

Honoring Our Ancestors: Using Reconciliatory Pedagogy to Dismantle White Supremacy

Jennifer McCleary
Estelle Simard

Abstract: *The US social work profession has historically claimed primarily middle-class white women as the "founders" of the profession, including Jane Addams and Mary Richmond. Scholarship of the history of the profession has focused almost entirely on settlement houses, anti-poverty advocacy, and charity in the late 1800s in the northeastern United States as the groundwork of current social work practice. Courses in social work history socialize students into this historical framing of the profession and perpetuate a white supremacist narrative of white women as the primary doers of social justice work that colonizes the bodies and knowledge of Indigenous people and their helping systems. Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC) in the US have always had indigenous systems of social care. Yet, the social justice work of BIPOC, and especially Indigenous people in the US, is left out of the dominant narrative of the history of social work practice for several reasons including racism, colonialism, and white supremacy. In this paper the authors contribute to the critique of the role of white supremacy as a colonizing process in social work history narratives and discuss frameworks for decolonizing social work pedagogy through a reconciliatory practice that aims to dismantle white supremacy.*

Keywords: *Dismantling White supremacy, reconciliation, Indigenous knowledge, social work history*

"Colonization is a dehumanizing process for both the colonized and the colonizer"
(Stirling, 2015, p. 37)

Like any profession, social work in the United States has a series of origin stories that weave together a historical narrative of the birth of the profession during the Progressive Era (1890s to 1920s). So the story goes, white, middle class women like Jane Addams, Mary Richmond, and Ellen Gates Starr built settlement houses and charity organizations in Northeastern states and went for *friendly visits* among neighbors to address issues of poverty and to advocate for immigrant rights (Abramovitz, 1998; Abrams & Curran, 2004; Edmonds-Cady & Wingfield, 2017; Franklin, 1986; Gregory, 2020; Kendall, 1989). The story of social work includes a schism between acolytes of Jane Addams (macro practitioners in the present day) or Mary Richmond (micro practitioners today) that is still healing (Krings et al., 2020). The story even has a villain in the form of Abraham Flexner, who maligned fledgling social workers by saying they weren't "real" professionals and forever altering the course of social work's disciplinary destiny as social justice advocates sought validity through professionalization (Gelman & González, 2016).

This is the history of social work that is taught in social work curricula across the United States, and it centers the social caring work and disciplinary priorities and practices of white, middle-class, women in the Northeast and obscures or marginalizes social care,

Estelle Simard, MSW, Visiting Professor, and Jennifer McCleary, Ph.D., Associate Professor, Department of Social Work, University of Minnesota Duluth, Duluth, MN.

Copyright © 2021 Authors, Vol. 21 No. 2/3 (Summer 2021), 259-273, DOI: 10.18060/24146



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

healing, and advocacy work conducted by Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC) either historically, or today. Because most historical narratives of the development of social work claim primarily white, middle class women as founding ancestors and overwhelmingly ignore BIPOC activists and helping systems, our historical narrative is steeped in white supremacy. Further, in our rush to professionalize, social work traded the inclusion of BIPOC ways of helping and social change agendas for a homogenous and professionalized labor force, consisting primarily of white, middle class women from the Northeastern US (Gregory, 2020; Haley, 2020).

In this paper we surface the exclusion of Indigenous knowledge and helping systems from the evolution of US social work practice and directly tie this to colonialism and white supremacy in social work today. We provide a path to dismantling white supremacy in social work by reconciling white supremacist social work history with Indigenous (specifically Anishinaabe) helping systems and Indigenous ways of knowing, and include specific examples of reconciliation, especially between the two authors of the paper, one of whom is a member of the Couchiching First Nation and Anishinaabe, and one of whom is a white descendent of colonial settlers. We focus on Anishinaabe helping systems because of the specific geographic and socio-historic location of the home academic department of the authors. Both authors are faculty at a university in the upper Midwest that sits on territory forcefully taken from Anishinaabe and other Indigenous peoples by settler colonists. In our department we serve a higher than typical proportion of Native American students. As a public land grant university, we have a responsibility to confront this specific colonial geopolitical reality within our institution, curriculum, and pedagogy. Briefly, land grant universities receive benefits from the Morrill Acts of 1862 and 1890, which fund higher education institutions by granting states federally controlled land to sell to raise funds for endowments (Nash, 2019). Nearly 11 million acres of the federally controlled lands granted to states through these Acts were Indigenous lands stolen through treaties and cessions. Many universities have benefitted from land grants without reconciliation with or acknowledgement of the tribes that were dispossessed of their land to build white supremacist institutions (Nash, 2019).

Writing this paper was deeply personal for both authors and we focus on our experience with decolonization in our academic home. Because of this, in this paper we specifically focus on reconciliation between white, colonial/settler descendent social workers and Indigenous social workers. Reconciliation work between other racial or ethnic groups is also essential to dismantling white supremacy in social work education, scholarship and practice. It is not our intention to omit or obscure the ways that white supremacy and reconciliation impacts non-Indigenous People of Color, but in the context of this paper we view this as a parallel process with many intersections, but with its own history, context, and process.

For as long as there have been Indigenous languages and ceremonies, there has been an Indigenous helping and advocacy process. Black, Indigenous, and People of Color across the world have been helping each other to live and flourish within their societies for generations. The evidence of these systems exists across oral histories which guide the collective nature between neighboring tribes and the dynamic functioning of community and family (Baskin, 2018). Indigenous traditional knowledge keepers teach the

development of individual roles within a community and how these roles fill the natural communal helping structures within Indigenous Nations (Weaver, 2016).

Within the Anishinaabe Nation, these sacred roles or duties exist and are expressed throughout the language, the rituals, the customs, and the ceremonial practices and weave a functional social system designed for wellbeing, abundance, and relationships. Anishinaabe language, oral history, and traditional knowledge keepers generate the position that helping people through communal or governmental structures existed long before the origins of Eurocentric social work theory and practice. Further, these natural helping phenomena were culturally safe, theoretically aligned, consequential in nature, and contextually suited within Indigenous worldviews (Baskin, 2018). Yet these Indigenous helping systems have been all but ignored by social workers who purport to practice social work with Indigenous communities.

White supremacy uses the social construction of race and the racialization of people to assert social control, hierarchies of power, and legitimize the oppression of people racially coded as Black and Brown. The power of whiteness and white supremacy in the United States is reinforced by systems including the legal system, the education system, and the social welfare system that codify a set of behaviors and values as white and consequently normative (Almeida et al., 2019).

Since its birth, social work has been steeped in white supremacy and has contributed to the colonization and continued oppression of Indigenous people in the United States. Historically, social workers were complicit in the destruction of Indigenous families and communities through the removal of Native children from their families (Crofoot & Harris, 2012). Today, child welfare systems perpetuate shockingly high disparities of Indigenous children's involvement with the system (Dettlaff et al., 2020).

The social care and community healing systems of BIPOC have not been entirely ignored by Euro-American social work practice. In 1973 the Council on Social Work Education Guidelines suggested social work curricula should include information about working with racial and ethnic minority groups (Jani et al., 2011). These guidelines ushered in an era of "multiculturalism" in social work education programs as they began adding courses such as "Social Work Practice with African Americans" or "American Indian Families" (Jani et al., 2011). Black and Brown ways of knowing and healing were "discovered" in the 1990s and incorporated in small, commodifiable pieces into social work courses. The social work practice taught in these courses is Eurocentric or white supremacist social work practice adapted to fit some basic assumptions about homogenized African American or Native American cultural practices. Rarely do these courses center Indigenous or Black helping practices as a legitimate form of social work, reinforcing the idea that social workers are white and clients are not, and that legitimate social work practice is Eurocentric in origin and adapts to cultural practices of racial and ethnic groups. This is an example of what Linda Tuhiwai Smith describes when she writes "the collective memory of imperialism has been perpetuated through the ways in which knowledge about Indigenous peoples was collected, classified and then represented in various ways back to the West, and then, through the eyes of the West, back to those who have been colonized" (Smith, 2013, p. 1).

White Supremacy and Colonization of Indigenous Peoples

White supremacy is intricately tied to the colonization and genocide of Indigenous people during the formation of the United States. Colonization is an active act that expands a State or settler space at the expense of Indigenous land and people. The act of colonization will always create a negative relationship between Indigenous people and settler people, as the act of colonization means the absence of empathy, compassion, and love for an Indigenous person as they are. The act of colonization is deeply rooted in a colonial mentality or belief system that maintains superiority and privilege for the settler. Colonization of the land that is now the United States is rooted in a white supremacist mindset (Almeida et al., 2019).

Colonization was and is empowered and maintained through the laws of the colonial state. A pillar to settler colonial development, colonial laws prepare the pathway to land acquisition, settler state development, and erasure of Indigenous ways of knowing, Indigenous spaces, Indigenous bodies, and Indigenous identities. Colonization in its most brutal form is extermination of cultural ways and knowledge through violence and genocide (Stirling, 2015).

Formal and informal processes, laws, and practices derived from the act of colonization perpetuate current colonialism in today's social welfare systems. These processes are designed to increase the social, emotional, educational, political, and economic powers of the colonizer (Waziyatawin & Yellow Bird, 2005). Central to this paper is the historical destruction of Indigenous knowledge and Indigenous forms of social care through colonization and the continued subjugation of Indigenous knowledge in current social work pedagogy and social welfare systems.

Colonialism privileges one way of knowing – the settler way of knowing. Colonialism does not allow Indigenous ways of knowing into colonial tools, such as laws, policies, procedures, or *social helping systems* that would support Indigenous ways of knowing. Colonialism recognizes only the settler world in research, in law, in programs and services (Almeida et al., 2019). Colonialism like colonization is a verb and therefore an action. It is a settler's conscious and unconscious effort to maintain power through the social structures designed to support settler ways of knowing (Gough, 2013).

The colonization of Indigenous knowledge and social care is evident in the current structure of the US child welfare system (Charbonneau-Dahlen et al., 2016; Crofoot & Harris, 2012; Heart et al., 2016; Landers & Danes, 2016). The roots of today's child welfare system can be found in the historical legacy of Native American boarding schools. Residential or boarding schools were established in the late 19th century to remove Native children from their homes, families, and lands, and assimilate them into Eurocentric ways of being and knowing (Charbonneau-Dahlen et al., 2016). Native children at boarding schools were separated, often permanently, from their families, communities and Nations. They were forced to cut their hair, wear European clothing, and were punished for speaking Indigenous languages. There is extensive evidence of severe physical and sexual violence, isolation, murder, and other forms of trauma perpetrated against Native children at boarding schools (Heart, 1999; Heart et al., 2016). Boarding schools were designed to

socialize and colonize the mind of Indigenous children and youth by severing cultural ties and separating Indigenous children from cultural knowledge (Baskin, 2018).

Child welfare continues to be the colonial tool of choice in disruption of family systems and forced assimilation of Indigenous children, as the dominant colonial settler ideology has prevailed (Dettlaff et al., 2020). Its deepest impacts are etched in today's deadly statistics of over-representation of Indigenous children in out-of-home care. In addition to this over-representation, Indigenous children's unique development and cultural needs are often not being met either by the child welfare system or the child welfare caregiver (Landers & Danes, 2016). The disruption of family, the assimilation, and the continued abuse of Indigenous children is an unsettling colonial tool designed within a white supremacist legacy.

The coloniality of the child welfare system is perpetuated by social work education programs that don't recognize or teach the historical legacy of colonization and its current effects on Indigenous people (Coates & Hetherington, 2016). When Indigenous content is included, it is often historical, minimal, and depicts Indigenous people as recipients of social care. Indigenous content in social work curricula rarely include adequate or accurate histories of Native American genocide and colonization, information about current, living Indigenous Nations, or models of Indigenous social care (Coates & Hetherington, 2016). This lack of adequate education is one important factor in disproportionately high representation of Indigenous children in the child welfare system (Hanna 2021).

Indigenous Pedagogical Ways of Knowing

Indigenous ways of knowing, being, and pedagogy require a fundamental understanding of Indigenous peoples' sacred, traditional, contemporary, and deliberative laws and this knowledge must be included in current social work pedagogy if reconciliation is to occur. Indigenous pedagogy begins with the fundamental knowledge that we are on a spiritual journey in a human experience. It is knowing our purpose and integrating that purpose into our families and our communities across Turtle Island. Turtle Island is the name that many Indigenous people use to refer to the continent of North America. The word originates with Algonquian and Iroquoian-speaking people but is commonly used by many Indigenous people. Indigenous pedagogy could be specific to ones' purpose in life. However, most importantly, Indigenous pedagogy is a way of being within this life. The ceremonies, lodges, and rites of passage are designed to support this purposeful learning within an Indigenous community. Cultural structures bring continuity and wellbeing to the individual, family, and community. As a result, developing an attachment to culture is an Indigenous pedagogical practice.

In this section we focus on outlining specifically Anishinaabe ways of knowing for several reasons. First, if Indigenous knowledge is known and visible, it can be included in social work pedagogy as a step toward dismantling white supremacy. Second, we focus specifically on Anishinaabe knowledge because of the geographic location of our social work program. Finally, we acknowledge that Indigenous tribes are different and contain a multitude of cultures, traditions, languages, and ways of being. It is impossible to group all tribes into one homogenous Indigenous culture.

Many different words describe the concept of sacred laws in the Anishinaabe language, such as Anishinaabe *Inaakonigewin*, or sacred law (Courchene, 2015; Craft, 2014; Fletcher, 2017). Sacred law is one of four categories of law, along with natural, customary, and deliberative. Sacred law is considered the “original instruction” for the Anishinaabe people (Craft, 2014). Natural law is consistent with the behavior and reaction of the “natural environment” (Craft, 2014). Customary law is concerned with practices, traditions, and customs of Anishinaabe peoples. Concerning Anishinaabe laws, Craft (2014) stated, “most laws flow from sacred law” (p. 12). Anishinaabe *Inaakonigewin* speaks to life's responsibility, specifically to one's own life and to all life that exists here. Anishinaabe *Inaakonigewin* is the Great Spirit/Creator's law. It understands you are spirit first and come from the spirit, and with this responsibility, you are aware of what this entails. “Anishinaabe rules and protocols form and inform Anishinaabe *Inaakonigewin* and are meant to be observed. Observance of those rules is linked to concrete and spiritual consequences” (Craft, 2014, p. 12).

In Anishinaabe ways of knowing and being, sacred laws are expressed in language. Sacred laws guide the spirit's sacred journey on this earth (Courchene, 2015; Fletcher, 2017). Sacred laws are the rules, procedures, responsibilities, and codes within relationships. Sacred laws are a legal structure for communal/societal development and guide responsibilities to community, society, and the world. Sacred laws are the living embodiment of Creation. These laws live as internal/intrinsic standards to personal, familial, and communal development (Courchene, 2015; Fletcher, 2017).

Our responsibility to these laws is to ensure they are carried out in good ways and ensure they are shared and promoted as sacred understandings of the Creator's rules. Sacred laws are passed on through stories, teachings, or instructions. Sacred laws are “embedded in Anishinaabe language, sacred narratives, personal reminiscences, and ceremonies” (Courchene, 2015, p. 44). Sacred laws have protocols, procedures, and at times a formal process that exists before entry into the sacred knowledge. Sacred laws in the form of stories allow a process of dialectic learning, which is the substance of Indigenous pedagogical frameworks. Sacred laws and their stories or teachings promote who you are as an Indigenous person and who you are meant to be (Dennis & Minor, 2019). Sacred laws are not only a guide to teach one how to act and be in this world, but provide a context for relations with other beings. An example of sacred law is *mino-biimaatziwin*; this is a sacred law for the governance of self and the governance of self with others. Sacred laws are with us as they are spiritual, as we are part of the Great Spirit (Courchene, 2015).

Dismantling White Supremacy Through Reconciliation

Social work education is Eurocentric. It centers Eurocentric ideas and theories and sets them as the standard by which to deem Indigenous knowledge and healing systems as “other” and marginal. Even the practice of seeking to include Indigenous knowledge in social work pedagogy as a form of “diversifying” the curriculum reinforces the white supremacist idea that white values, forms of knowledge, practices, and behaviors are at the center and Indigenous values, forms of knowledge and practices are at the margins.

Numerous scholars suggest frameworks for decolonizing social work education and practice (Coates & Hetherington, 2016; Dumbrill & Green, 2008; Fellner, 2018; Hendrick & Young, 2018; Tamburro, 2013). Some scholars recommend indigenizing social work programs by including Indigenous voices, stories, knowledge, and authors in Amer-European curriculums (Coates & Hetherington, 2016; Hendrick & Young, 2018). Others emphasize that this inclusion is ineffective if done outside of the context of critical self-reflection and the equitable treatment of Indigenous knowledge (Dumbrill & Green, 2008; Tamburro, 2013). Some scholars suggest the building of critical consciousness (Freire, 1970) to name and interrupt white supremacy and coloniality in texts, curricula, and practice modalities (Almeida et al., 2019). We argue that decolonizing social work must include a focus on reconciliation between Indigenous people and settler/colonizers.

The onus of change within a monolithic system comes from within the structure. All people with power and privilege within the system have a responsibility to contribute to dismantling white supremacy and making room for cultural safe spaces to develop. Although the dismantling and cultural developing can be simultaneous processes, the dismantling and restructuring must start first.

This paper is written by two authors with specific identities. Estelle is Indigenous and Jennifer is white and female identified. Jennifer is a descendent of settler/colonists and lives on occupied territory that was forcefully seized from Anishinaabe and other Indigenous people in the Treaty of 1854. Both authors are professors at a public land grant university that is also located on forcibly seized Indigenous land. In this section of the paper we will describe our personal approaches to decolonizing social work. We take this approach of separate paradigms of decolonization because we believe that we both have unique experiences with colonization and responsibilities for contributing to decolonizing actions.

Estelle

As an Indigenous researcher, it is difficult to present the phenomenon of colonization/settler colonial without being influenced by the topic. For example, I am an Indigenous woman, and have experienced colonization/colonialism firsthand. As an Indigenous woman I have witnessed colonization/settler colonial effects on my family, extended family, community, and Nation. As an Indigenous woman, I have worked all my life to help Indigenous children, youth, families, communities, and organizations, to create a vision of cultural wellbeing as a countering influence to colonization. As an Indigenous woman, I have educated myself within academia to learn the tools of research to create and support a better life for Indigenous children. As an Indigenous researcher, I comprehend the historical etching of colonization/settler colonialism on Indigenous peoples. Further, I am cognizant of the need to bracket my personal experiences from my academic and professional knowledge.

Bracketing my Indigenous experience of colonization/settler colonial throughout this article has been an experience of blocking reality, guarding against settler colonial mindset, and reflective reconciliatory process of experiences for myself, my children, my family, my extended family, my community, my Indigenous Nation, and ultimately with United

States/Canada. It has not been impossible to bracket my worldview, as it is a daily coping skill many Indigenous people acquire to function “normally” within society. Be it good or bad, functional or dysfunctional, all Indigenous peoples experience a bracketing of their worldview when they intersect with the United States and Canada. Emotionally charged research, such as colonization/settler colonial, often needs to be bracketed. Levels of self-awareness and emotional intelligence are necessary features to the bracketing process because colonization/settler colonial ideologies and their impacts on Indigenous peoples are devastatingly haunting. The intention and applications of these ideologies have long lasting impacts on Indigenous peoples, because the intention and application make one worldview better at the expense of another worldview. Colonization and settler colonialism will always allow for *power and privilege* to exist within a colonial settler system and society as that is colonization/settler colonialism's only way of knowing and being, in spite of the consequences to others.

Jennifer

I operate from the belief that decolonization is a paradigm shift that happens over time. As a descendent of settler/colonizers, I have been socialized to recreate colonization in my actions and beliefs. I was taught a history in American public schools that effectively erased the genocide of Indigenous people during the formation of the United States. Further, I was socialized to believe that the colonization of Indigenous people has ended and that current public policy sufficiently amends historic mistakes. During a master's and Ph.D. in social work I was trained to identify with foremothers of social work who looked like me (white, middle class, female) and to use Eurocentric theories, skills, practice modalities and ways of creating knowledge. I was taught that the helping practices and knowledge of Indigenous people are merely cultural relics that can inform my practice, but are not centered in my practice.

The first step in my process of decolonization is to critically interrogate and recognize my personal, *current* role in the history and perpetuation of colonization. I believe that it is my responsibility to learn the history of Indigenous people prior to colonization; to understand the extent and method of genocide perpetrated on Indigenous people during colonization, and to develop a deep understanding of Indigenous people in the United States today, especially focusing on the tribes and nations geographically proximate to me. In addition to learning content, I must also recognize my personal contribution to colonization including living on land that originally belonged to Anishinaabe people, working at an institution that frequently replicates colonial practices, and benefitting from race privilege.

The second step in my process is to actively engage in resistance to colonial practices (Baskin, 2018) and seek ways to reconcile my identity as a white settler/colonizer with my actions. This requires a paradigm shift wherein I continue to interrogate my actions, beliefs, and re-actions through a lens of recognition of socio historical identity.

Finally, I believe that true dismantling of white supremacy and the decolonization of social work will come from reconciliation between settler/colonizer social workers and Indigenous social workers and reconciliation between Euro-American and Indigenous

ways of knowing, caring, healing, and advocacy. This reconciliation is a process of listening to and learning from Indigenous peoples, actively dismantling white supremacist ideas, policies, behaviors, and practices to make space for Indigenous ways of knowing, and actively valuing Indigenous ways of knowing as important not just for Indigenous people, but for all people (Baskin, 2018; Pratt & Danyluk, 2019).

Frameworks for Reconciliation

Dismantling the white supremacy inherent in social work practice, pedagogy, and scholarship since its inception is at the heart of decolonizing social work education and curriculum. It is the responsibility of both white and Indigenous people and should be conducted within the framework of relationships and reconciliation (Baskin, 2018). White social workers need to actively resist the colonial practices that are built into our systems of education. Below we describe some specific and concrete actions that contribute to dismantling white supremacy through decolonization. We believe the first step in this process must be for both non-Indigenous and Indigenous people to engage in critical self-reflection, as described in the section above, and to focus on building and repairing relationships between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people and communities. Few social work departments have a critical mass of Indigenous faculty, but most social work departments are proximate to Indigenous lands and communities. These relationships will be central to the steps described below.

Within the context of reconciliatory relationships, social work programs can begin to scan and assess all levels of their institution to understand the vortex of unwritten, unearned, and at times the unconscious power and privileges contained within monolithic systems designed for white bodies (Almeida et al., 2019; Baima & Sude, 2020; Gregory, 2020; Seawright, 2014; Tamburro, 2013). Decolonized social work paradigms must address social justice issues in ways that are meaningful to Indigenous peoples (Sinclair, 2019). This includes more than understanding and listening to the plight of Indigenous students and faculty, it is actively engaging in the system as a whole to dismantle the historical, spiritual, political, social, educational, and economic implications of colonization on Indigenous bodies (Pitner et al., 2018). Decolonized social work pedagogy and practice requires moral, ethical, and transformative leadership and agendas. Leaders within educational systems need to assess their environment for systematic injustices on Indigenous bodies (Pratt & Danyluk, 2017). This assessment requires transformative change teams with skills to manage the dynamics of reconciliatory social work practice. This assessment also requires the understanding of walking through the educational system through the eyes of an Indigenous person.

Decolonized social work pedagogy and practice requires understanding the levels of cultural knowledge incorporated into the institution. After scanning for and developing processes to dismantle systematic injustices, social work programs can document where there could be real and sustainable inclusion of Indigenous knowledge. For example, does the curriculum contain accurate and adequate information about Indigenous people? Is there semblance of reconciliatory relationships with geographically proximate Indigenous tribes? Is there a land acknowledgement established and presented in all publications of the

university? Does the university secure knowledge of Indigenous peoples across the system to inform, educate, and support the ghosted students within the monolithic institution? Indigenous people want to succeed in the university system; however, the annals of colonial trauma permeate Indigenous student learning. Decolonized social work pedagogy and practice requires an evaluation of resource development. What types of Indigenous knowledge rests within the university and the department? Where does it rest? Who maintains it and brings it to life for a department and a university?

Decolonized social work pedagogy is more than culturally congruent lesson plans. It is actively engaging the educational system at all levels of functioning. Addressing educational systems means working with Indigenous Nations, the state, the universities, the management, the departments, the teachers, the curriculum, and the outcomes. Decolonizing social work education is not the responsibility of Indigenous people, although it is essential for this group to have voice within these sectors. Educators within these higher education institutions must establish a culturally informed and culturally responsive agenda to the issues of oppression faced by Indigenous peoples. Educators need to work with national bodies to give voice to the correct history of Indigenous peoples and the impact of this history on Indigenous people, families, and communities.

Institutional works for decolonized social work pedagogy and practice include embracing Indigenous ways of knowing that focus on empowerment (Root et al., 2019). Institutional works require review of bylaws, policies, procedures, and orientation manuals for faculty and staff that include culturally informed/culturally responsive standards. Institutional works continue with evaluating the vision, mission and goals that are inclusive of Indigenous peoples and POC or minorities. Culturally informed policies that include forward thinking cultural approaches for the faculty, staff, and students must be centermost. These policies should include policy statements on culturally responsive practice within the institution. Further, these culturally informed policies need to be integrated into the wide systems job descriptions, to ensure the onus of cultural responsiveness rests with staff and faculty. Cultural screening competencies for potential hires should include behavioral interviews that assess cultural responsiveness in ways that bring congruent values to the institution (Steen, 2018). Most importantly, institutions must have innovation to begin to decolonize all sectors of the institution.

Decolonized social work pedagogy and practice requires very specific education for staff and faculty (Hendrick & Young, 2018). The assumption that all educators are educated in areas of colonization and decolonization strategies is misleading. Not all educators have this knowledge. As a result of monolithic socialization, educators can fall into a space of privilege and complacency which maintains the status quo. Consequently, this is the rationale for cultural learning spaces that allow for exploration of critical reflection, cultural courage, and Indigenous learning (Fernando & Bennett, 2019; Morcom & Freeman, 2018). The need to develop human identity (Schiele, 2017) is cornerstone to decolonized social work pedagogy and practice. Fortified self-awareness on Critical Race Theory (Pulliam, 2017), Critical Indigenous Ways of Knowing, and Critical Multiculturalism (Feize & Gonzalez, 2018) are essential learning strategies for educators within monolithic metropole state institutions. Having opportunities within one's system to reconceptualize issues of race, racism (Tisman & Clarendon, 2018), worldview

dichotomies, political, social, emotional, mental, spiritual, and historical dimensions of white power over BIPOC people gives opportunities to shift institutional worldviews and assert a humanity framework (Tascón & Ife, 2019).

Decolonized social work pedagogy and practice requires careful planning in student learning outcomes (Varghese, 2016). Application of Indigenous best practices and learning strategies are part of the accessible development within the cultural committees or elders associated with the institution's development. Utilization of Indigenous content, Indigenous authors, Indigenous space and land are required throughout the program. Nevertheless, having opportunities to decolonize together (Nicotera, 2018; Pitner et al., 2018) within a social work program builds a different world, one which changes social work practice.

Conclusion

Our approach to reconciliatory pedagogy consists of five key elements described above: 1) critical self-reflection and relationship repair/building between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people, 2) conducting an institutional scan for colonial practices, 3) transforming colonial policies and practices within the institution, 4) incorporating cultural knowledge into curriculum, policy, and practices, and 5) providing an accurate education about colonization and dismantling colonial practices to students, staff, and faculty.

These steps require social work faculty, especially non-Indigenous faculty, to recognize and name the ways white supremacy and settler colonialism are perpetuated in academic institutions as well as the teaching and practice of social work itself. But beyond simply acknowledging the fact of white supremacy, this framework offers a pathway toward decolonization that guides social work faculty, students, and practitioners through concrete action steps. It is especially important to focus on transformative inclusion of Indigenous knowledge and practices in social work curricula. Many diversity and equity efforts in academia currently are focused on "inclusion" of historically marginalized groups. Including those who have been historically shut out is clearly important, but if people are included into institutions that stay grounded in white supremacy and colonialism, it is not true inclusion. Inclusion must also mean transformation of the historical structures and institutions that barred access in the first place.

References

- Abramovitz, M. (1998). Social work and social reform: An arena of struggle. *Social Work, 43*(6), 512-526. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sw/43.6.512>
- Abrams, L. S., & Curran, L. (2004). Between women: Gender and social work in historical perspective. *Social Service Review, 78*(3), 429-446. <https://doi.org/10.1086/421920>
- Almeida, R. V., Werkmeister Rozas, L. M., Cross-Denny, B., Lee, K. K., & Yamada, A. M. (2019). Coloniality and intersectionality in social work education and practice. *Journal of Progressive Human Services, 30*(2), 148-164. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10428232.2019.1574195>

- Baima, T., & Sude, M. E. (2020). What white mental health professionals need to understand about whiteness: A Delphi study. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 46(1), 62-80. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jmft.12385>
- Baskin, C. (2018). Sovereignty, colonization, and resistance: 150 years of social work with Indigenous peoples. *Canadian Social Work*, 20(1), 34-49.
- Charbonneau-Dahlen, B. K., Lowe, J., & Morris, S. L. (2016). Giving voice to historical trauma through storytelling: The impact of boarding school experience on American Indians. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma*, 25(6), 598-617. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10926771.2016.1157843>
- Coates, J., & Hetherington, T. (2016). *Decolonizing social work*. Routledge.
- Courchene, D. (2014). Anishinaabe gaagiikido gaagii-bi-izhisemaagoowin/Articulating an Anishinaabe oral history research methodology [Unpublished master's thesis]. University of Winnipeg, Canada.
- Craft, A. (2014). *Anishinaabe Nibi Inaakonigewin Report/Reflecting the Water Laws Research Gathering conducted with Anishinaabe Elders*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3433235>
- Crofoot, T. L., & Harris, M. S. (2012). An Indian child welfare perspective on disproportionality in child welfare. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 34(9), 1667-1674. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2012.04.028>
- Dennis, M. K., & Minor, M. (2019). Healing through storytelling: Indigenising social work with stories. *British Journal of Social Work*, 49(6), 1472-1490. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjsw/bcz044>
- Dettlaff, A. J., Weber, K., Pendleton, M., Boyd, R., Bettencourt, B., & Burton, L. (2020). It is not a broken system, it is a system that needs to be broken: The upEND movement to abolish the child welfare system. *Journal of Public Child Welfare*, 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15548732.2020.1814542>
- Dumbrill, G. C., & Green, J. (2008). Indigenous knowledge in the social work academy. *Social Work Education*, 27(5), 489-503. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02615470701379891>
- Edmonds-Cady, C., & Wingfield, T. T. (2017). Social workers: Agents of change or agents of oppression? *Social Work Education*, 36(4), 430-442. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02615479.2017.1291802>
- Feize, L., & Gonzalez, J. (2018). A model of cultural competency in social work as seen through the lens of self-awareness. *Social Work Education*, 37(4), 472-489. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02615479.2017.1423049>
- Fellner, K. D. (2018). Embodying decoloniality: Indigenizing curriculum and pedagogy. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 62(3/4), 283-293. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajcp.12286>

- Fernando, T., & Bennett, B. (2019). Creating a culturally safe space when teaching aboriginal content in social work: A scoping review. *Australian Social Work, 72*(1), 47-61. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0312407x.2018.1518467>
- Fletcher, L. M., (2017). Anishinaabe Law and the Round House. *Albany Government Law Review, 10*, 1-24. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2961440
- Franklin, D. L. (1986). Mary Richmond and Jane Addams: From moral certainty to rational inquiry in social work practice. *Social Service Review, 60*(4), 504-525. <https://doi.org/10.1086/644396>
- Freire, P. (1970). Cultural action and conscientization. *Harvard Educational Review, 40*(3), 452-477. <https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.40.3.h76250x720j43175>
- Gelman, C., & González, M. (2016). Reconsidering social work 100 years post-Flexner: Where are we now, where are we headed, what has been gained, what has been lost? *Journal of Social Work Education, 52*(1), S1-S5. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10437797.2016.1192932>
- Gough, H. R. (2013). *Colonization and madness: Involuntary psychiatric commitment law and policy frameworks as applied to American Indians* [Doctoral dissertation, Arizona State University]. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. https://repository.asu.edu/attachments/110342/content/Gough_asu_0010E_12727.pdf
- Gregory, J. R. (2020). Social work as a product and project of whiteness, 1607-1900. *Journal of Progressive Human Services, 32*(1), 1-20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10428232.2020.1730143>
- Haley, J. M. (2020). Intersectional and relational frameworks: Confronting anti-Blackness, settler colonialism, and neoliberalism in US social work. *Journal of Progressive Human Services, 31*(3), 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10428232.2019.1703246>
- Hanna, M. D. (2021). Child welfare system issues as explanatory factors for racial disproportionality and disparities. In A. Dettlaff (Ed.), *Racial disproportionality and disparities in the child welfare system* (pp. 177-197). Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10428232.2019.1703246>
- Heart, M. Y. H. B. (1999). Oyate Ptayela: Rebuilding the Lakota Nation through addressing historical trauma among Lakota parents. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment, 2*(1-2), 109-126. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315862378-8>
- Heart, M. Y. H. B., Lewis-Fernández, R., Beals, J., Hasin, D. S., Sugaya, L., Wang, S., Grant, B. F., & Blanco, C. (2016). Psychiatric disorders and mental health treatment in American Indians and Alaska Natives: Results of the National Epidemiologic Survey on Alcohol and Related Conditions. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology, 51*(7), 1033-1046. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00127-016-1225-4>
- Hendrick, A., & Young, S. (2018). Teaching about decoloniality: The experience of non-Indigenous social work educators. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 62*(3/4), 306-318. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajcp.12285>

- Jani, J. S., Pierce, D., Ortiz, L., & Sowbel, L. (2011). Access to intersectionality, content to competence: Deconstructing social work education diversity standards. *Journal of Social Work Education, 47*(2), 283-301. <https://doi.org/10.5175/jswe.2011.200900118>
- Kendall, K. A. (1989). Women at the helm: Three extraordinary leaders. *Affilia, 4*(1), 23-32. <https://doi.org/10.1177/088610998900400103>
- Krings, A., Trubey-Hockman, C., Dentato, M. P., & Grossman, S. (2020). Recalibrating micro and macro social work: Student perceptions of social action. *Social Work Education, 39*(2), 160-174. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02615479.2019.1616686>
- Landers, A. L., & Danes, S. M. (2016). Forgotten children: A critical review of the reunification of American Indian children in the child welfare system. *Children and Youth Services Review, 71*, 137-147. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2016.10.043>
- Morcom, L., & Freeman, K. (2018). Niinwi - Kiinwa - Kiinwi: Building non-indigenous allies in education through indigenous pedagogy. *Canadian Journal of Education, 41*(3), 808-833. <https://journals.sfu.ca/cje/index.php/cje-rce/article/view/3344/2641>
- Nash, M. A. (2019). Entangled pasts: Land-grant colleges and American Indian Dispossession. *History of Education Quarterly, 59*(4), 437-467. <https://doi.org/10.1017/heq.2019.31>
- Nicotera, A. (2018). Teaching Note—Circle of Insight: A paradigm and pedagogy for liberation social justice social work education. *Journal of Social Work Education, 54*(2), 384-391. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10437797.2017.1350232>
- Pitner, R. O., Priestler, M. A., Lackey, R., & Duvall, D. (2018). A dedicated diversity course or an infusion model? Exploring which strategy is more effective in social work pedagogy. *Journal of Social Work Education, 54*(1), 49-60. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10437797.2017.1314839>
- Pratt, Y. P., & Danyluk, P. J. (2017). Learning what schooling left out: Making an indigenous case for critical service-learning and reconciliatory pedagogy within teacher education. *Canadian Journal of Education/Revue Canadienne de l'éducation, 40*(1), 1-29. <https://journals.sfu.ca/cje/index.php/cje-rce/article/view/2349/2379>
- Pratt, Y. P., & Danyluk, P. J. (2019). Exploring reconciliatory pedagogy and its possibilities through educator-led praxis. *Canadian Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 10*(3), 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.5206/cjsotl-rcacea.2019.3.9479>
- Pulliam, R. M. (2017). Practical application of critical race theory: A social justice course design. *Journal of Social Work Education, 53*(3), 414-423. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10437797.2016.1275896>
- Root, E., Augustine, S., Snow, K., & Doucette, M. (2019). Evidence of co-learning through a relational pedagogy: Indigenizing the curriculum through MIKM 2701. *Canadian Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching & Learning, 10*(1), 209-227. <https://doi.org/10.5206/cjsotl-rcacea.2019.1.8006>

- Schiele, J. H. (2017). The Afrocentric paradigm in social work: A historical perspective and future outlook. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment*, 27(1-2), 15-26. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10911359.2016.1252601>
- Seawright, G. (2014). Settler traditions of place: Making explicit the epistemological legacy of white supremacy and settler colonialism for place-based education. *Educational Studies*, 50(6), 554-572. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131946.2014.965938>
- Sinclair, R. (2019). Aboriginal social work education in Canada: Decolonizing pedagogy for the Seventh Generation. *First Peoples Child & Family Review*, 14(1), 9-21. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1069584ar>
- Smith, L. T. (2013). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples*. Zed Books Ltd.
- Steen, J. A. (2018). Reconceptualizing social work behaviors from a human rights perspective. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 54(2), 212-226. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10437797.2017.1404526>
- Stirling, C. J. (2015). *Decolonize this - settler decolonization and unsettling colonialism: Insights from critical ethnographies with indigenous and allied educator-activists in Aotearoa/New Zealand, the United States of America and Canada* [Doctoral dissertation, State University of New York at Buffalo]. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global.
- Tamburro, A. (2013). Including decolonization in social work education and practice. *Journal of Indigenous Social Development*, 2(1), 1-16. https://scholarspace.manoa.hawaii.edu/bitstream/10125/29814/v2i1_02tamburro.pdf
- Tascón, S. M., & Ife, J. (Eds.). (2019). *Disrupting whiteness in social work*. Taylor & Francis. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429284182>
- Tisman, A., & Clarendon, D. (2018). Racism and social work: A model syllabus for graduate-level teaching. *Journal of Teaching in Social Work*, 38(2), 111-136. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08841233.2018.1442384>
- Varghese, R. (2016). Teaching to transform? Addressing race and racism in the teaching of clinical social work practice. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 52(sup1), S134-S147. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10437797.2016.1174646>
- Waziyatawin, A., & Yellow Bird, M. (2005). *For indigenous eyes only: A decolonization handbook*. School of American Research Press.
- Weaver, H. N. (2016). Indigenous social work in the United States: Reflections on Indian tacos, Trojan horses and canoes filled with Indigenous revolutionaries. In M. Gray, J. Coates, & M.Y. Bird (Eds.), *Indigenous social work around the world* (pp. 99-110). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315588360-14>

Author note: Address correspondence to Jennifer McCleary, Department of Social Work, University of Minnesota Duluth, Duluth, MN 55804. Email: jmcclear@d.umn.edu.