there is little evidence to suggest that a cultural approach has bettered the lives of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.

In her research within training settings, Young (1999) identified that, if the course was centred on culture, trainees would discuss and challenge the authenticity of culture and Indigenous identities. Young’s work, together with earlier work by Brach and Fraser (2000), Campinha-Bacote (1999), Fredericks (2006, 2008), Spencer and Archer (2008) and others, gave us numerous examples of why such training should not focus on culture alone and why it needs to centre race as a springboard to opening up discussion and ideas. Casta, Lumby and Farrelly (2009) argue that content addressing racism, bias and discrimination needs to be included in any generic module of cultural competency training being undertaken by all staff and management. In this way, training can offer the capacity for personal transformation and an ability to create a broader agenda than self-learning can provide. It would allow a focus on contemporary Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander identities in all forms and how students, staff and communities are all part of the real world, together with identifying where points of connection may be made with CQU staff. We wanted to challenge the notion of the ‘real Aborigine’. That is, the Eurocentric and white understandings of what culture is and is not, and what an Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander person is and is not (Carlson 2016; Fredericks 2013; Gorringle et al. 2011; Hollinsworth 1992, 2013; Sarra 2011). This had been raised numerous times in the University by both students and staff, and, thus, needed to be addressed within this course.

After examining a wide range of literature about Indigenous cultural competency, including Universities Australia’s National Best Practice Framework for Indigenous Cultural Competency in Australian Universities (2011), following consultation with CQU staff members, we came to the understanding that CQU’s Indigenous cultural competency course needed to be developed from our own Indigenous standpoints, with race underpinning our theoretical perspectives. We decided to utilise critical Indigenous studies as a mode of analysis to offer accounts of the contemporary world of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples (Moreton-Robinson 2009), critical race theory as an
epistemological framework for non-Indigenous participants to interrogate their own cultural positionings (McLaughlin & Whatman 2011) and to examine institutional racism. It needed to centre race and challenge thinking and behaviours; offer opportunities for participants to reflect on their own cultural identity, white privilege, attitudes, prejudices and propensity to stereotype; challenge racism; promote anti-racism practices; and to be available as a face-to-face course via the university online teaching platform, so that it is accessible to all staff across the wider CQU footprint. It was our view that this approach would better contribute toward the CQU goal of building cultural competency than merely offering a course about Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander cultures that does not lead to the needed structural changes and recognition of Indigenous rights, nor further understanding of white race privilege. We agree with the view of McGloin and Carlson (2013) that critical thinking is a crucial element in the acquisition of cultural competency.

Developing the content for the course

We began to map out specifically what this course would contain in terms of content. We believed that it was essential to cover colonisation and the history of removal, disposition, trauma and pain. In addition, we covered the effects of federal and state policies and legislation about Indigenous peoples, together with the ongoing impacts. For example, the resulting statistics concerning demographics and the status of Indigenous people regarding the disparities between Indigenous and non-Indigenous (health, education, socio-economic status, etc., and how these aspects are interdependent). We also considered it essential to present evidence of Indigenous resistance and activism, and to demonstrate how this continues today. We argue that it is essential to provide an historical context in order to understand the contemporary experiences of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples. On initial viewing of the content, it may look as though all of the information is similar to how others would present similar training. However, a closer examination will reveal that, throughout the course, the content is flipped to demonstrate how Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples were resistant and full of agency, in many forms, against institutional racism in policies and practices from the very beginning of British contact.

The course’s later sessions were developed to focus on the everyday work of the participants within the university. We started by discussing the concepts of race and racism, in particular institutional racism, and asked participants to consider how matters of race impact on their own day-to-day lives. We included Debbie Bargallie’s emerging work that focuses on how Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples experience racism through systems and structures in their everyday work with colleagues in large organisations, such as the Australian Public Service (Bargallie 2015). We drew on her work because there is an alignment with how Indigenous employees may experience racism within a university. In addition, we introduced the concept of white privilege and asked participants to undertake an exercise in ‘Unpacking the Invisible Knapsack’ (McIntosh 1988). This exercise requires participants to analyse a list of 50 ways that the daily effects of white privilege can impact on their lives.

We decided that our final session would present information and discussions about CQU’s commitment to ‘Closing the Gap’ and reconciliation through the ‘Reconciliation Action Plan’ (RAP). We factored in a final exercise asking participants to consider what activities they could undertake in their workplace, based on their learnings of the day, that could contribute to CQU’s RAP.
As stated previously, our intention was to present the content in a strengths-based model in order to challenge the stereotypes that Indigenous people, historically, were somehow ‘passive’, ‘won over’, ‘defeated’ or just ‘gave up’. Moreover, in these contemporary times, that Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples continue to demonstrate resistance and agency through their everyday activities, such as employment and education, as well as strategy actions, such as in social media. In this way, the learning activities would offer multiple opportunities for participants to question Euro-centrism and the continued history in Australia of devaluing and denial of Indigenous values in favour of the continuous presence and actions of the dominant culture. We wanted to stir the being within people to think about their positioning in their everyday world and how they could make a difference within their work with the university and beyond (Westwood & Westwood 2010; Young 1999).

Implementation of the course

As we got closer to being ready to offer the course via a face-to-face workshop and the online teaching platform, we were filled with excitement and also apprehension regarding how it would be received. As the lead trainer, Debbie had spent a lot of time making it the best she could before the big start day. We knew that we had ensured that all of the content was there—the facts, figures and examples—and that the course was based on evidence of sound teaching practices and training course design. It would be difficult for anyone to question the course from any of these angles. Debbie was the lead facilitator for all of the training and Bronwyn was the co-facilitator for the face-to-face training, as such Bronwyn was able to oversee all communications within the online teaching platform. As we kicked off the first face-to-face course, we were both nervous, but we soon eased ourselves into the facilitation.

What became apparent to us quite early was that, as we talked about Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples, the participants appeared interested and focused on what we were saying. We interpreted their body language as positive and affirming of the content, also of us as the facilitators. However, as we moved the discussion, turning the gaze to the participants to reflect on themselves and discuss issues of racism and privilege, the atmosphere in the room shifted. It was clear that there were feelings of discomfort in the room. Evidence of this was that a few people could not focus on the front of the room and sat awkwardly, sideways with their arms crossed in front of them as if to shield their bodies. A couple of the participants also repeatedly looked at one another and began to write notes to each other across the table.

At this point, Debbie raised the discomfort that some people may have been feeling and began to discuss racism and how difficult and emotionally charged it can be. Debbie also made it clear that we were not discussing individual racism, but institutional racism. For the majority of participants, including Indigenous participants, it was the first time that they had engaged with such material. Some participants struggled with the exercises on white privilege and race demonstrating their resistance to engage with the content. For other participants, it was a ‘light-bulb’ moment. As Sullivan (2006, 5-6) states, “as unconscious, habits of white privilege do not merely go unnoticed. They actively thwart the process of conscious reflection on them, which allows them to seem non-existent even as they continue to function.”

During a break, some non-Indigenous participants, who had earlier been disengaged, became engaged in conversation with an Indigenous participant about their views of the course content, more so about what is and is not ‘culture'. The non-Indigenous participants
commented that the training was ‘not really about culture’ and that it was not what they thought the training was going to be about. They commented that, had they known it ‘was about this’, then they would not have attended. This conversation inappropriately places the Indigenous participant, who was also there to learn, as an ‘all knower’ of everything Indigenous.

On returning from the break, we witnessed how racism is often played out when non-Indigenous people use an Indigenous person to amplify their voices in order to justify their own positionings. This was all based on the feelings of uncomfortability of a couple of non-Indigenous participants when the course content shifted to issues of racism and white privilege. We know that we cannot ignore racism and that it will not ‘just go away’. We also know that silencing racism enables whiteness and privilege to be sustained.

Many educators tend to silence race talk. This is most often motivated by the educators’ desires to ‘keep everyone happy’, ‘not offend anyone’ and protect students from ‘getting upset’ with the general belief that talking about race is too conflict-laden, tense and hurtful, and, more importantly, implies that one is racist (Castagno 2008). On a daily basis, we (the authors of this article) participate in race talk, whether it is in delivering education, managing racist practices, allegations of racist behaviours or in work meetings or conference environments. This everyday experience provides us (the authors) with significant exposure to the discourses and practices taken up in racial dialogues that function to support white domination and privilege—a ‘whiteness’ that is similarly identified by DiAngelo (2015).

DiAngelo (2015) explains how it is easy to be distracted by white participants who dominate or resist and many facilitators spend a lot of time and energy trying to reign in these participants. We consider it essential to challenge the “white silence in these racial discussions” (DiAngelo 2015, 1). Our experience, as educators and facilitators of conversations about race, has taught us that it is necessary to continue to engage in the dialogue and keep it moving, even when participants are uncomfortable. We persisted in drawing the silent participants into conversation through inviting them to comment or asking them for their thoughts or responses to activities. We continued to reassure participants that we are in a safe space to have these conversations. We are reassured by DiAngelo (2015, 1) who states, “going against one’s ‘grain’ for engagement, while difficult, is necessary and will result in the least harmful and most authentic and rewarding engagement”.

If we had been less experienced facilitators, we may have found the behaviours and situation confronting and problematic in terms of managing the room. Some behaviours could be observed as trying to intimidate us. Based on our previous experience, we knew we had to push on and deal with it in our debriefing session at the end of the day. We also knew we needed to work with Indigenous participants who had unknowingly been co-opted into supporting white fragility (DiAngelo 2011) and white privilege (Frankenberg 1993; McIntosh 1988; Moreton-Robinson 2004; Nicholl 2004; Sullivan 2006; Wellman, 1993) over and above addressing issues of racism as they impact on Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples and ensure that the participant was personally okay and understood the situation they had been placed in. This is the hidden nature of many ‘whiteness’ issues. In Australia, the nature of whiteness is connected to the fact that non-Indigenous understandings and practices have historically constituted the social and cultural mainstream of Australian society. We raised a point to the group that learning about Indigenous culture and cultural competency is not always about only hearing the ‘happy
stories’. This also raises the concern that many non-Indigenous people embrace learning about Indigenous content and perspectives, but often only on their terms.

As the day went on, the questions asked by participants in their small groups or in the larger forum and the casual conversations over refreshment breaks were insightful and demonstrated positionality in relation to where participants were placed in understanding themselves and issues of race, racism, privilege, whiteness and more. For example, one participant wondered when we would be discussing ‘kinship systems’, while another wanted to discuss ‘little spirits’, and another, ‘rock art’. Others wanted to know when they could refer to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people as ‘black’ or ‘blacks’ and not Indigenous peoples, and when could people identify as being Indigenous and when they could not. Others wanted to talk about their personal experiences with Aboriginality, including disclosing that they had just found out that they have Aboriginal heritage.

We also needed to manage a range of emotions across the day, including people revealing that they felt like a veil was lifted on the truth and they were so happy that they attended the training. Others were pleased by our openness and others cried, expressing that they were not happy being accused of past events for which they are not responsible. We did not accuse anyone of carrying out past events, nor did we state that people should feel guilty. We cannot control other people’s emotions, nor are they our responsibility. Our view is that the feelings of some people had more to do with their own white fragility and protecting their own white privilege.

People cannot hide the facts and the reality of what happened in Australian history because some people might feel upset or uncomfortable. We made our intention clear, ‘up front’, that we were there to break ‘the great Australian silence’. Otherwise, what remains is a “cult of forgetfulness practised on a national scale” (Stanner 1968). We cannot not use the word ‘racism’ because people do not want to hear it. We cannot just tell the ‘nice’ stories that make people feel happy and ‘happy stories of diversity’, rather than unhappy stories of racism (Ahmed 2007,164, cited in Phillips 2015). That is, stories that focus on the nice or the happy and offer a pleasant form of cultural understanding and voyeurism to others.

In not mentioning the word ‘racism’ or not telling the stories of racism to simply appease others, we also fall victim to the insidious and subtle ways that racism occurs. In her forthcoming PhD thesis, Bargallie identifies that ‘racism’, as a word, is primarily absent in conversation with non-Indigenous work colleagues—it is often taboo, off limits or ‘never to be used’. The only talk is to be ‘happy talk’. This is backed up by the common mantra that ‘there are no racists here’ or ‘there is no racism here’. Bargallie argues that there is almost always the denial of racism or, furthermore, the denial of the denial of racism by non-Indigenous work colleagues if any conversation on racism is raised, racism is absent. However, this conflicts with the real everyday racism that is experienced by Indigenous employees. Bargallie (2015) argues that, in this way, “racism is both absent and present”. She explains that this is one element that signifies an “absent presence of racism” in the workplace (Bargallie 2015).

By the end of the day, we were exhausted. Emotions go both ways. We had both felt the waves of participant emotions hitting us through the training day, although Debbie had felt the full brunt. Sometimes they were soft, gentle waves and at other times hard and forceful waves of dislike and anger. There were numerous racist comments, denials and racial micro-aggressions from participants that resulted in a form of violence on the spirit, mind
and body. At one point, before dinner, Debbie described that her body felt like she was having a stroke. She was not, but she was emotionally and physically battered.

We decided to have a short break and reconvene later with two other people that we had asked to take notes and provide feedback to us on the day. We also had the evaluation forms from the course. Over dinner, we discussed the notes about the day, the evaluation forms and our feelings. The general feedback was very good. There were a few comments about the evaluation that we know people would be hesitant to say in person. There were also conflicting comments. For example, while the majority of people wrote that the facilitators were ‘passionate’, ‘articulate’, demonstrated ‘knowledge’ and dealt with issues, a couple wrote that they (we) were ‘aggressive’ or ‘angry’. We know that this is fairly standard feedback and that Aboriginal women are sometimes positioned as ‘aggressive’ and ‘angry’, rather than as ‘passionate’ and ‘articulate’ as non-Indigenous women and men are positioned. Audre Lorde (1984), Aileen Moreton-Robinson (2000), bell hooks (sic) (2000) and Bronwyn Fredericks (2010) have all written about the figure of the angry black woman, the angry woman of colour, the angry Indigenous woman, while Sara Ahmed (2008) describes this phenomena as a kind of feminist killjoy.

We were also given the feedback from many people who completed the face-to-face training that they wished it was longer than one day, despite having already argued that they needed one day from their other work duties to attend the training! Some were even told to see if they could leave the training early in the afternoon to get back to their desks. While others within the university, who had not completed the training, had an opinion about it; that it should be one day or shorter. We were advised that it would cost too much if everyone wanted to leave their work place for two days to attend the training.

Additionally, we received feedback that the course should not be as ‘difficult’. We were advised that we should in some way ‘dumb down’ our material. This was a shock for us and really offensive considering that it was developed and delivered from an Indigenous perspective in a higher education space. We were fairly certain that no-one ever questions whether occupational health and safety legislation, discrimination legislation or fire drill procedures are ever ‘dumbed down’ and/or not covered when offering training to staff. We questioned whether this was only because it was about Indigenous peoples or because we were not presenting the training from the dominant, Western worldview.

**Learnings from the course**

Offering this course from an Indigenous worldview and in a strengths-based model was always going to bring some critical feedback. The course also more than satisfied many of the participants who stated that it was different, refreshing and acted as an opening of thought for them. The evaluation that we achieved for this first course helped us to shape the course for future delivery. People really enjoyed the opportunity for interaction and discussion. It was identified that there was a need to compel the participants to take greater responsibility for their own learning and to do ‘more work’ through group work, conversation, critical thinking and analysis.

We realised from our own debriefing and the feedback that we need to clearly identify, in advance, that this is a learning journey. We also learnt, from the onset of the training, that we need to clearly articulate ‘our’ view of what Indigenous cultural competency is for the purpose of CQU so as to avoid any misunderstandings. Furthermore, we need to assert that participants will not be culturally competent from one day of training, regardless of the name ‘competency’ being in the course title.
Learning is an ongoing process and participants are on the journey of becoming competent. We identified a need to give some form of resource to take home for follow-up because it is impossible to cover all of what we consider to be relevant in one day. We made the decision to purchase copies of the book *Indigenous Australia for Dummies* (Behrendt 2010) as take-away resource for each participant. This was gratefully received by participants of the following courses and confirmed our decision, based on the evaluation of the first course. The evaluation of the first course enabled us to produce a strong ‘Indigenous cultural competency’ course that has had overwhelmingly successful reviews, as well as participants sending ‘thank you’ emails and posting messages on social media (Stokes 2015).

**Conclusion**

The CQU Indigenous Cultural Competency course that we developed and delivered was based on evidence grounded in 40 years of practice by others’ and our own experiences. It achieved its desired outcome: It brought together Indigenous and non-Indigenous people at CQU to share and talk, not just about culture, but about history, race, colonisation and the future. We knew, based on the evidence and what CQU proposed through its Reconciliation Statement (2001) and proposed Reconciliation Action Plan, that we had to offer an opportunity for course participants to challenge thinking and behaviours; reflect on their own cultural identity, privilege, attitudes, prejudices and propensity to stereotype; challenge racism; and promote anti-racism practices.

The course did reveal tensions and difficulties. We are proud of our colleagues for enrolling in the course, sticking with it and making the effort to work through issues. We know it enabled degrees of personal transformation (Kelly 2013; Young 1999). We also know that it has the capacity to develop and build tangible skills and strategies for CQU’s staff that will greatly contribute to the future success of the organisation, as well as the future of the broader communities that the university serves. In the development and delivery of the course, the facilitators and participants were co-creators in the process of change within our university environment. It is ‘in the doing’ that change occurs and it is ‘in the doing’ that the words ‘cultural competency’ and ‘reconciliation’ have meaning. In this, we believe that we have made a difference and have identified ‘Which Way’ in relation to culture and race in teaching Indigenous cultural competency training courses for transforming higher educational institutions.
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