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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report was requested by the Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation Division of the South Australian Government (AARD). AARD currently has a non-accredited three day introductory workshop that trains Aboriginal people in the general notion of western heritage and heritage management concepts and conventions. Although the teaching content within this training program has been continuously reviewed, the structure of this course has the possibility to evolve. Therefore this report contains the results of a critical analysis of a selection of known heritage training programs for Aboriginal people offered in Australia. The aims of this project were to identify the aspects of these programs which are successful in order to develop potential options and directions for improving the current AARD heritage training program.

To discover what programs for training Aboriginal people in matters of heritage are available in Australia, internet searches using general search engines and state websites was undertaken in conjunction with consultation with heritage professionals. Due to confidentiality issues, particularly in the private sector, only an additional two programs were identified and willing to contribute to the project. The three organisations, with heritage training programs for Aboriginal people and willing to participate in this project were from Aboriginal Affairs Victoria (AAV), the Australian Heritage Council (AHC) and Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation Division South Australia (AARD).

These three programs were critically analysed with a focus the aims, method of delivery and outcomes. The purpose was to identify complimentary concepts from the AAV and AHC programs to address the limitations of AARD’s program. Concepts that were utilised in the formulation of AARDs options of improvement are;

- **AAV**
  - 2 Step process,
  - Designed for Aboriginal Participants, and
  - Accredited.

- **AHC**
  - 2 week intensive,
  - Real life setting,
  - Diverse background of participants,
  - Accredited,
  - Processes/steps towards study,
In response to the request from AARD, a proposed list of six options was developed. These options are to be used as a guideline to possible amendments to the program. Three key points were identified, the need to tailor the program to the Aboriginal participants, the need to include all stake holders as participants, and the need to develop the idea of reciprocal learning. These notions have been included within each option outlined within the results. The proposed options are:

- **Option 1**: 3 Day workshop
  - Introductory workshop
  - Improvement in resources
  - Improvements in language in delivery
  - Additional resource

- **Option 2**: 4 day workshop
  - Introductory workshop
  - Improvement in resources
  - Improvements in language in delivery
  - Additional resource
  - Elder teaching day
  - More in depth topics cover

- **Option 3**: workshop → follow up consultation
  - Improved introductory workshop
  - Questions and queries addressed
  - Support/Help

- **Option 4**: workshop → follow up workshop
  - Improved introductory workshop
  - Revision/review of initial workshop
  - Questions/problems addressed
  - More in depth on some issues

- **Option 5**: workshop → follow up 2 week course
  - Improved introductory workshop
  - 2 week intensive
  - Real life setting
  - More in-depth
  - Accredited

- **Option 6**: Workshop → 2 week intensive → Tafe course
  - Improved introductory workshop
  - 2 week intensive
  - Cultural Heritage Management TAFE or uni course
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1. INTRODUCTION

In the 1970s and 80s numerous Australian states passed Aboriginal heritage protection Acts to protect Aboriginal cultural and archaeological sites from deliberate destruction. In South Australia, the *Aboriginal Heritage Act 1988* (the Act) was passed following the identification that previous Acts were not adequately protecting and preserving the State’s Aboriginal heritage. It did this by making it a crime to destroy any cultural material or sites ‘that are of significance according to Aboriginal tradition, or that are of significance to Aboriginal archaeology, anthropology or history’ (Article 3 and Article 23).

In response to the introduction of the Act in 1988, the Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation Division (AARD) in the Department and Cabinet of the South Australian Government was established. AARD is the primary agency responsible for Aboriginal affairs within South Australia. AARD has a large portfolio and its responsibilities cover:

- providing leadership in Aboriginal policy and program development
- developing, coordinating and implementing policies for Aboriginal affairs
- monitoring the impact of government services on the wellbeing of Aboriginal families and communities in South Australia
- protecting and preserving Aboriginal heritage and culture
- facilitating community development initiatives
- providing and maintaining essential services and infrastructure on Aboriginal Land Holding communities
- supporting the State's Aboriginal Landholding Authorities
- leading and contributing to special government and strategic intervention projects.

(Department of Premier and Cabinet 2003)

One of the ways that AARD addresses these responsibilities is through a heritage training course for Aboriginal people.
The original workshop offered by AARD evolved out of the Native Title System and how this system works in Australia in 2006. It was developed as a response to Indigenous land use negotiations of the Riverland area of South Australia. Lawyers for the Indigenous community involved in these proceedings requested that the community have access to a program that would train individuals on the procedures and concepts of heritage, heritage management and site identification. Although the teaching content within this training program has been continuously reviewed, the structure of this course has the possibility to evolve. This paper is a critical analysis of a selection of known heritage training programs for Aboriginal people offered in Australia. The analysis seeks to identify the aspects of these programs which are successful in order to develop potential options for improving the current AARD heritage training program.

2. HISTORY OF HERITAGE TRAINING IN AUSTRALIA

The Assimilation Policies of the late 1930s were based on the practice where Aboriginal people would undergo instruction on ‘white’ Australian practices and societal norms to be fit to be a member of Australian society (Bennett 1999:59). The practice and utilisation of this policy carried through until the late 1960s in most states, and well into the 1980’s in Queensland (Bennett 1999: 60). This theory of making them like us is also represented in the environment of Aboriginal inclusion in the management of Aboriginal heritage of that era. There was very little inclusion or recognition within legislations and policies that there was a link or connection between living Aboriginal communities and Aboriginal archaeology (Sullivan et al. 2008: 1). Langford (1983:2), when discussing the role of archaeology in the past and future of Aboriginal heritage management stated that ‘there can be no doubt that your science or archaeology is white organised, white dominated, and draws its values and techniques from European and Anglo-American culture...’. This statement is further emphasised by the fact that until the 1970s Aboriginal relics were protected only for their scientific and research potential (Sullivan 1996: 3).

During the 1970s the political climate began to change and with it the paradigm of heritage began to evolve (Bennett, 1999:60; Sullivan et al. 2008: 1). The adoption of ‘self-determination’ for Aboriginal policies in 1971 meant that Aboriginal people were able to
‘decide the pace and nature of their future development’ by taking a ‘real and effective responsibility for their own affairs’ (Cavanagh 1974: 12). This was represented in the heritage sector through the move towards involving Aboriginal people in the inclusion within the management of their own heritage. The Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies were exemplary in this paradigm change. Originally the aims of this institute were conservation of sites based on the archaeological and research significance of a site. However, in the mid 1970s, the institute began to sponsor the protection of sites on the basis of Aboriginal significance (Sullivan et al. 2008: 1). Further movements towards the inclusion of Aboriginal people in the management and study of Aboriginal heritage was the concept and practice of recommended and sometimes mandatory consultation of Aboriginal representatives in the processes of research. However, this view and stance has sometimes been perceived as being a token inclusion and there is now a movement towards ‘self empowerment’ (Bennett 1999: 63; Langford 1983: 3).

Once again the paradigm of heritage management altered and shifted. There was a movement not only to include Aboriginal people in the process of significance assessment and consultations but for the Aboriginal communities to be involved in the processes of management. This movement coincides with the introduction of Native Title legislations and self empowerment policies of the 1980s. The policy of self empowerment ‘enables Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders to have a real ownership of (their) programs thereby engendering a greater sense of responsibility and independence...’ (Herron 1999). Therefore, reflecting these self empowerment policies, Aboriginal heritage was deemed to be owned by the Aboriginal communities. This custodianship of heritage, however, has been fraught with difficulties (Sullivan 1996:2; Sullivan et al. 2008).

To assist Aboriginal communities in managing and asserting custodianship of their heritage there was a movement towards encouraging Aboriginal people to undertake formal training in cultural heritage management. Aboriginal people were encouraged to attend university courses in relation to heritage and the management of heritage. Upcher, in 1996 (62), wrote a cautionary tale on the incorporation of Aboriginal people into an education system that is not designed for Aboriginal people and is dominated by western viewpoints on heritage. Heavy dependency on formal literacy skills, educational disadvantages, non- Aboriginal
lecturing staff, and Aboriginal perspectives noted but not included in the teaching, are all areas that Upcher thought to be insufficient and detrimental to the training of Aboriginal people in cultural heritage management (Upcher 1996: 62).

Failures and limitations identified in early attempts to include Aboriginal participation within tertiary studies of cultural heritage management have led to suggestions that, instead of adapting people for a course, the course should be tailored and designed to match the people (Morrissey 1984:228). This has been extended and incorporated into the designing and delivery of heritage training courses for Aboriginal people. Since the late 1990’s there has been a movement toward designing programs in teaching Aboriginal people in matters of heritage whilst acknowledging and including the different views that Aboriginal people have on heritage (Sullivan 1996: 1). Furthermore, these programs have been designed to be delivered in a fashion that is relevant to the Aboriginal participants. The need for this shift from us teaching them was indicated as early as 1980s with Langford stating (1983:2) ‘...and we are not sure that training Aborigines within a white value science is desirable’. However, though identified as an issue in the 1980s it is still a prevalent issue in today’s paradigm of Aboriginal people and heritage training.

Currently, there is a Commonwealth study being conducted on the relevance, delivery and availability of heritage training courses across Australia. Stepwise Heritage and Tourism Pty, Ltd have been contracted by the Department of Environment, Water, Heritage and Arts (DEWHA) to undertake a training needs analysis for cultural heritage management training for Indigenous land and sea managers (Hall et al. 2010:2). The DEWHA aims to more accurately understand the needs of Aboriginal groups in relation to cultural heritage management training in order to plan for the future training needs of these groups (Hall et al. 2010: 2). Optimistically, this study may identify areas of weakness. Furthermore, the Stepwise project and the requests for the critical analysis of AARD’s training program may identify a new shift in the heritage paradigm possibly identifying that there is a need for Aboriginal people to have an understanding of the processes of western heritage management and that there is a need for western heritage managers to develop an understanding of Aboriginal perspectives and concepts of heritage and its management.
3. METHODS

To discover what programs for training Aboriginal people in matters of heritage are available in Australia, an internet search using general search engines was undertaken in conjunction with searches on state and federal government websites. Preliminary research identified that there appears to be very few programs currently available. However, a program in Victoria was identified and a mention of Sharon Sullivan being linked to training programs on heritage was acknowledged.

Sharon Sullivan was contacted to help identify some heritage training programs within Australia. Sullivan confirmed that there appears to be a lack of such programs offered and currently there is a Commonwealth Government sponsored project being undertaken to review current programs to determine what was available and whether such programs could be improved through a national training program. This project is being headed by a consulting firm Stepwise (Sullivan 2010 pers. comm., 27 May). Nick Hall from Stepwise was contacted, and although their research is in preliminary stages, they have identified and can confirm that there is a significant absence of programs offered within Australia’s Governmental bodies (Hall 2010 pers. comm., 29 May). Hall noted that there are programs within the private sector, such as mining, that do offer either a basic training program or on the job training.

The companies contacted within the private sector have not been responsive to email requests. This lack of response may indicate an unwillingness to participate or contribute in this study. Due to time constraints for this project, only programs that were willing to participate with information exchange and interviews were used. The three organisations, with heritage training programs for Aboriginal people and willing to participate in this project were from Aboriginal Affairs Victoria (AAV), the Australian Heritage Council (AHC) and Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation Division South Australia (AARD).

To help determine what aspects of the AARD program had limitation Birt provided feedback forms from previous training programs. Permission was sought and given to use the information and personal views expressed within these resources. However, the use of names to identify personal view points was not required or sought for it was not necessary for this report.
3.1 Aboriginal Affairs Victoria (AAV)

Through internet searches on general search engines and on the Aboriginal Affairs Victoria website, two pamphlets and contact information for the training course were discovered. One pamphlet was an overview of the course and the other a course outline. Natalie Paynter was the contact used for this project as the representative of the AAV. Information was gathered from Paynter through email exchange and telephone interviews.

3.2 Australian Heritage Council (AHC)

Information on the AHC model for teaching Aboriginal people about heritage was collected mainly via phone interviews. Interviews with Sharon Sullivan and Nick Hall, co-ordinators of the program, were undertaken over the phone. Other then the interviews, one article ‘Learning to walk together and work together : providing a formative teaching experience for Indigenous and non-Indigenous heritage managers’ by Sullivan, S., Hall, N., and Greer, S. (2008) was utilised and course information from James Cook University was extracted from this institution’s website.

3.3 Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation Division, South Australia

Information on the South Australian model for heritage training for Aboriginal people was gathered from the archives, interviews and email exchange. Peter Birt was the contact representing the AARD program. Current training resources, including resource booklets and PowerPoint presentation, were provided by Birt. Furthermore, he provided archived comments and feedback forms collected on previous training workshops. Birt was also interviewed on past and current training workshops, their aims, methods of teaching, outcomes, logistics and any problems perceived within the program. Furthermore, Birt was consulted for feedback and input during the process of analysing the program, as well as in the formation of future AARD workshop options.
4. RESULTS

4.1 Aboriginal Affairs Victoria- Past and Present- Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Management Training Program (AAV Program)

4.1.1 Providers

Aboriginal Affairs Victoria (AAV) of the Department of Planning and Community Development, in partnership with La Trobe University, has developed a two stage program for the training of Aboriginal people in heritage management. The program is titled the Past and Present- Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Management Training Program of Victoria (AAV Program) and was developed as a requirement of the Aboriginal Heritage Act 2006 (Paynter 2010 Pers. comm., 19 May). The first stage, the Workshop, of the AAV Program is developed and executed by both contributing parties (La Trobe 2010: 2; Paynter 2010, pers. comm., 19 May). The second stage, Certificate IV, was developed by both parties, however is only offered by enrolment at the La Trobe University (La Trobe 2010 3; Paynter, 2010, pers. comm., 19 May).

4.1.2 Overview

The AAV Program is a two stage program for the training of Aboriginal people in heritage management (La Trobe 2010:1; Paynter 2010, pers. comm., 19 May). The first step is an introductory three day workshop (Workshop)(La Trobe 2010:1-2; Paynter 2010, pers. comm., 19 May). This workshop is a non accredited workshop that is offered in two locations a year, one in the metropolitan area of Melbourne and another in a regional setting (Paynter 2010, pers. comm., 19 May). This is to broaden the reach of the program (Paynter 2010, pers. comm., 17 May). On completion of the introductory workshop, participants have the option of applying to continue studying through the Certificate IV in Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Management (Certificate IV). This Certificate IV is a Tafe course offered through La Trobe University in conjunction with the Department of Aboriginal Affairs Victoria.

Both the Workshop and the Certificate IV are funded by the Department of Aboriginal Affairs Victoria. This funding covers all costs associated with the Workshop and the course costs involved with the Certificate IV. Most students are eligible for Abstudy during their
study to cover living expense whilst undertaking the Certificate IV. (Paynter 2010, pers. comm., 19 May).

4.1.3 Participants

The AAV Program is open to;

• Registered Aboriginal Parties (RAP),
• unsuccessful RAP applicants,
• Traditional Owners,
• Aboriginal people working in government and council agencies involved in heritage,
• Aboriginal people interested in working in the heritage sector,
• Aboriginal Elders and Aboriginal people working in the private heritage sector (La Trobe 2010: 4; Paynter 2010, pers. comm., 19 May).

Over the two previously offered Workshops there have been a total of 55 participants. The Workshop is under the supervision and instruction of one lead/ head facilitator. There are approximately ten trainers from AAV and La Trobe University who support the head facilitator (Paynter 2010, Pers. comm., 19 May).

So far, there have been eighteen participants from the two Workshops (that have been offered) who have continued on to participate in the Certificate IV. The only pre-requisite for the Certificate was the completion of the Workshop. Individuals interested in participating in the Certificate IV applied through Aboriginal Affairs division of the Department of Planning and Community Development. However, due to funding restrictions, not everyone was accepted for the course (Paynter 2010, Pers. comm., 19 May).

4.1.4 Frequency

This is the third year of the AAV Program and there are no participants who have completed the whole program. This is because the completion of the first Certificate IV is not expected until August 2010. There have been two Workshops offered so far. The plan is to have two Workshops and run one Certificate per annum (Paynter 2010, Pers. comm., 19 May).
4.1.5 Aims

This heritage program is linked to the current legislation for Aboriginal heritage management in Victoria, *Aboriginal Heritage Act* 2006, and its primary aim is to ensure that the Aboriginal community can participate in the carrying out of functions and requirements stipulated by this Act (La Trobe 2010: 1; Paynter 2010, Pers. Comm., 19 May). As a side benefit, the program can provide pathways to tertiary studies and increase employment opportunities for Aboriginal people (Paynter 2010, Pers. comm., 19 May).

4.1.6 Methods of delivery and course content

The Introductory three day Workshop is offered as a full residential. The three days are a combination of classroom and field based activities (La Trobe 2010: 4). This is designed as a “taste of cultural heritage management” (Paynter 2010, Pers. comm., 19 May). Both the first day and third day cover topics of cultural heritage concepts, practices, motives and outcomes, working with the *Aboriginal Heritage Act* 2006 roles and responsibilities, and cultural heritage management plans through classroom activities. Site visits during the second day facilitate practical artefact identification, site classification, site recording and management. During the last day (third day), participants are advised what employment opportunities there are and particular emphasis is paid to the potential for participants to further their training by undertaking the Certificate IV course. A certificate of participation is presented to all of the participants on completion (La Trobe 2010: 2; Paynter 2010, Pers. Comm., 19 May).

The Certificate IV course is conducted over one year in ten, one week intensive residential blocks. The location of the residential blocks is different every time and situated on country across Victoria (Paynter 2010, pers. comm., 19 May). It builds on the knowledge and skills learnt at three day introductory workshop (La Trobe 2010: 3). The core competencies covered in this course as outlined in the course overview are;

- Work effectively in the cultural heritage management industry
- Investigate cultural heritage landscapes and environments
- Analyse and interpret cultural materials
- Manage the discovery of human skeletal remains
• Review assessments for legislative compliance
• Deal with conflict
• Develop conservation strategies for cultural resources
• Devise and conduct community consultation
• Conduct field research into natural and cultural resources
• Inspect and monitor cultural places
• Operate in remote isolated situations
• Follow OH&S procedures
• Read and interpret maps
• Apply first aid
• Work in an Indigenous community organisation (La Trobe, 2010:1 and 3).

These core areas are built to provide the students with a well rounded heritage background, allowing them to be involved in, and contribute to, the wider heritage community (La Trobe 2010: 2). On completion of this two stage course, participants graduate with a nationally accredited qualification. This will provide the participants with a qualification to enter into the work force or to further their education in a university course and will give them advanced standing for the first year of an Archaeology course such as the Bachelor of Arts or Archaeology at La Trobe University (La Trobe 2010: 2).

4.1.7 Outcomes

So far there have been no participants completing the Certificate IV. However, there are 18 expected to finish in August this year (Paynter 2010, pers. comm., 19 May). The program as a whole has contributed to the evolution of the heritage industry of Victoria. The private sector of the heritage industry has employed some of the participants of the program and others participants are supported during the Certificate IV course both financially and academically (Paynter 2010, pers. comm., 19 May).

4.1.8 Problems identified within this program

The program is still in its infancy and it is, thus, difficult to identify if there are any problems with the theoretical underpinning of the program, as no one has completed both stages. Currently the only problem that has been identified is a funding issue. Twenty-nine
Aboriginal individuals applied to continue into the second stage of the program, The Certificate IV course, and there was funding for only nineteen. Originally, there was only funding for fourteen participants and it was pushed out to the larger number. Additional funding is obviously required for the program so that participants who have elected to proceed to the second stage Certificate IV can be supported. (Paynter 2010, pers. comm., 19 May)

4.2 Australian Heritage Commission and James Cook University- **Heritage Management Training Course** (AHC Program)

4.2.1 Providers

Professor Sharon Sullivan from James Cook University (JCU), Nicholas Hall, then from Charles Sturt University, and Dr Shelly Greer from JCU, in collaboration with the Australian Heritage Council, formulated and coordinated the AHC-JCU Heritage Management Training Course. This course was provided in conjunction with the Aboriginal community, Aboriginal Elders and other stakeholders of the area(s) in which the course is delivered. The AHC Program was incorporated into the Masters and Certificate of cultural heritage management at the JCU and university teaching staff help with the delivery of the course. (Sullivan et al. 2008: 4)

4.2.2 Overview

The AHC Program is a two week intensive conducted in a ‘real life’ setting on a real site. Four major programs have been administered, two in Queensland and two in the Northern Territory. The first course was instigated in 1994 in Carnarvon Gorge in Central QLD, the last in 2002 (Sullivan et al. 2008: 4). This Program was developed in response to short comings in the training of Aboriginal people in the concepts and practices of western cultural heritage management. The course was included within postgraduate programs in cultural heritage management (Sullivan 2010 pers. comm., 27 May). However, due to financial cut backs, the postgraduate programs in cultural heritage management and the AHC Program are no longer offered (Sullivan 2010 pers. comm., 27 May). Nevertheless, there are plans for future employment of this program (Sullivan 2010 pers. comm., 27 May). Although this course is
no longer offered, it is included in this analysis as it provides a unique example of heritage training.

4.2.3 Participants

Participants of this program have come from a diverse background and incorporate both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal individuals. Participants include;

- Aboriginal site officers or persons nominated by Aboriginal communities throughout Australia,
- Postgraduate students from the disciplines of anthropology, archaeology and cultural heritage management from JCU,
- Young anthropologists, archaeologists and cultural heritage managers newly employed in government agencies,
- Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal community leaders,
- Stakeholders, such as National Parks, land owners, local government and community associations etc, and
- Teaching staff from JCU and the AHC (Sullivan et al. 2008: 3-4).

The course is offered to all Aboriginal communities across Australia. Invitations for Aboriginal people were provided through Aboriginal networks, regional associations and state agencies. Facilitators also contact potential students through professional networks and word of mouth.

4.2.4 Aims

The advent of this training program was a response to issues of difficulty that Aboriginal communities still have in caring for their heritage and asserting custodianship of their heritage. Sullivan et al. (2008: 2) identified these issues and set out to provide a training program that could address these issues. These issues are:

- There is little training available in Australia for Aboriginal communities to assist them to carry out heritage management on their own heritage,
- There is a lack of effective communication between Archaeologists/ Cultural Heritage Managers and Aboriginal communities and people, and
• Traditional modes of education and training for archaeology, anthropology and cultural heritage management are often inaccessible and inappropriate for Aboriginal people (Sullivan et al. 2008: 3).

This program aims to train Aboriginal site officers, archaeological graduates and young cultural heritage managers in a real life setting. The above issues are addressed through providing Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal participants with basic concepts and principles of cultural heritage management tailored with relevance to concerns and aspirations of the local participating community. Essentially, once participants are given basic heritage management training, they are asked to solve practical and political problems of site management with the use of local examples, where available (Sullivan et al. 2008: 3).

4.2.5 Methods of delivery and content covered

The course is offered over a two week residential. The methodologies were developed and based on the principles and essential logic of the Burra Charter. All participants work through the process of developing an outline heritage management plan. This is undertaken on a site that has been selected and determined appropriate by the facilitators, community leaders and relevant stakeholders prior to the residential block. The course is executed on site as a collection of informal lectures, research and practical work. The heritage management plan is undertaken through a step by step process. A topic is introduced and then an informal lecture with examples from across Australia and overseas is presented. Participants then undertake this element on the previously selected site. The results of each stage were analysed and discussed within the whole group including the students, the facilitators, community representatives, community Elders and stake holders. A consensus would be reached on each topic before another topic was introduced and acted on. Some areas that were covered are;

• background research,
• basic site observations,
• appropriate methods of consultation with traditional owners and stakeholders,
• identification of all elements of the sites cultural significance-significance assessment,
• physical condition assessment,
• development of realistic solutions to problems and issues,
• Conservation and management issues, and
• Technical and policy issues (Sullivan et al. 2008: 4-5).

At the end of the two week course, the different elements of each stage were pulled together to form key components of a heritage management plan. This heritage plan would then be formally presented to the community and stakeholders (Sullivan et al. 2008: 7).

Throughout the two weeks, participants work in groups of five to six. The groups are deliberately constructed to represent different skill levels, prior experience, gender and cultural affiliations. The young archaeologists, cultural heritage managers and postgraduate students put an emphasis on the presentation and production of a good professional-looking report. However, Aboriginal community participants and site officers tend to contribute with their integrated heritage values and their role as a member of an Aboriginal community. They pay more attention to the decision making and are more sensitive and understanding of the social complexity of some situations. Every participant in this training program plays an essential role in the evolution of other participants, understanding of heritage concepts and processes from the aspect or paradigm of the other contributing participants (Sullivan et al. 2008: 4).

An important contribution to this course was the role of the Aboriginal Elders. They were treated as teacher, client and, where appropriate, student. This enabled a very crucial element of the program to be addressed and that is the importance of working within the community’s traditions (Sullivan et al. 2008: 5).

4.2.6 Outcomes

There have been many outcomes in the participation in the AHC Program;

• Dialogue and communication has increased between all stakeholders involved in a heritage site,
• Stronger engagements have been negotiated between Aboriginal traditional managers and park managers,
• The running of these AHC Programs has led to developments such as the Anangu controlled and staffed cultural heritage plan and unit in the Uluru- Kata Tjuta Park,
• Participants have returned to their respective communities and have used a range of simple principles and techniques that were learnt during the AHC Program,
• The course demystified the process and content of preparing and understanding a heritage management plan, and
• Many of the Aboriginal participants have gained confidence in their own ability through the course and use this experience as a first step in acquiring tertiary qualifications in cultural heritage management (Sullivan et al. 2008:4 and 7; Sullivan 2010 pers. comm., 27 May).

4.2.7 Problems identified within this program

The only evident hurdles within this program are associated with logistics. First, the need for considerable funding has led to the cancellation of the course and program. Secondly, there is a need for thoughtful preparation, as well as coordination, with the willing and suitable community group. Lastly, due to the ‘real life’ setting, there is potential for conflict and episodes of high drama, particularly in issues of cross-cultural and cross-gender communication (Sullivan 2010 pers. comm., 27 May).

4.3 Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation Unit- Heritage Site Recording and Conservation Workshop (AARD Program)

4.3.1 Providers

The AARD of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet of South Australia developed and coordinated the execution of the AARD Program. AARD contracts the Department of Archaeology at the Flinders University to manage and undertake training programs throughout South Australia. The university provides staff and high grading students for teaching and support during the three day workshop which is run within the selected Aboriginal community’s region (Birt 2010 pers. comm., 17 May).

4.3.2 Overview

The AARD Program is an on country experience that encourages and trains Aboriginal people in the general notion of western heritage and heritage management concepts and conventions. Importantly, this program is set in a relaxed atmosphere and encourages Aboriginal people from all walks of life to be involved and contribute in the learning and
teaching. While it is not an accredited course, certificates of attendance are handed out at the conclusion of the workshops.

This program was first presented to the Aboriginal community of the Riverland region of South Australia in August of 2006. Since its establishment there have been 13 training programs with the last in May of 2010 on country at Point Pearce, York Peninsula, South Australia. Flinders University have been involved since 2007 and are currently still a crucial part of the teaching team. The number of courses offered by AARD is determined by two primary factors. Firstly, Aboriginal communities need to show an interest and have the ability to congregate together. Secondly, funding availability determines the ability and frequency of the delivery of the program. AARD is the sole financial contributor for the program and must cover accommodation, transport, catering and other associated expenses. If the accumulation of expenses from one program is more expensive due to location, housing, participant numbers, catering etc, these expenses can then prevent further or more frequent opportunities to offer the program during the remaining financial year. Furthermore, as the training programs are only a small part of AARD portfolio responsibilities, time and staffing restraints can also affect the frequency of the programs. While the programs are only three days, each program can take a large portion of time, from the limited AARD staff, to organise (Birt 2010 pers. comm., 17 May).

4.3.3 Participants

The organisers and providers of the heritage training program are a combination of AARD staff, Flinders University staff and Flinders University students. While the program is delivered by these organisations, it is the chair person of the heritage/ Native Title representative group who selects the Aboriginal participants who will be attending. These typically include a well rounded collection of community members including;

- Elders,
- members of the heritage/ Native title group,
- interested parties, and
- members of the younger generation.
Usually the training program groups consist of approximately 12 community members. However, there have been programs with participant numbers reaching as high as 23. No matter the number, the facilitators endeavour to keep the ratio of participants to facilitators low at around 1:3. This ensures the teaching environment is suitable for a personal style of information exchange (Birt 2010 pers. comm., 17 May).

4.3.4 History of program

The original workshop offered by AARD evolved out of the Native Title System and how this system works in Australia. It was developed as a response to Indigenous land use negotiations of the Riverland area of South Australia. Lawyers for the Indigenous community involved in these proceedings requested that the community have access to a program that would train individuals on the procedures and concepts of heritage, heritage management and site identification. Following this native title request, the original training program was developed under the instruction of David Baker, Manager of Aboriginal Heritage Branch Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation Division, by staff at AARD. Due to the time frame requested during the Native Title procedures, the original AARD Program quickly collaborated. This program was originally a draft and there were plans to edit and update the program once the initial training request by the Riverland case was satisfied. However, since its initiation in 2006 there has been no significant or substantial review or update to structure and framework of the course (Birt 2010 pers. comm., 17 May).

To help in the formulation and the teaching of the program Flinders University was contracted to give advice and help. The involvement of Flinders University in this program has continued into the present. During the initial involvement of Flinders University there was a three tiered program postulated. This would have involved the introductory workshop as the first stage, followed by a second workshop that would be used as advanced standing into a short course at Flinders University. This was a sound arrangement, unfortunately, due to restraints and circumstance within AARD this plan never eventuated (Burke 2010 pers. comm., 15 November)
4.3.5 Aims

The aims for this program have been developed, and will continue to evolve and reflect the political and social environment. Originally the aims were formulated from a combination of what the Aboriginal community had requested through the Native Title procedures and the opinion of the then current manager of AARD. Both parties identified the need to get the Aboriginal community involved in on site heritage management and AARD wanted to increase the production of site card submissions. Site cards are a form used to gather information for the South Australian Register for Aboriginal Sites. Therefore, the aim was to increase the number of Aboriginal sites identified and recorded on the Register (Birt 2010 pers. comm., 17 May).

Since then, however, the aims have evolved. It was noted by Peter Birt (2010) that the aims of this program can differ for each program delivered depending on the objectives that the participating communities and relevant government agencies decide on. The principal aims for the current training program are based on building a relationship between Aboriginal communities and the government based on respect and understanding through educating participants on methods to identify Aboriginal and historic heritage values. The program is premised on recognising the essential role Aboriginal people have in identifying their heritage and the potential contribution heritage assessment employment can have on community self-sufficiency. The training program is set in a relaxed atmosphere and aims to develop relationships between heritage professionals, government officials, Aboriginal elders and other members of the Aboriginal community (Birt 2010 pers. comm., 17 May).

Aim: reciprocal education exchange

The training program provides an environment where elders can form or strengthen relationships between other members of their community and heritage professionals, as well as government officials. All parties involved can benefit from building a positive working relationship between each other. Sometimes relationship barriers between participants exist due to previously badly managed consultations which have caused a now long standing conflict or disagreement between some of the parties. By building healthy relationships between all attending individuals, future consultation programs or heritage assessment projects are likely to be more harmonious and, thus, more effectively and efficiently completed (Birt 2010 pers. comm., 17 May).
Aim: self-sufficiency and inclusion

Another of the aims of this program is education and understanding. Once again the environment of the program is constructive towards a reciprocal education exchange. By no means is it a one way exchange system. The Aboriginal community learn both about their own culture from Aboriginal elders and about the western concepts of heritage, legislation and site identification from the heritage professionals and government officials. Likewise, the Aboriginal elders learn about western concepts and practices surrounding heritage and heritage management. Furthermore, Aboriginal elders learn about concerns and have the opportunity of dialogue with and from other members of the Aboriginal community. Likewise, and if not more importantly, are the understandings that the western participants can obtain about Indigenous concepts or paradigms involved in heritage significance, site identification and heritage management (Birt 2010 Pers. comm., 17 May).

The main aim from the perspective of the Aboriginal community members is the concept of self sufficiency and inclusion. The Aboriginal communities do not just want consultation form heritage managers in matters of their heritage but also to be included and responsible for their own heritage. Therefore, by attending the training program on site on community it enables them to be part of the learning/teaching program. Furthermore, the Aboriginal community aspire to take responsibility and ownership of identifying sites and filling site cards out for each recognised site (Birt 2010 pers. comm., 17 May).

4.3.6 Methods of delivery and content covered

The course is generally held over two to three days and is broken into two and sometimes three main components. The first component is classroom-based and includes the use of a resource booklet(s) and PowerPoint presentations on the topics of identifying, recording and conserving Aboriginal heritage sites. The second component of the training program includes onsite field based exercises to facilitate practical site identification, and recording. Usually these components are taken over a two day on country series of workshops. The elective third component is covered during an optional third day. This elective component is a PowerPoint presentation and associated resource booklet on the topic of site monitoring (Birt 2010 pers. comm., 17 May).
The initial step taken during the first day of the program are the introductions, welcome to country, acknowledgements, general house-keeping and an outline of occupation, health and safety issues (Birt 2010 pers. comm., 17 May). For the rest of the day there is a PowerPoint presentation with a supporting resource booklet covering issues of;

- Legislations: *Aboriginal Heritage Act 1988*
- Aims of the program
- Why should heritage sites be recorded
- Site recording: general equipment instructions
- Stone tool identification
- Aboriginal Heritage Branch site cards
- Site conservation planning
- Site condition cards. (Department of Premier and Cabinet 2003)

Importantly, these topics are discussed in relation to how this knowledge and information can benefit the community. However, it must be stated that this is a very general overview of the above mentioned topics. A more hands on learning and sharing of knowledge are embarked on the second day and during the second component of the course.

The second day entails the onsite field-based exercises. The main activity is filling out Aboriginal Heritage Branch Site cards. The participants go through a step by step process with help from the facilitators, of filling out the site card, seeing the physical aspects of what they learnt during the previous day’s activities. This activity is not solely organised for the learning of site card processes but also to facilitate a reciprocal learning environment where Aboriginal Elders can discuss Indigenous concepts of heritage, as well as teach younger generations about their history and stories. Whilst onsite and on country, often elders feel comfortable and inspired to share their knowledge. Furthermore, being on site encourages conversations between participants (Birt 2010 pers. comm., 17 May).

As an option, the Aboriginal community can choose to undertake a third day and third component to the program. This is a site monitoring workshop and is executed in a similar fashion to the first component of the program. It is based on a resource booklet and supported with a PowerPoint presentation. However, in many instances, if this option is
taken, the plan for a monitoring workshop is diverted and a second day on site is requested instead (Birt 2010 pers. comm., 17 May).

4.3.7 Outcomes

The outcomes from this program are to ensure that:

- An understanding of how Commonwealth and South Australian heritage protection Acts operate, particularly those involving Aboriginal heritage, and how these Acts can be utilised by the Aboriginal community.
- Relationships are built and renewed.
- The course provides an avenue to those interested in heritage management.
- Those who attend feel that they have obtained knowledge that will help in the future with understanding what heritage management is and the processes involved in heritage management. (Birt 2010 pers. comm., 17 May)

5. DISCUSSION

5.1 Limitations of the current AARD program

- **Lack of follow up program or consultation** - After the training program there is no follow up. Therefore any information or relationships built may be lost. Any questions to do with information learnt during the workshop cannot be addressed. Furthermore, this shows a lack of a support framework for Aboriginal people seeking to manage their own heritage. This lack of a support framework may cause the workshop to be perceived as a token gesture-i.e. That they go to the community and ‘train’ them in conceptual archaeology and heritage management but provide no long term practical support towards the application of the skills learnt. This need and want for follow up consultation or further workshops has been identified through widespread participant feedback (Barmera 2008; Raukkan 2009; Hawker 2006; Kingston 2009).

- **No provisions for further study** - this workshop is an introductory course. Although important to have an introductory course available for all Aboriginal people interested, there is a lack of available pathways for participants who are interested in
furthering their tertiary education. The course itself identifies a need for Aboriginal people to gain understanding of western concepts and processes in order to assert their custodianship over their heritage but does not provide them the means to do so.

- **Not recognised through accreditation** - therefore, the AARD Program is not recognised by the heritage industry. For Aboriginal people to have a definite stance in the management of their heritage and to have a real chance at working in the heritage industry on an equal level to western heritage managers there needs to be accreditation. Understandably, this is not a realistically available goal for introductory courses. However, if there are provisions, steps and support available for Aboriginal people to take part in an industry recognised accredited course, then this goal may become more accessible.

- **Language used in the resources and delivery of information can be inappropriate** - the introductory course is designed for Aboriginal participants with a diverse social and educational background. Therefore attention needs to be paid to the language used in the resources handed out and in the method of delivery (Barmera 2008). The resources provided are similar to resources used in university level courses. This may inhibit and even demoralise some of the participants. Furthermore, specific and detailed attention must be paid to the jargon used by the facilitators. This is a difficult idea to address as many individuals do not even realise the language they use can be alienating. However, there is a fine line between plain spoken terms and condescension.

- **Lack of inclusion of Aboriginal Elders and representatives as teachers** (Hawker 2006; Kingston 2009). One of the aims of AARD in this program is to have a two way exchange of knowledge. However, this is contradicted by the course framework, in which only western concepts and knowledge are addressed. If AARD truly desires a reciprocal arrangement, this needs to be addressed.

- **Develop the concept of reciprocal education** - reciprocal education is a central idea to AARD program. Although an environment is built within the course to support information exchange between all people involved, there is room for improvement.
This is important and may develop the concept of Aboriginal inclusion and custodianship in heritage within Australia. Furthermore, Aboriginal people can contribute to the cultural heritage arena with their knowledge in integrated heritage values and their role as a member of an Aboriginal community. If western heritage managers actively seek the ‘teachings’ of Aboriginal custodians it will in turn contribute to the improvement of the position and inclusion of Aboriginal people in Australian heritage. As Aboriginal people have a viewpoint and way of looking at heritage, that as westerners need Aboriginal guidance to recognise and or understand.

- **Develop the ability for relationship building**: Currently the DPC-AARD program included only Aboriginal community members, government officials and archaeology/cultural heritage professionals. There is room to develop the concept of relationship building within the program. This can be achieved through the inclusion of all stakeholders involved in heritage management. The development of understanding between each party and their position and perspectives will contribute to positive relationships. This in turn will allow for a more harmonious future address of heritage issues.

### 5.2 Concepts used in the development of the current AARD program

To develop the current AARD Program, concepts from the AAV and AHC programs have been drawn upon. These concepts have been used to address the limitations identified within the AARD program.

#### 5.2.1 Aboriginal Affairs Victoria

Three concepts from the AAV Program have been utilised. These are;

- **2 Step process**: This allows those that want to further their studies in cultural heritage management can do so with the support of AAV. It still offers an introductory course that can introduce Aboriginal people to the western concepts and practices of heritage management,

- **Designed for Aboriginal participants**: Both the introductory course and the Certificate IV are designed around the needs of the participant. This is significant as
it identifies that a course for Aboriginal people needs to be tailored and designed for the Aboriginal participant, and

- **Accredited**- the second part of the two-step program, the Certificate IV, is a Tafe accredited course.

### 5.2.2 Australian Heritage Council

For the case of strengthening and developing the current AARD Program six concepts from the AHC Program were highlighted and these are;

- **2 week intensive**- the length of this course enables more information to be taught and exchanged,

- **Real life setting**- this course is delivered on a real site, covering real issues and developing a real heritage plan. Furthermore it provides practical experience and lessons that cannot be obtain elsewhere,

- **Diverse background of participants**- importantly, participants of this course have come from a diverse cultural, social and educational background, which allows for a broader arena for relationship building,

- **Accredited**- which will enable the participant to be recognised in the heritage industry,

- **Processes/steps towards study**- the course can be used as advanced standing towards a degree, diploma or certificate studies in cultural heritage management or archaeology at JCU, and

- **Addresses strengths of all participants**- This program is an accredited part of a university course and associated with western concepts of education. However, it is designed to focus on the participants strengths. Therefore,
  
- the postgraduate students place emphasise on the presentation and production of a good professional looking report, and
- whilst the Aboriginal participants’ tend to contribute with their integrated heritage values and their role as a member of an Aboriginal community. They pay more attention to the decision making and are more sensitive and understanding of the social complexity of some situations.
Table 1 Concepts to be used in the development of AARD program:
From studied models; Aboriginal Affairs Victoria (AAV) and Australian Heritage Council (AHC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AAV</th>
<th>AHC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• 2 Step process</td>
<td>• 2 week intensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Designed for Aboriginal Participants</td>
<td>• Real life setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Accredited</td>
<td>• Diverse background of participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Accredited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Processes/steps towards study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Addresses strengths of all participants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3 Options for AARD

In response to the request from AARD, a proposed list of options for the improvement and extension of the current AARD Program has been formulated (see Table 1). All of these options should be made available to Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people. This will enable relationships to be developed between Aboriginal people and non-Aboriginal stakeholders such as land owners, professional archaeologists, cultural heritage managers, students in archaeology and cultural heritage managers etc. Moreover, the need for each step of the program to be designed and tailored for the Aboriginal participants is imperative. Furthermore, the idea of focusing on the strength of the participant is vital. This will allow for more participants to be included and perhaps empowered to undertake further study.

The proposed options are separated into three groups. The first group is composed of two options (Option 1 and Option 2) and are a revision and development of the already existing introductory workshop. Secondly, is a group of three options (Option3, Option 4 and Option5) that are based in a twostep process which involves a revised introductory workshop and an additional follow up stage. Lastly, the final group has only one option (Option 6). This option is based on a three tiered/staged process concept of an introductory workshop that leads onto a second preliminary stage and then onto a full tertiary course. All of these options are tiered, with the first (Option 1) being a necessity and least problematic to the last option (Option 6) the most ideal but most difficult to implement.
Table 2 Options for the improvement of current AARD Program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>OPTION</th>
<th>Key components</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Group 1 | Option 1- 3 Day workshop | Introductory workshop  
Improvement in resources  
Improvements in language in delivery  
Additional resource* |
| Group 1 | Option 2- 4 day workshop | Introductory workshop  
Improvement in resources  
Improvements in language in delivery  
Additional resource*  
Elder teaching day  
More in depth topics cover |
| Group 2 | Option 3- workshop → follow up consultation | Improved introductory workshop**  
Questions and queries addressed  
Support/Help |
| Group 2 | Option 4- workshop → follow up workshop | Improved introductory workshop**  
Revision/review of initial workshop  
Questions/ problems addressed  
More in depth on some issues |
| Group 2 | Option 5- workshop → follow up 2 week course | Improved introductory workshop**  
2 week intensive  
real life setting  
More in-depth  
Accredited |
| Group 3 | Option 6- Workshop → 2 week intensive → Tafe course | Improved introductory workshop**  
2 week intensive***  
CHM Tafe or uni course |

* Additional resource is one that is to be taken onsite by participants to help in future recording and information collection

** Improved introductory workshop is either Option 1 or Option 2

*** 2 week intensive is represented in Option 5

5.3.1 Group One

The options within this group are based on the already existing introductory workshop offered by AARD. What is proposed is a revision and revitalisation of the program. Both of the options within this group need improvement and attention paid to the language used in
the resource booklets, PowerPoint presentations and any interactions with the participants of the program. Furthermore, there is a need for an additional resource. This resource would be designed to be used after the workshop for the use on site by the participants. It should include a checklist of steps, processes, technologies and information to be gathered and used to successfully record a site. Also, it should be suitable to be easily carried and made in all weather material (eg laminated).

**Option 1**- is to keep the 2-3 day informal workshop with some proposed revisions;

- needs improvement within the resource booklets
  - Less writing and more pictures- it could be overwhelming,
  - Editing- the resources need editing to remove simple mistakes in information, consistency and grammar, and
  - Language- the course is offered to individuals from a diverse background socially and educationally. Therefore, particular attention needs to address the words and technical terms used.

- Language in delivery
  - As said previously the participants come from a diverse background, therefore, language used as well as the delivery of the course content needs to be tailored to the audience,
  - There is a need to keep it simple, and

- Lastly, an additional resource- this resource need to be included to insure the concepts taught during the course can be utilised on site. This resource is essentially a check list to assist in the collection of sufficient information needed to adequately record a site successfully.

**Option 2**- is a 4 day introductory workshop. Similarly to Option 1, this option builds on the current AARD program. However, it diverges from Option 1 with an addition of an extra day. This day will be used to;

- Facilitate an Aboriginal Elder teaching period- allowing for the reciprocal learning aim to be acted upon and formally included within the format of the course, and
• Provide more in depth and/ or broader topic range- the additional day would allow for some aspects within the current AARD program to be expanded or for new concepts to be added.

5.3.2 Group two

This group of proposed programs utilises the revised introductory workshops of Option 1 and Option 2 with an addition of a second step. This step can take the form of a consultation from heritage professionals or a second workshop or course. This will provide support to the the participant involved in the first There are three options within this group;

Option 3- Using either Option 1 or Option 2 for the first step of this two phase program will be elementary. The second phase or step will be a follow up to the introductory workshop (first step). It will take the form of an informal consultation from at least one heritage professional (second step) representing AARD. This follow up will allow for;

• Question and problems experienced by the participants in the first step, to be addressed; and
• Possibility for help to be given

Option 4- Like Option 3 the first step of this program is the revised introductory workshop. To insure that knowledge is not lost or forgotten a further follow up workshop should be offered. This workshop would be two to three days in length and will;

• Revise and review the course content of the first workshop;
• Some aspects from the course content of the first workshop can be elaborated with more in-depth consultation;
• Additional concepts, topics and notions may be introduced; and
• Questions and problems experienced in the utilisation of information from the first course would be addressed.

Option 5- Similarly to Option 3 and Option 4, this option uses the revised introductory workshop. It builds on the introductory workshop through introducing a follow up or continuation course. It would be based on the AHC Program. Therefore, it would be situated on a real site and for an intensive term of two weeks. This would provide;
• more in-depth analysis of the course contents;
• practical experience and lessons that cannot be obtain elsewhere;
• a taste of tertiary education;
• Furthermore, it would have the chance to be accredited; and
• Could be used towards a larger course offered through universities and Tafe.

5.3.3 Group three

This group incorporates parts from the two previous groups. It is a three stage program, which includes the revised introductory workshop (Option 1 or Option 2) followed by a 2 week intensive (Option 5) that would, for those participants interested, lead to a fully accredited course in heritage management.

Option 6- this option will provide a tailored program for the participants to further their tertiary education. It still includes the introductory course for a broader group of individuals. However, it has provisions to help and escort the interested parties to slowly prepare for the tertiary stage of the program and in turn, undertake a tertiary course. The last step within the program, the tertiary course, would be designed similarly to that of the AAV course. This course would preferably be offered through Tafe SA or Flinders University. This group consists of only one option.

6. CONCLUSION

The aim of this project was to analyse and consolidate known Aboriginal heritage training in Australia. Three programs were identified and critically analysed. However, it must be noted that some government agencies and/or private industries were unable to be contacted. Therefore, further research is required to determine whether any other programs could contribute to this analysis. Aspects from the programs analysed were used as a baseline for the review of AARD’s current Aboriginal training program.

In response to the request made by AARD, to provide options for the improvement of the current program offered at AARD, six options were developed. These options are to be used as a guideline to possible amendments to the program. Three key points were identified, the need to tailor the program to the Aboriginal participants, the need to include all stakeholders as participants, and the need to develop the idea of reciprocal learning. These
notions have been included within each option outlined within the results. Conceptually these notions could be used to change the paradigm of heritage. However, this theory has not been possible to address in detail within this report and therefore open a way for further study.
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