

Building Evidence about Indigenous Pathways and Transitions into Higher Education

Forum Evaluation – Engagement at the Interface: Indigenous Pathways and Transitions into Higher Education

Associate Professor James Smith, Charles Darwin University

The project that resulted in the production of this report was funded under a National Priorities Pool (Higher Education Participation and Partnerships Program) grant from the Commonwealth. The recipient of the grant has granted the Commonwealth the right to sub-licence the material in this report. Copyright in the report remains with the original copyright owners.

Except where otherwise indicated, and save for any material protected by a trade mark, the Department of Education and Training, acting on behalf of the Commonwealth, has applied the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International Licence.



Modifications: Changed to meet WCAG 2.0 accessibility requirements.
Alternate text inserted for all images. Minor typographical errors corrected.

Contents

1. Background.....	3
Purpose and Scope of Evaluation	3
Structure of the Report	3
2. Approach and Methodology.....	4
Overview.....	4
Procedures.....	4
Data Gathering Instruments.....	4
Data Analysis.....	4
3. Findings	5
Forum Delegates	5
Publication Authors.....	9
4. Conclusions and Recommendations	13
Conclusions	13
(a) The Forum.....	13
(b) The Publication	13
(c) The Forum Steering Committee.....	13
Recommendations	13
(a) in relation to the Forum	14
(b) in relation to the publication.....	14
(c) in relation to the Forum Steering Committee	14
Appendix 1: Forum Schedule.....	15

List of Tables

Table 1: Delegates rating of building an evidence base (n=28).....	5
Table 2: Delegates rating of the Forum’s usefulness for sharing evidence about Indigenous HEPP funded programs (n=28).....	5
Table 3: Delegates rating of the Forum’s usefulness for networking (n=28).....	5
Table 4: Delegates rating of the journal’s usefulness as a resource (n=28)	6
Table 5: Delegates satisfaction rating of the pre-program communications (n=28)	6
Table 6: Delegates satisfaction rating of the registration process (n=28).....	6
Table 7: Delegates satisfaction rating with the timing of the Forum (n=28).....	6
Table 8: Delegates satisfaction rating with the location of the Forum (n=28)	7
Table 9: Delegates satisfaction rating with the Forum’s facilities (n=28).....	7
Table 10: Delegates expectations (n=12).....	7
Table 11: Delegates key learning (n=23).....	8
Table 12: Delegates overall satisfaction rating with the Forum (n=28).....	8

1. Background

This report outlines an evaluation of a national Forum on Indigenous pathways and transitions into higher education hosted by the Office of the Pro Vice-Chancellor Indigenous Leadership (OPVC-IL) held at the Australian Centre for Indigenous Knowledges and Education (ACIKE), Charles Darwin University, 22-23 October 2015. The theme of the Forum was *Engagement at the interface: Indigenous pathways and transitions into Higher Education*.

The intended outcomes of the Forum were to:

- a) facilitate networking, share information and create a national dialogue about Indigenous pathways and transitions into higher education;
- b) provide a culturally safe opportunity to share stories and emerging evidence about Indigenous pathways and transitions into higher education;
- c) generate and document an evidence-base about the most effective approaches for supporting Indigenous pathways and transitions into higher education;
- d) explore different and innovative approaches and strategies that incorporate Indigenous knowledges and practices into the development and implementation of Indigenous focused pathways and transitions into higher education; and,
- e) generate and document an evidence-base about the most effective approaches for supporting Indigenous pathways and transitions into higher education.

The Forum was divided into substantive sessions, working groups, poster presentations, workshops and yarning circles which provided delegates the opportunity to focus on specific areas from their own HEPPP perspectives and experiences (Appendix 1). The Forum also included a conference dinner, which was an opportunity for further networking. Professor Colleen Hayward, Professor Lester Rigney, Professor Martin Nakata and Professor Steven Larkin delivered the keynotes. OPVC-IL provided registration, travel and accommodation costs for sponsored delegates, and there was an open call for fully paid registrations. In total 130 delegates attended the Forum of which 47 were sponsored and 83 paid registrations. Delegates included representatives from each Australian state and territory and included universities and Indigenous organisations. Efforts were made to include secondary school students as delegates, and higher education students were engaged in a panel discussion as part of the conference program.

Purpose and Scope of Evaluation

The evaluation focuses on three interrelated dimensions, namely the Forum; the aligned publication of a special issue of *Learning Communities: International Journal of Learning in Social Contexts*; and, the role of the Forum Steering Committee (FSC). The evaluation of the Forum, the publication, and the FSC was designed to monitor the processes and immediate outcomes in order to identify and understand the extent to which general intended outcomes were met.

Structure of the Report

The report outlines the general approach and methodological steps that have been adopted in this evaluation, and then moves to findings relating to the Forum, the publication and the FSC followed by general conclusions and recommendations.

2. Approach and Methodology

Overview

A responsive approach was adopted for the evaluation. This involved gathering data from the various participants and some key stakeholders in order to provide an overall portrayal of processes and outcomes from a range of perspectives. The parties involved included the Forum delegates, the Forum Steering Committee and the journal authors.

Procedures

The evaluation consisted of the following steps:

- a) a review of documentation associated with the Forum such as the proposal, communication to delegates, communication to journal authors, and the Forum program schedule;
- b) completion of the Forum survey by delegates;
- c) completion of the Publication survey by the authors;
- d) completion of the Forum management survey by the Forum steering committee; and,
- e) a review of anecdotal data from emails, tweets and online sources.

Data Gathering Instruments

The Forum delegates were asked to complete and submit an evaluation survey either through the Forum app or online through a Survey Monkey web link¹. After the first invitation, delegates were reminded a further two times about the survey. Disappointingly, the response rate was only 22%. Journal authors completed an evaluation survey through a Survey Monkey web link² with a response rate of 40%. Forum steering committee members completed an evaluation survey through a Survey Monkey web link³ with a response rate of 62%.

Data Analysis

The procedures outlined above yielded a range of largely quantitative data, which, in most cases, are organized into frequency tables. Results from each data source are then drawn together and the summaries recorded and used to generate overall conclusions in relation to the purposes of the evaluation. In turn, the findings and conclusions are used to develop a series of recommendations.

¹ <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/HEPP2015>

² <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/862N5C2>

³ <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/TJ69GMS>

3. Findings

Forum Delegates

The delegates were requested to rate and comment on four areas of the Forum: (a) content; (b) logistics; (c) facilities; and (d) overall experience.

(a) Content

Delegates were asked to rate the extent to which the forum assisted in building and evidence base about pathways and transitions into higher education. Most delegates indicated that this was done to a great extent.

Table 1: Delegates rating of building an evidence base (n=28)

Rating	Not at all	Very little	Neither	Somewhat	To a great extent
Frequency	0	0	1	12	15

Delegates were asked to rate the usefulness of the Forum for sharing evidence about Indigenous HEPP funded programs. A majority of delegates indicated that this was done to a great extent.

Table 2: Delegates rating of the Forum’s usefulness for sharing evidence about Indigenous HEPP funded programs (n=28)

Rating	Not at all	Very little	Neither	Somewhat	To a great extent
Frequency	0	0	1	9	19

Delegates were asked to rate the usefulness of the Forum for meeting and networking in the Indigenous higher education space. An overwhelming number of delegates indicated that this was done to a great extent.

Table 3: Delegates rating of the Forum’s usefulness for networking (n=28)

Rating	Not at all	Very little	Neither	Somewhat	To a great extent
Frequency	0	0	0	3	25

Delegates were asked to rate the usefulness of the special issue of the *Learning Communities* journal. The majority of the delegates indicated that the journal was a useful resource.

Table 4: Delegates rating of the journal’s usefulness as a resource (n=28)

Rating	Not at all	Very little	Neither	Somewhat	To a great extent
Frequency	0	0	5	16	17

(b) Logistics

Logistics included communications, registration and timing. Delegates were asked to rate their satisfaction of the pre-program communications. The majority of delegates indicated that they were satisfied while a smaller number felt dissatisfied.

Table 5: Delegates satisfaction rating of the pre-program communications (n=28)

Rating	Very dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neither	Satisfied	Very satisfied
Frequency	0	3	2	13	11

Delegates were asked to rate their satisfaction of the registration process. A majority of delegates indicated that they were either satisfied or very satisfied.

Table 6: Delegates satisfaction rating of the registration process (n=28)

Rating	Very dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neither	Satisfied	Very satisfied
Frequency	0	3	2	13	11

Delegates were asked to rate their satisfaction with the timing of the Forum. The majority of delegates indicated that they were very satisfied while a smaller number felt dissatisfied.

Table 7: Delegates satisfaction rating with the timing of the Forum (n=28)

Rating	Very dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neither	Satisfied	Very satisfied
Frequency	0	2	1	12	14

(c) Facilities

Facilities included the location of the Forum, the rooms and the meals. Delegates were asked to rate their satisfaction with the location of the Forum. A large number of delegates indicated that they were very satisfied with the Forum’s location.

Table 8: Delegates satisfaction rating with the location of the Forum (n=28)

Rating	Very dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neither	Satisfied	Very satisfied
Frequency	0	0	0	6	23

Delegates were asked to rate their satisfaction with the Forum's rooms. The majority of delegates indicated that they were very satisfied with the Forum's rooms.

Table 9: Delegates satisfaction rating with the Forum's facilities (n=28)

Rating	Very dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neither	Satisfied	Very satisfied
Frequency	0	1	0	9	19

(d) Overall experience

Overall experience includes expectations, key learning, participation possibilities, and the overall forum rating. Delegates were asked to provide a comment regarding their expectations, which were then collated under themes. The majority of delegates reported a positive experience, which also allowed for networking opportunities.

Table 10: Delegates expectations (n=12)

Theme	No. of respondents citing each theme (n=12)
Positive expectations	6
Positive networking opportunities	4
Negative programming	1
Further evidence	1

Although the question asked delegates to indicate their response to what was missing from the Forum, most provided a positive reaction. The majority of delegates indicated that their expectations were "lived up to", "met", "exceeded", or "went way beyond my expectations". One delegate commented: "I didn't come to the forum expecting anything specific. I knew I would be in a space in which my understanding was limited and therefore would have an opportunity to learn, and I'm happy to say I did." A smaller number commented that the Forum provided an occasion for "networking and contact with key Indigenous academics" and a "great networking opportunity". One delegate was critical of the program in that "there were too many streams" which resulted in "very small groups" in attendance and suggested a reduction in the number of concurrent sessions. Another delegate suggested that there should have been "more links and further evidence" to how well Indigenous students are participating in higher education.

Delegates were asked to identify a key learning that was provided by the Forum and this resulted in a number of themes. In addition to the survey, other sources including tweets, emails, publications and websites provided additional comments.

Table 11: Delegates key learning (n=23)

Theme	No. of respondents citing each theme (n=23)
Positiveness	7
Parity	2
Equity-achievement nexus	1
Challenges	1
Best practices	8
Engagement	4
Robust evaluation	1

Although the responses were far ranging, the majority of delegates indicated that the Forum provided examples of best practice at a national level with comments that “sometimes the simplest methods are the most effective”; that there was “a much better understanding of what is best practice”; “that all universities have different best practice methods” and that these practices must be cognisant of the “student cohort” ensuring that there is “collaborative and culturally appropriate service provision.” A significant number of the responses indicated a positive attitude to “the credible work our people are achieving”; that “positive change is possible”; and, that “the passion and a desire to succeed, along with good and available support are critical for desired outcomes.” Other delegates commented on the importance of engagement with higher education at the school and community levels and that “the key to understanding your university community and local community is understanding how they inform you on what their needs are in higher education.” One delegate stated that the Forum “provided a valuable vehicle for sharing of outcomes and learning for the development and improvement of future projects and programs” while another stated that she was “reinvigorated being amongst like-minded people from around the country all working towards a greater cause” and that “it was truly inspiring to see and hear about the wonderful programs and initiatives currently in operation.” On reflection of attendance at the Forum, one delegate remarked that “the conference put me just where I need to be: far enough out of my comfort zone to challenge me and expose me to new ideas but close enough to my expertise that I can incorporate these new ideas and contribute to the conversation.”

In conclusion, the delegates were asked to rate their overall experience of the Forum. An overwhelming number of delegates indicated that forum was excellent.

Table 12: Delegates overall satisfaction rating with the Forum (n=28)

Rating	Very poor	Poor	Average	Good	Excellent
Frequency	0	0	0	4	28

Some overall comments were stated publicly online. Professor Bronwyn Fredericks, Pro Vice-Chancellor (Indigenous Engagement), Central Queensland University stated that:

This national Forum on transitions into higher education provided a valuable vehicle for sharing of outcomes and learnings for the development and improvement of future projects and programs. I am really proud that CQUniversity was part of this national Forum and is contributing to the transition of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people into higher education⁴.

Dr Tim Pitman, NCSEHE Research Fellow commented:

As an academic, the conference put me just where I need to be: far enough out of my comfort zone to challenge me and expose me to new ideas but close enough to my expertise that I can incorporate these new ideas and contribute to the conversation. As a researcher of higher education policy, specifically, it is critical that my work is informed by the coal-face experiences of those working with Indigenous students and the students themselves, and I thank Charles Darwin University and the Australian Centre for Indigenous Knowledges & Education (ACIKE) for the opportunity to attend⁵.

Publication Authors

The ten lead authors of the articles published in *Learning Communities: International Journal of Learning in Social Contexts* were requested to rate and comment on: (a) procedure; (b) process; (c) communication; and (d) overall satisfaction. Four authors completed the survey.

(a) Procedure

Authors were asked to rate the procedures involved in developing the journal. This included determining the extent to which the Editors:

- provided clear guidelines for preparing and submitting a manuscript (2 authors indicated *somewhat*, and 2 authors indicated *to a great extent*);
- provided a clear statement of the journal's policies on authorship criteria (3 authors indicated *somewhat*, and 1 author indicated *to a great extent*);
- established a system for effective and rapid peer review (4 authors indicated *to a great extent*); and,
- ensure timely publication of the manuscript (4 authors indicated *to a great extent*).

(b) Process

Authors were asked to rate the process of being involved in writing for the journal. This included determining the extent to which the Editors:

- treated them with fairness, courtesy, objectivity, honesty and transparency (4 authors indicated *to a great extent*); and,

⁴ <https://www.cqu.edu.au/cquninews/stories/engagement-category/2015/cquni-presents-at-national-transitions-forum>

⁵ <https://www.ncsehe.edu.au/engagement-at-the-interface-indigenous-pathways-and-transitions-into-higher-education/>

- protected the confidentiality of their work during the review process (4 authors indicated *to a great extent*).

Authors were also asked to rate how satisfied they were with:

- the peer review process (3 authors indicated they were *satisfied*, and 1 author indicated they were *very satisfied*); and,
- the entire publishing process (2 authors indicated they were *satisfied*, and 2 authors indicated they were *very satisfied*).

In addition, Authors were asked to provide comments on what the Editors could do to improve the process of future publications. One author stated that the Editors could “provide individual copy-edited proofs for checking prior to publication [and] provide a final copy of the article to each author once published”. Another author stated that “the timelines were very tight [and] it would be helpful to have had some earlier advice”. Authors also provided comments on how they shared, or directed others to share the journal as a means to disseminate new evidence. One author stated they shared the web link with interstate colleagues and expected to use the journal in “future strategic policy and program planning relating to Indigenous higher education”. Another author said that they “circulated the journal to co-authors and shared publication details within the University [and] provided links to relevant people within the University”.

(c) Communication

Authors were asked to rate the communication process involved in the development of the journal. This included determining the extent to which the Editors communicated editorial decisions to the authors in a timely, clear and constructive manner (3 authors indicated *somewhat*, and 1 author *to a great extent*). Authors were also asked to rate how satisfied they were with the Editors communicating the final outcome of the manuscript (2 authors indicated they were *satisfied*, and 2 authors indicated they were *very satisfied*).

(d) Overall satisfaction

Authors were requested to provide other comments on their involvement in the journal writing activity. One author reported that it was “a relatively quick turnaround from submission to publication” while another stated that it “was a successful exercise and the publication was of a very high standard”.

Forum Steering Committee

A Forum Steering Committee (FSC) was formed in order to meet the conditions of the grant, specifically delivering a two-day national forum about Indigenous pathways into higher education for interested stakeholders including past and current HEPPP recipients. The FSC consisted of staff from the Whole of Community Engagement (5 members), the Northern Institute (1 member), the Batchelor Institute (1 member), Agentur Events Management (1 member), the Northern Territory Department of Education (1 member⁶), and the HEPPP Project Manager, Indigenous Pathways OPVCIL who chaired the meetings. Seven meetings were held in the lead up to the Forum. At the conclusion of the Forum, the FSC members

⁶ Withdrew after meeting 2.

completed an evaluation survey through a Survey Monkey web link. Five (5) members of the FSC completed the survey.

FSC members were asked to rate the extent to which they were involved in the following:

- providing input to the development of the project (3 members indicated *somewhat*, and 2 members indicated *to a great extent*);
- defining and helping to achieve the project outcomes (5 members indicated *somewhat*);
- identifying the priorities of the project (3 members indicated *somewhat*, and 2 members indicated *to a great extent*);
- identifying potential risks (1 member indicated *very little*, and 4 members indicated *somewhat*);
- monitoring risks (1 member indicated *very little*, 2 members indicated *neither*, and 2 members indicated *somewhat*);
- monitoring timelines (1 member indicated *not at all*, 1 member indicated *very little*, 1 member indicated *neither*, 1 members indicated *somewhat*, and 1 member indicated *to a great extent*);
- monitoring the quality of the project (1 member indicated *very little*, and 4 members indicated *somewhat*);
- providing advice about the changes to the project as it developed (1 member indicated *very little*, 2 members indicated *somewhat*, and 2 members indicated *greatly*);
- making decisions about changes to the project as it developed (1 member indicated *not at all*, 1 member indicated *very little*, 1 member indicated *neither*, 1 members indicated *somewhat*, and 1 member indicated *to a great extent*);
- reviewing the progress of the project against the milestones set (1 member indicated *not at all*, 1 member indicated *very little*, 1 member indicated *neither*, 1 members indicated *somewhat*, and 1 member indicated *to a great extent*);
- providing guidance (1 member indicated *not at all*, 1 member indicated *very little*, 2 members indicated *somewhat*, and 1 member indicated *to a great extent*);
- fostering positive communication outside of the FSC regarding the Forum's progress and outcomes (1 member indicated *very little*, 2 members indicated *somewhat*, and 1 member indicated *to a great extent*)⁷; and,
- actively promoting the Forum (1 member indicated *very little*, 3 members indicated *somewhat*, and 1 member indicated *to a great extent*);

FSC members asked to rate their satisfaction with:

- contributing to the meeting agenda (1 member indicated *not at all satisfied*, 1 member indicated they were *satisfied*, and 3 members indicated they were *very satisfied*);
- the timely receipt of minutes and action list (1 member indicated *not at all satisfied*, 2 members indicated they were *satisfied*, and 2 members indicated they were *very satisfied*);
- the timely receipt of progress reports on the status of the project since the last meeting (1 member indicated *not at all satisfied*, 1 member indicated *neither*

⁷ One member skipped this question.

satisfied or dissatisfied, 1 members indicated they were *satisfied*, and 2 members indicated they were *very satisfied*); and,

- receiving other documents/resources to be considered at the meeting (1 member indicated *not at all satisfied*, 3 members indicated they were *satisfied*, and 1 member indicated they were *very satisfied*).

FSC members were requested to provide comments on a number of items. Comments on what worked well included that there was “plenty of knowledge and flexibility in meeting times”; the role of the Chair; that there was a combination of “good team work, regular meeting and updates”; and, that “having CDU/OPVCIL/ACIKE support” really helped. In commenting on what could have been improved, three individual FSC members stated that:

- “involvement of interstate people working in this space to better cater for the needs of delegates from across Australia; greater leadership of the professional conference organiser”;
- “decision making could have been better; more input could have been sought from committee members; information that that some of us had provided was not always acted on and had to be provided again and again; communication about higher level arrangements was quite poor; and it was sometimes confusing as to what Agentur was doing and what their precise role was; some committee members were not active or didn't contribute”; and,
- “I thought Agentur were good during the conference but often seemed disorganised during the steering committee meetings”.

In commenting on what factors within the FSC meetings contributed to the successful hosting of the Forum, four individual FSC members report that:

- “having a CDU employed project manager who coordinated the conference including the events company and having experienced people who had previously ran forums at CDU; targeting and attracting high level key note speakers such as Lester Rigney, Martin Nakata and Colleen Hayward; small core group working together as much as possible”;
- “good distribution of responsibilities and dedicated people”;
- “the Chair was very organised”; and,
- “a can do attitude; expertise about Indigenous higher education; advocacy for student engagement”.

FSC members were requested to rate how well the FSC functioned with 2 members indicating *average* and 3 indicating *good*. Finally, FSC members were asked to provide any further comments with 1 member stating that “it would have been good to have had greater engagement of the PVC-IL”.

4. Conclusions and Recommendations

Conclusions

Conclusions can be made on the three elements of the activity: (a) the Forum, (b) the publication, and (c) the Forum Steering Committee.

(a) The Forum

The evaluation gathered data on each of the elements of the activity. The data indicated that, in general, the **Forum** was positively evaluated by the delegates. The Forum content was seen to assist to a great extent in building and evidence base about pathways and transitions into higher education; a valuable opportunity to share evidence about Indigenous HEPP funded programs; and, for meeting and networking in the Indigenous higher education space. Similarly, the majority of delegates were very satisfied with the facilities though for the logistics of the forum – which included communications, registration and timing – a small number were dissatisfied with certain aspects. This raises a question to how logistics could be better handled in any future Forum. Part of the answer may lie in the FSC providing better communication with and direction to the Events Management team. Overwhelmingly the majority of delegates stated that the Forum was of an excellent standard and was extremely valuable, in that it “provided a valuable vehicle for sharing of outcomes and learnings for the development and improvement of future projects and programs” (Professor Bronwyn Fredericks). This suggests that the hosting of future forums could be considered.

(b) The Publication

The data indicated that, in general, the **Publication** was positively evaluated by the journal authors including procedures, process, communication and the overall experience. Nevertheless one procedure did prove somewhat cumbersome. The procedure for submitting abstracts and undertaking peer reviews was through an online portal. This resulted in a level of frustration in coordinating both the reviews for abstracts and the submitted papers. Given the small number of abstracts and papers, it may have been more productive for the review procedure to be managed by the Forum coordinator.

(c) The Forum Steering Committee

The data indicated that the **Forum Steering Committee** (FSC) received a mixed evaluation by the FSC members. While the FSC activities of providing input to the development of the project, defining and helping to achieve the project outcomes, and identifying the priorities of the project was in general positively evaluated, other areas were less so. These included activities such as monitoring, providing advice, reviewing and receiving meeting documents, and decision-making. It seems that one FSC member in particular was not at all satisfied with the experience. This raises the question about how the FSC could function more inclusively to ensure that the process is rewarding for all of those involved. This could include establishing agreed roles and expectations of the FSC membership, as well as regular monitoring procedures.

Recommendations

In the light of the findings and conclusions, it is recommended that:

(a) in relation to the Forum

1. that for any future Forums, the FSC establish a closer working relationship with the Events Management team;
2. that CDU/OPVC-IL consider hosting an annual or biannual national/international conference on Indigenous pathways and transitions that is funded through registrations and sponsorship; and,
3. for logistical purposes that any future conferences consider using commercial facilities.

(b) in relation to the publication

1. that the online system for submission of abstracts and papers be reviewed.

(c) in relation to the Forum Steering Committee

1. that the FSC has a smaller membership via application and not nomination;
2. that all members of the FSC are comprehensively briefed about roles and responsibilities; and,
3. that there is an ongoing monitoring process in regards to FSC roles and responsibilities.

Appendix 1: Forum Schedule

Wednesday 21 October

4.30pm	Welcome reception (Professor Steven Larkin) and Cultural Performance (Kenbi Dancers)				
ROOM	Blue 2.1.11 & Blue 2.1.01				
Thursday 22 October					
8.30 am	Welcome to Country (Curtis Roman) and Official Opening (Professor Steven Larkin)				
ROOM	Blue 1 Theatre				
9.00 to 9.45am	Keynote 1 (Professor Colleen Hayward) <i>What can we do to make universities culturally safe places and is having a RAP an integral part of the cultural safety journey?</i> Edith Cowan University's RAP journey began in 2010 and this year launched its third plan aiming towards improvements into 2018. Organisational RAPs include the hard tasks of measuring change and success with the added requirement of carefully balancing the symbolism versus embedded sustained change. A retrospective look at key themes that incorporate a meaningful RAP is vital in forward thinking and planning.				
ROOM	Blue 1 Theatre - Chair: Curtis Roman				
10.00 to 10.30am	HEPP01 Supporting Indigenous participation in higher education in Australia: What can we learn from the Higher Education Participation Programme S. <i>Trinidad, Curtin; J. Smith & S. Larkin, CDU</i>	HEPP02 Perspectives on enabling education for Indigenous students at three comprehensive universities in regional Australia B. <i>Fredericks, S. Kinnear, C. Daniels, J. Mann & P. Croft-Warcon CQU</i>	HEPP03 Bunga Burrabugu – To Make Tomorrow A. <i>Cairnduff, M. Teague, USyd</i>	HEPP04 The Leaders in Indigenous Medical Education (LIME) Network Indigenous Pathways into Medicine Online Resource. C. <i>Ryan, The LIME Network</i>	HEPP05 'Anma', 'Marlpa' and 'Ngapartji Ngapartji' – metaphors for working together in an intercultural research space. L. <i>Hall, CDU</i>
ROOM	Blue 2A - Chair: L. Bowman	Blue 2.1.51 - Chair: B. Rossingh	Blue 3.1.12- Chair: M.Tofa	Blue 2.2.24 - Chair: K. Robertson	Blue 2.2.25 - Chair: M. Olcay
10.30am	Morning tea				
ROOM	Blue 2.1.50 & 2.1.50a				
11.00 to 11.30am	HEPP06 Acknowledging context and complexity when supporting pathways into higher education among remote Indigenous learners: Lessons learned during the formative phase of the Whole of Community Engagement initiative J. <i>Smith, CDU</i>	HEPP07 Pathways to success: How AIME's educational mentoring model is getting results. A. <i>Priestly, M. Lynch, C. Wallace, A. Hansen, V. Harwood, AIME</i>	YARNING CIRCLES: 1. HEPP08 Skilling Up Project – Pathways into tertiary study but which discipline? L. <i>Jackson-Barrett, G. Gower, A. Price, J. Herrington, Murdoch</i> 2. HEPP09 Old Ways, New Ways: Motivating Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students to study science J. <i>Barrow, ECU</i>	HEPP10 Menzies Pathways Program: Inspiring our young remote Indigenous students to pursue a rewarding career in Health, Science or Research. L. <i>Quall, S. Chirgwin, Menzies</i>	
11.35 to 12.05pm	HEPP11 The use of alternative pathways to higher education by Indigenous persons: a national comparison. T. <i>Pitman, Curtin</i>	HEPP12 Pathways have seeds too: Being inclusive of educational futures in early childhood. V. <i>Harwood & N. Murray, Wollongong</i>		HEPP13 Indigenous researchers and digital technologies in remote and very remote communities engaged in participatory action research enhancing professional pathways and identities. D. <i>Robbins & A. Girard, CDU</i>	
12.10 to 12.40pm	HEPP14 Tackling Indigenous Incarceration through Engagement with Higher Education. C. <i>Lee, H. Farley, USQ</i>	HEPP15 Ngala Karla-Our Home Fires: Enhancing cultural and spiritual connectedness S. <i>Karangarua, A. Caracciolo ECU</i>		HEPP16 Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Aspirations Program. J. <i>Hodges, UWS</i>	
ROOM	Blue 2A – Chair: L. Bowman	Blue 2.2.24 – Chair: B. Rossingh	Blue 3.1.12 – Chair: M. Tofa	Blue 2.25 – Chair: K. Robertson	
12.40 to 1.40pm	Lunch: Poster presentations – a. HEPP17 'Can you help us help our youth?' Increasing Aspirations in Higher Education Through the National Indigenous Science Education Program; J. <i>Jamie, Macquarie University</i> b. HEPP18 Promoting leadership skills in Indigenous veterinary students; M. <i>Vost, S. Evans-Kocinski, S. Matthew, R. Taylor & J. Gongora, USyd</i>				
ROOM	Blue 2.1.50 & 2.1.50a				
1.40 to 2.25pm	Keynote 2 (Professor Lester Rigney) <i>Implementing a University Wide Indigenous Education Strategy: The University of Adelaide Case Study</i> This paper will outline how the Tarrkarrri Tirkka Integrated Strategy incorporated several university approaches and actions into one coherent direction and purpose on key areas: Student services; Employment and Governance; Teaching and Learning; Research; Human Resources; Community Engagement, and International Outreach. Analysis of preliminary evidence from this case study suggests university-wide strategies can improve Indigenous access, success and workforce engagement.				
ROOM	Blue 1 Theatre – Chair: Curtis Roman				
2.30 to 3.00pm	HEPP19 Understanding the nexus between equity and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander higher education policy agendas in Australia: What are the synergies, tensions and possibilities? J. <i>Smith, CDU; S. Trinidad, Curtin</i>	HEPP20 How we do business: Rolling out cultural competence. J. <i>Sherwood, G. Russell-Mundine, USyd</i>	HEPP21 Implementation of an integrated Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander strategy in the Faculty of Veterinary Science J. <i>Gongora, A. Mahoney, S. Houston, R. Taylor, USyd</i>	HEPP22 NISEP in Yaegl Country – Reflecting on the Power of Respectful Partnerships for Enhanced Indigenous Education Outcomes. J. <i>Jaimie, Macquarie</i>	
ROOM	Blue 2A – Chair: A. Girard	Blue 2.2.24 – Chair: M. Olcay	Blue 2.2.25 – Chair: K. Robertson	Blue 2.1.51 – Chair: C. Street	
3.00pm	Afternoon tea				
ROOM	Blue 2.1.50 & 2.1.50a				
3.30 to 4.30pm	Panel: HEPP23 Success stories • Ms Robyn Ober, PhD candidate, BIITE; Ms Camille Lew Fatt, Office of the Commissioner for Public Employment, NTG; Mr Joel Liddle; Ms Natasha Llyod				
ROOM	Blue 1 Theatre – Chair: J. Smith				
6.30pm	Forum dinner (paid delegates only) Pee Wees				

Friday 23 October

8.30 to 9.15am	Keynote 3 (Professor Martin Nakata) <i>Indigenous student transitions into higher education studies.</i> This keynote will draw on the result of a five-year case study of services that have been designed to support academic persistence at a leading Australian university to highlight what can be done for our students, despite the slow progress of the school sector to graduate greater numbers of Indigenous students with the requisite grades needed for entry into Australian university programs.				
9.20 to 9.55 am	Launch & Webinar: HEPP24 Can't be what you can't see: The transition of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students into higher education. <i>S. Kinnane, UNDA; J. Wilks, K. Wilson, SCU</i>				
ROOM	Blue 1 Theatre – Chair: Curtis Roman				
10.00 to 10.30am	HEPP25 "It's a safe environment for us Indigenous students" – How the Preparation for Tertiary Success course creates a culturally safe learning space for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Pre-Tertiary students. <i>M. Wilkes, L. Hall, BIITE</i>	HEPP26 Speaking With One Voice: How a Systems Approach Has Improved Indigenous Participation in 'I Belong'. <i>A. Fricker, RMIT</i>	HEPP27 Can't be what you can't see: Summary of findings. <i>S. Kinnane, UNDA; J. Wilks, K. Wilson, SCU</i>	HEPP28 Community Leaders re-setting the higher education vision: Critical reflections of a whole of community engagement approach in remote Aboriginal communities. <i>L. Watts, B. Rossingh, CDU</i>	HEPP29 Successful Indigenous transitions into higher education. <i>M. Nakata, M. Peachey, C. Ah See, UNSW</i>
ROOM	Blue 2A – Chair: A. Girard	Blue 2.1.51 – Chair: P. Fraser	Blue 2.2.24 – Chair: J. Smith	Blue 2.2.25 – Chair: J. Bronnimann	Blue 3.1.12 – Chair: D. Robbins
10.30am	Morning tea				
ROOM	Blue 2.1.50 & 2.1.50a				
11.00 to 11.30am	WORKSHOP: HEPP30 Indigenous pathways into higher education for remote Indigenous communities. <i>Y. Yunupingu & B. Rossingh</i>		HEPP31 How can low SES communities create meaningful partnerships to increase student confidence and motivation towards university? <i>T. Irwin, B. Duroux & R. Callahan, SCU</i>	HEPP32 Aspiration, achievement and access: The ACT-Indigenous Success pathway to university. <i>M. Fleming & D. Grace, Canberra</i>	HEPP33 Post-entry language assessment and academic literacy support for Indigenous English as Another Language or Dialect (EAL/D) students in tertiary education. <i>A. Girard & D. Robbins CDU</i>
11.35 to 12.05pm			HEPP34 Enabling people to 'see what they can be'...The Community Aspirations Program (CAP-Ed). <i>B. Fredericks, T. Lamey, M. Mikecz & F. Santamaria, CQU</i>	HEPP35 Row AHEAD: Clontarf to Curtin. <i>C. Thorn & C. Flodin, Curtin</i>	HEPP36 Should English Language Learning be a priority for policy and practice? EALD Indigenous Students, Indigenous pathways and transitions into Higher Education and the thoughts of a parallel traveller. <i>G. Koramannil, CDU</i>
12.10 to 12.40pm			HEPP37 The Language of Learning On Country. <i>E. McCreedy & B. James NAILSMA</i>	HEPP38 Fostering Australian Indigenous Students' Participation in Business Education. <i>P. Vitartas, Dang, K. A., K. Ambrose & H. Miller La Trobe/Monash</i>	HEPP39 Are online courses the future of Indigenous higher education in Australia? <i>P. Prayaga, E. Rennie, E. Pechenkina, A. Hunter, Swinburne</i>
ROOM	Blue 2A		Blue 2.1.51 – Chair: P. Fraser	Blue 2.2.24 – Chair: J. Smith	Blue 2.2.25 – Chair: J. Bronnimann
12.40 to 1.40pm	Lunch: Poster presentations – a. HEPP17 "Can you help us help our youth?" Increasing Aspirations in Higher Education Through the National Indigenous Science Education Program; <i>J. Jamie, Macquarie University</i> b. HEPP18 Promoting leadership skills in Indigenous veterinary students; <i>M. Vost, S. Evans-Kocinski, S. Matthew, R. Taylor & J. Gongora, USyd</i>				
ROOM	Blue 2.1.50 & 2.1.50a				
1.40 to 2.25pm	Keynote 4 (Professor Steven Larkin) <i>Indigenous participation in higher education: a transformative agenda for Universities</i> Achieving meaningful Indigenous participation in higher education necessitates Universities to undertake transformative processes. This keynote therefore describes the opportunities and challenges for universities in positioning themselves as universities of choice for prospective Indigenous students. This discussion extends to core business areas such as learning and teaching, research, community engagement, governance and administration in upholding and promoting Indigenous leadership within their respective institutions.				
ROOM	Blue 1 Theatre – Chair: Curtis Roman				
2.30 to 3.00pm	HEPP40 From the Known to the Unknown: The reality for Yolngu students navigating the jungle to university? <i>M. Tofa, B. Rossingh, CDU</i>	HEPP41 The Colonial University and the Potential of Rectificatory Action. <i>J. Puch-Bouwman, CDU</i>	HEPP41 Transition and Transformation: Yungorendi Indigenous Student Pathways. <i>R. Wilson, Flinders</i>	HEPP43 Rural Indigenous student university visits. <i>J. Galea, UWS</i>	HEPP44 Swimming not drowning – Resilience as a key determinant of success for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Pre-Tertiary Students. <i>M. Wilkes, L. Hall, BIITE</i>
ROOM	Blue 2A – Chair: D. Robbins	Blue 2.1.51 – Chair: L. Watts	Blue 2.2.24 – Chair: A. Girard	Blue 2.2.25 – Chair: P. Fraser	Blue 3.1.12 – Chair: C. Street
3.00pm	Afternoon tea				
ROOM	Blue 2.1.50 & 2.1.50a				
3.30pm to 4.30pm	HEPP45 Panel: Cultural safety: contested, credible or somewhere in-between? (mixed panel of keynote speakers, presenters and students/graduates)				
ROOM	Blue 1 Theatre – Chair: Professor Martin Carroll				
4.30pm to 4.45pm	Closing: Professor Steven Larkin				