# Transcript: NCSEHE panel discussion: Tips for outreach staff on how to evaluate outreach programs for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students

SARAH:  Hi everyone. We're just going to wait 10 or 20 seconds till everyone comes into the Zoom room. Just going to give it another few seconds. People are still just coming in. Just bear with us while everyone comes into the room. Okay. Well, welcome, everyone. I'd like to start by just acknowledging the Country that I'm currently on. Today I'm located in the D'harawal nation and I acknowledge with deep respect the traditional custodians of the land, the Wadi Wadi people. I pay my respect to elders past, present and emerging and to the Aboriginal community that continue to care for country. I stand for a future that profoundly respects and acknowledges Aboriginal perspectives, culture, language and history and a continued effort to fight for Aboriginal justice and rights paving a way for a strong future. Thank you for joining us today. I'm Sarah O'Shea the Director of the National Centre for Student Equity in Higher Education, NCSEHE for short. NCSEHE is hosted at Curtin University and is funded by the Commonwealth Government with a dedicated mission to improving the higher education outcomes, that is access, participation, retention, success and completion rates for marginalised and disadvantaged people through a variety of strategies, including research practice and policy. NCSEHE is very excited to be hosting Dr Katelyn Barney's Webinar which is looking at how outreach staff might evaluate programs for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students. Katelyn is one of our 2020 Equity Fellows. This fellowship program that Katelyn is a part of has been running since 2016. We provide support for targeted research within the equity field. So today Katelyn has brought together a great panel to reflect upon this topic which builds upon her NCSEHE fellowship which focuses on increasing the impact of outreach programs. Each of the panellists today is an expert in the field. So we have Professor Maria Raciti, who is the Director of Indigenous and Transcultural Research Centre and also an adjunct fellow with the National Centre for Student Equity and Higher Education. Also Professor Gawaian Bodkin-Andrews who is of the D'harawal nation and who is a researcher and lecturer promoting Aboriginal stand points and perspectives and also a Professor for the Centre of advancement of Indigenous Knowledges of the University of Technology Sydney. Before we start, I just have a few housekeeping details. Firstly, you will notice on your screen that we have a captioning and the captioning is done by Bradley Reporting and will be recorded. This recording will be available in the coming days on the NCSEHE website. To activate the closed captions, click the CC button in the tool bar. Actually it will be at the bottom of the screen and that way you can follow along in captions. We are also capturing it via browser. Nina will add that link to the chat pod now. If you have any technological difficulties, please email NCSEHE at ncsehe@curtin.edu.au. We've planned for each of the speakers to speak for about 15, 20 minutes for some time for discussion at the end. Please start the session by going into the chat pod and introducing yourself. We have people from all over the country and beyond, it's nice to meet each other. Perhaps you could also identify the Country you're located on. Please choose all panelists and attendees when you post. If you have a question for the panel, please add that question to the Q&A box and you can vote on questions as well that have been posed by others. Okay. Well, that finishes the housekeeping. I'm going to pass over now to Katelyn to introduce the research. Over to you, Katelyn.

KATELYN:  Thanks, Sarah. Hi everybody. Thanks for joining us. I'd just like to also start by acknowledging the traditional owners of the lands where I am today and pay my respects to their ancestors and their descendants who continue to have strong spiritual and cultural connections to Country. I also want to acknowledge and thank the members of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander advisory group that have worked with me on this fellowship as well and thank them for their support and advice. As Sarah mentioned, the focus of the fellowship has been around building further evidence around what works in outreach programs and also how they could be strengthened and originally I had planned to have a national symposium as part of the fellowship that was to be a face-to-face event, but obviously due to COVID that wasn't possible. So in part this Webinar is, instead of having that national symposium, but also one of the themes that came through interviews with outreach staff, was there's a need for more data to be gathered and more evidence around how to measure the impact of outreach programs. So this Webinar today is part of a suite of resources that I'm developing as part of the fellowship to assist outreach staff. Originally we had three speakers but unfortunately Professor Kathleen Clapman was unable to join us today but we still have two fantastic speakers today. So the first presenter is Professor Maria Raciti. As Sarah mentioned she is the Director of the Indigenous and Transcultural Centre at the University of the Sunshine Coast. She was part of the Australian and governmental task force that was assisted with the 2019 national, regional and rural and remote tertiary education strategy. She's also a Principal Fellow of the Higher Education Academy in the UK and she's undertaken a number of large scale projects that have produced meaningful and impactful outcomes. Thank you, Maria.

MARIA:  Thank you very much for the introduction and welcome, everybody. I'm coming to you today from the most beautiful Gubi Gubi country here on the Sunshine Coast. There's a great image behind me there. I wish to acknowledge the traditional owners on the lands on which we're all coming from today and pay my respects to the elders, past, present and emerging. I'm an Aboriginal woman. I'm a descendant of the Kalkadoon-Thaniquith/Bwgcolman peoples and I take much joy in living, working here on the Sunshine Coast. I'm a Professor of Marketing and what that means is what I'd like to share with you today is some of the tools and tricks around evaluation, really to get people started. I teach marketing and an area of social marketing which is about behavioural change to bring about improvements in people's quality of life. I've also worked previously in an Indigenous centre and are connected with outreach activities that occur. I thought I'd put this together in five simple steps as a way to get people started and to give you some ideas or templates as to ways that you can engage in evaluation of your outreach program be it a camp or any other activity. I probably wanted to kick off with what evaluation matters. Working in universities we know there's always a pressure to demonstrate success and provide evidence for this. During COVID and post COVID we know this will be even more important. They're looking at ways, for example, and what evaluation does for us is it provides this on-going check of strategies and tactics. It tells us what's working and what isn't. It is actually a really critical part of not only maintaining our programming going forward, but it's a bit like keeping your finger on the pulse, knowing whether it's going in the right direction. For those of you who have worked in Indigenous outreach for many years, you'll know that cohorts change, as different generations come through the system, they have different experiences and different views and just different outlooks. So what it means with evaluation is that even if we ran the same program for the last five years, what students are coming in with, their expectations and what they're looking for may be different. So evaluation provides us this opportunity to keep our finger on the pulse, to demonstrate success but also so that we know that what we're doing is working. It allows us to improve our program design and implementation and the all important element of this, which is impact, which is what we're looking for. Was it effective?  So Indigenous outreach, and I've got the elephant there because I think there's an elephant in the room when we often talk about measuring and evaluating success in universities. What we know is that Indigenous outreach success is defined differently by different stakeholders and this sometimes creates a bit of a tension. Sometimes outreach staff are being asked about how many students they were able to recruit, what to convert as a result of the camp experience yet that may not have been the singular purpose of it. So this really creates tensions and as you're developing your evaluation strategy, what the goal is, is to stop and think about the different stakeholders that you're going to be sharing this information with and what they think success is. That way you can capture the data and information that they're looking for, so you can share with them that information. Now, some may be looking at success in different ways. So for a school or for the parents it may be about the level of engagement for that person in that space. I'm going to share with you a few questions as well that you can ask. So give you a real tool kit, if you like, to help you move forward. I guess what I'm making with this one is there are competing tensions. It's not going to go away. So the smart thing to do is develop your evaluation and collect the data you need for various stakeholders, so that you have that at hand. As you all know what, where, when and how to evaluate is not always easy. Evaluation can take many forms. Probably one of the biggest things we see in higher education is that any type of outreach with school students in particular, because there's a time lag between them experiencing the outreach program and making the decision to come to university, it can make it really challenging to figure out the relationship between your program and them coming. Is there a causal relationship or was it number of other touch points and factors that came into their decision process?  So what it means is that when we approaches evaluation it's best to be multi-dimensional and multipronged and I'll show you a table of that, how you can do that. So I've put together these five steps. First of all, this idea is from the outset actually visualise the big picture of your program. What are the inputs and what are you trying to get out of it and what does impact mean. Once you have this big picture, it actually helps you to move forward to the next step which is actually conducting your evaluation. It's important to do this because I know that sometimes staff who are conducting outreach are new or have moved on or have taken on a different role. So as a part of this self-evaluation it's important to say what lessons have we learnt and what can we do better next time. Then there's the planning and implement and analyse and finally sharing. Not just sharing with those within the university, but sharing that with participants and external partners such as parents and schools. So it creates a comprehensive process as you can see. I believe the slides are available on the NCSEHE website and that you can download them in a PowerPoint form which means you can actually grab these images off them and use them. So one of the things is called a logic model. Now, this is a really great visual picture of the program. It's a great way to have it at the beginning because it actually gets you to stop and say okay, what are the inputs, what are the resources that we're using in this particular outreach program. What are the actual activities that we're doing. The reason I pause on those two are often they're the only data that we have. Extending the evaluation to cover everything in the big picture. We want to look at the outputs. So how many people participated?  I'll show you an example in the next slide. Outcomes, what happened?  Did they change their behaviour?  Did they engage more?  Did they have positive things to say and, finally, the all important impact. Did we make an impact in the decision-making for that student?  Is that student going to come to university or are they going to go to our university?  So I've put together this mock up as an example of the big picture. Just an idea. I threw some words in there to give you a starting point. Here you can see I focused on outreach camps because that was the focus of Katelyn's work. Input, for example. You might say it's the dollars we put together for staff, accommodation, travel, incentives. We generally have a budget we can work with that we can say are a part of our inputs. Then we have our activities. You might have, for example, day 1 welcome, day 2, academic activity, day 3 cultural activity. Briefly identify these in these big picture visualisation. Then focus on the camp outputs itself. How many people participated?  Did their confidence improve?  Did they have greater clarity of what they want to do after school or whether the program they looked at was for them and general satisfaction with the camp as well. Was it a good experience?  Did they meet other people?  Then we look at - this is where I separate these two things out because the camp outputs are really the focus of what the Indigenous service centre might be looking at, whereas universities are looking for outcomes. They're looking mostly around the view that was there an attention to attend your university itself. If you have 20 people come along, how many of them are likely to come along and enrol at your university?  Will they be sharing positive word of mouth about your university with fellow students, their school, their parents when they return?  The last one I've called it widely participation impact. I've separated those two out into higher education and of course their success through higher education as well. So by separating these out you can see that you have camp inputs, activity and outputs. You have university outcomes and that's addressing those stakeholder views and... and impact which is important because it shows our social objective has been met. The second step is actually asking questions of yourself or your team. I've put forward here four really powerful questions. That's all you really need. Take the time to work through them because it's important not to just jump into the next output activity without reflecting on the past one. The first question, do we fully understand the expectations of our camp participants and their families?  Now, that's an important one. As I mentioned, expectations change over time. The sector changes over time. Education, society changes over time. So do you fully understand what people are expecting when they're coming along to this and what their parents, families and extended community are expecting from your activity?  The second question, do we fully understand how going to university is situated within the lives of our targets or our participants?  That's really key because obviously in a COVID world we know that people's decision-making is a little bit different to what it was pre-COVID. But do we understand about what else is happening in their lives, how important is it for them to go to university or do they have other competing agendas, things competing for their attention is fine. This really is a question about what we call in social marketing competition. Competition for the attention, the energy, the emotions, the focus of the target audience. The third question, do we fully understand the barriers and enablers facing our camp participants?  Again, these can change over time. So it's important that you take that time to sit down and understand, well, what are some common questions they might ask about barriers and what are some enablers such as scholarships and adversaries that we can share with them that will help them. The last question, the important one, what did we learn from the last camp and what changes have we made to address these?  Absolutely key that even if you're new to taking on an outreach program that you spend that time self-evaluating at the first instance. The third step along is the plan itself. So we've got our big picture. We've asked ourselves some hard questions and now we can start to but the plan together. Evaluation occurs across all phases of an outreach program. Not just something you do at the end. It's important before they even attend through the process the experience of the camp, for example, and then at the end questions asked, observations made and evaluations occur. It's important your evaluation isn't only focused on your camp participants but you consider all other partners as well. So a partner might be the academics who are delivering the content for your participants in your camp. It may actually be your ambassadors that are helping people to settle in and spending time with them. It may be people at the accommodation, if you're using accommodation, who can give some feedback on how things are going. Questions that have been asked, for example. It also includes the school, did you communicate well with them, can you do better next time. Of course, parents and families as well. What this does is you start to see the evaluation isn't just a singular focus on the participant but instead it's all things across the program. I will show you a tool on the next slide that will make this seem simpler. The main thing too is you want to compare your outreach programs with previous offerings that you had to show change over time. We call these... it's important to say if you've got data from the last three or five years that you're able to look at those number of participants, where they've come from or the programs they've looked at. Having this base line is important because it can show you areas where you've improved with each offering of a camp. Now, there's no one best method of collecting data. I'm going to show you simple ways of collecting data. It doesn't have to be sophisticated. It doesn't require excessive data analysis or anything like that. It's about getting the right data and drawing the story together about it. So here is an example of a plan table or evaluation table. You should be able to download this when you download the slides. Now, what it shows you, I'll just start over on this slide. Hopefully you can see my mouse. I've divided the evaluation up in different phases. Pre-camp, then each day's activities, broadly speaking, then a follow up. A follow up in the week after as well. By breaking it down into these it doesn't seem so overwhelming and you have a plan of attack. Across the top you can see what you're evaluating, who, what, when and how. A simple table like this can make what seems like a daunting process a much more focused endeavour. This might be something you didn't think of, as people are enrolling and giving details of joining up, you might ask them questions around their confidence and academic ability or cultural identity. Gawaian will talk a little bit more about this. This is an interesting topic from his area. Who you might ask is the participant themselves and you can do that when they confirm their attendance. Now, I'll show you a way to do some really brief online surveys. You can do them through your phone for your participant. So it's actually not that difficult to put together. The main thing is keep the surveys brief and keep them focused on the key questions that matter to you. With day 1, for example, you might be focused in on evaluating how people are settling in and are they are making connections. How are they feeling in the space. Rather than ask the participants themselves, you might ask the ambassadors or the staff at the accommodation places or the other staff that are there on the day to help welcome people as they come in. You might actually do it differently. Rather than a survey, you might have observation notes. So say as your ambassadors are signing off for the day, that they have to write down a few notes and a few questions, which I'll show a few in a little bit about what they observed. How well were people settling in?  How did it compare to previous experiences?  Maybe identifying areas that can be improved or looked after. With the activities, as you go down you can see I've identified different partners. Here we have academics, it might be just a phone interview, just two or three questions, how did things go today, what were the top three questions you were asked, what could we do better next time. We might, for example then, look at cultural activities. Look at how this enriches students' cultural identity. You can do this via a mobile survey mobile phone app you can use mentimeter. We might be asking the parents of the schools themselves. What did the principals or the liaison officers hear when students came back?  So this follow up is absolutely critical. It's really important that you don't leave it too far, I'd say about a week after the camp has finished you came back and got in contact. Really important to do this to show that there's an ongoing connection between the university, the outreach camp staff and the participants themselves. You might also share the experience with parents too and I think that's an important one to see how parents or what parents or guardians are hearing when participants return home. Here are some questions. I won't go through all of them. There's a few there. I thought I'd put a few together to give you a starting point. Simple. These are obviously questions for the participants themselves. Did the camp meet your expectations?  An important one too. Katelyn's work identified that the connections made between students at the camps are really important and valuable. You might ask a question, will you stay in contact with the other students you met at the camp?  What aspect of the camp did you find most useful?  I like this next one when I'm teaching, what did you learn that surprised you?  That nice little learning game in there. Some really focused ones, did the camp help you clarify what you want to do when you finish school?  How likely is it that you will go to university?  How likely is it that you will come to our university?  Would you recommend the camp to others?  The last one to keep it simple, if you could change just one thing about the camp, what would it be?  So this is just a starting point. You may only pick two or three questions out of there go forward. I thought I'd give you some words around that. For our internal partners, academics or ambassadors that are helping with the program. What worked well?  How engaged were the participants during your time with them?  What were the top three questions you were asked. By phrasing questions like that, the top 3 questions or one thing we could do better, it actually gives you the most salient responses you are after. It gives you the high leverage points. The fourth one down there, were the responses and training that we provided for you helpful?  I think that's an important one because that is marking back to your inputs, what inputs you gave with training both ambassadors and academics and what could we do better next time. Questions to parents and schools. Again, how satisfied were you with our communication about the camp?  Was the camp a good experience for your child/student?  Did you feel the camp helped your child/student decide what they want to do after they finish school?  Did it help enrich their cultural identity?  That's something that Gawaian will talk a bit about in his presentation. How likely is it that your child will attend university after they finish school?  What did we do well?  If there's just one change to the camp, what would it be?  Some nice little points in question there. I hope that they're helpful. The next part is once you've got that evaluation table together you've got a few questions, then it's about implementing it and analysing as you go. You don't necessarily need to be able to use SPS or other data analysis tools. I think simpler is the better. If you're using open-ended questions, you can simply draw out the key themes. What were the top 3 questions, for example, that were asked of academics or ambassadors. You should be able to narrow those down manually by looking at the data themselves. With some of the other questions, if you have it on a rating scale of 1 to 5, you're able to easily analyse that material. I think that that simple analysis will help you give insight and data to your various stakeholders. The last step is sharing. Sharing is really key because it's not just about sharing a report or a summary within the Indigenous unit itself but it's also with the university too. Beyond that it should also be shared with the participants, the schools and the parents. I think that's really important that you share with all partners. Now, on the side here on the slide you can see the simple info graphic. I created it on Canva which is freely accessible to anybody. It's a summary that can be sent out to the school principals, liaison officers, parents, teachers. You can have this on the front of the comprehensive report which you share with the university, for example. Who participated, what were the top 3 things they liked, how did their confidence grow. Before the camp confidence and after camp confidence when they finished and what parents and schools thought about the experience. As you can see I made up my own little website best camp ever. So, look, thank you for that. I hope that was insightful and interesting. I'll pass over to Katelyn. Thanks, Katelyn.

KATELYN: Thank you, Maria. You made some really useful points in relation to why evaluation matters and also some great suggestions on the kinds of questions outreach staff can ask themselves first when they're setting up evaluations and you also made some good suggestions around the kinds of data staff might collect and then share. I think an important question is around once you gather that data, what do you then do with it and how do you ensure that it empowers Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people. That links well to our next speaker who will talk about the complexity of this in relation to Indigenous data sovereignty and the usefulness of data. So Professor Gawaian Bodkin-Andrews is a lecturer and researcher at the University of Technology Sydney. He focuses on Aboriginal stand points and perspectives, particularly in education and psychology. He's led numerous research grants and his projects are focusing around a diverse range of topics and particularly with the development of a strong foundation in Indigenous research methodologies. In this work he's continuing in applying his quantitative and qualitative research methods within his work. Thank you Gawaian, I'll hand over to you.

GAWAIAN:  Thank you, Katelyn. I’d like to offer an acknowledgment of Country. (Aboriginal language spoken). Roughly translated, my apologies, I'm aware I wear the mask of white privilege but I ask that you understand that I was born D’harawal on bitter and fresh waters lands and as part of our protocols I wish to offer my deepest respect for the Country that I'm now standing on which is D'harawal Country and offer my respects to the elders past, present and emerging in the future. I also offer my respect to the Aboriginal peoples and Torres Strait Islander people and I see some Maori and possibly First Nations people as well. Thank you for coming and to my Indigenous colleagues, it's always good to have you listening as well. Thank you, Katelyn and Sarah for inviting me. I'm going to stress right now that an earlier point that Maria made in her excellent presentation is practical and powerful and that is multiple stakeholders. The point of this actual presentation, I guess, will focus on too often when we get caught up in our fancy methods and methodologies and the expectations from government agencies, university, the need for evidence, evidence, evidence, that sometimes the most important stakeholders tend to get forgotten and in this case we're thinking about Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students and communities who will be connected to this research. I'm just going to talk about these particular tensions and the need to really prioritise Indigenous governance and decision-making within any project, particularly research evaluations and outreach programs and I'm going to draw from my own experience and stuff ups as well, I guess early on in my research career. Hopefully that will drive the message home. Please bear with me and hopefully I'll get a decent message across and don't send you all to sleep. Is this working?  There you go. Sorry, my apologies. There we okay. Okay. Now, in the Indigenous research setting it's often cited within the papers that there's a lot of mistrust in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities about research itself. More often than not this is often focused on quantitative data particularly. I guess the problem there is as researchers or potential researchers we have to overcome this mistrust but we also have to understand why this mistrust exists. Kukatai & Walter highlight this issue of the hierarchy of Indigenous data. In this case we have an ideal scenario where there is a data desert where Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people are erased from all research is the least desirable and then we move up this ladder where we have data about us which we have non-Indigenous researcher and researching from their Wetern foundations or stand points and basically making policy and practice from that. Then we have data more closely aligned with us or for us and then data with us where researchers, whether they be Aboriginal or non-Indigenous, are more carefully walking with Aboriginal communities and scholars and representatives and the top of the data, according to Kukatai & Walter, data led by us, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples, First Nations people, this is the pinnacle of data. I would argue the data you have to look out for regardless of the data being used. Maggie Walter argues too often in terms of hierarchy the most popular is the data about us and/or the data desert. This is where Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples have little to say in the direction and what's being measured and so forth. This is a trend that needs to stop altogether. Unfortunately though even if we look at the data by us or with us there is immense danger, particularly in the quantitative research setting where we're using scale measures, this is where we come into the research field with the wrong foundations or stand points or basically looking from the perspective Eurocentric research, if that makes any sense. One of the most influential papers for me highlighting is by Palawa scholar Maggie Walter who talks about even quantitative data that is meant to be neutral and so forth and impartial is highly political and highly bias. She highlights three particular biases in such data that can affect our evaluations and research. This is ideological evidence, the example she highlights is in Hughes and they talk about NAPLAN data and they suggested that Aboriginal students in metropolitan setting have closed the gap and there's no work needed here. All the work needs to be done in remote and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities. If you look more carefully at the data this is more of an ideological bias where they mis-represent the lived experience of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander in metropolitan settings. Statistical understandings data we often approach data too uncritically. Often we can get excited about results that really don't tell the whole picture. The example Maggie highlights is the report on Indigenous unemployment where the rate of Indigenous unemployment actually lessen over time, and they were celebrating this, but the problem is when you look at non-Indigenous rates that actually fell even further. The gap actually widened. A big one I'm passionate about is what's known as the orthodoxy of dichotomy. That's basically a comparison between Indigenous and non-Indigenous students and too often these comparisons actually favour or almost always favour non-Indigenous students. That's because our measures and outcomes come from non-Indigenous perspectives. We have to be very careful there. One movement starting to address these limitations within quantitative data and this is a big movement that's happening quite strongly in New Zealand from the work of Kukutai. There's a few Maori scholars. There's definitely First nations scholar within Canada and the US as well. Some excellent work being done it here. That's the emergence of Indigenous data sovereignty. There's two key messages to take home. One, we really need to understand what is Indigenous data. Too often we limit it to - say for example we ask questions of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples and that's all the data there is. That's not always the case Indigenous data sovereignty takes the idea that data that affects Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities it is Indigenous data. If it affects policy that effects us it is Indigenous data. We're looking at data on our resources such as our lands, waters and so forth, looking at the data of the basic demographics, health and so forth. Then we're looking at our cultural data. Data from our standpoints and epistemologists, such as our oral histories and so forth. This is all Indigenous data because it can all have an impact upon us and we have to keep that in mind. So Indigenous data sovereignty then takes on the notion of governance and this is critically important. That's basically the right of Indigenous peoples to determine the means of the collection, access, analysis, interpretation, management, dissemination and reuse of data pertaining to Indigenous peoples from whom it's being derived and who it should be related to and who it should affect. In that regard Indigenous data sovereignty is about our collective rights to make decisions about data that will affect us regardless of the types of data. I'm of the very strong opinion that all Indigenous research, including evaluations, must be at the very least have a shared governance with Indigenous representatives, community members, scholars and so forth. In 2018, I think this was, the Australian division of Indigenous data sovereignty, the Maiam nayri Wingara data sovereignty collective held a summit. These were over 40 Indigenous leaders, CEOs of Indigenous organisations and research collectives came together in Canberra and talked about what is Indigenous data sovereignty from Aboriginal and Torres Strait lslander perspectives and we had a strong presentations by some Maori scholars as well who were helpful in guiding discussions. There was five key conclusions that came out of it. It's all centred around how Indigenous peoples, communities and representatives can help and ideally govern data and research about us. So therefore making the data with us, for us and by us. The first one is a notion of having control of a data ecosystem. Basically we should have a voice from the creation or very idea of the research in the first place and we should have decision-making there to the dissemination of the data and as Maggie argued earlier, the reuse of data as well. So what's going to happen after the project is over. This is critically important. Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander voices should not be left out at any stage of this nor should they be reduced to a minority. I personally argue it should be at least be a 51% Indigenous majority decision making in any research project. The second one is data is contextual and disaggregated so data needs to not only respect the diversity of our people, move beyond Indigenous or not dichotomy but it needs to respect where the research takes place. So our Country, our place and it must also protect our peoples. Whether it be anonymity and so forth, it should not do any harm to our peoples and community. The next key finding was data needs to be relevant and it must be empowering. The results of data needs to be empowering for our peoples and communities. It needs to strengthen our voices and give us a say in not only how it's collected but how this data can be used for our peoples and our communities and our future generations is most important. The data structures have to be held accountable to Indigenous peoples and representatives. So this means if there's ethics applications to be written, there needs to be consultation before, during and after ethics itself. That needs to be accountability there. The storage of data is critically important. One thing we often forget about is the notion of capacity development as well. These are research projects. We should be bringing Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people relatives with us and possibly using this as a training exercise as well to further strengthen future Indigenous researchers. Finally, the data needs to be protective and strengthen individual's interests. The data needs to be part of the emancipation project to help us overcome the negative impacts of colonisation. It should be for our benefit and researchers Indigenous or not must be accountable for their research. Now I'm going to go into my earlier research where I wasn’t even aware of Indigenous data sovereignty. I won't get into too much detail here. I got caught up in high level statistics. It was about cultural representativeness or cultural appropriateness. I was given a whole heap of western orientated measures about student's self-perceptions and I was asked by my supervisors to apply it to Indigenous and non-Indigenous students and talk about what was wrong with Indigenous students and why they weren't performing well. So what I used was a measure of self-perception and I looked at 12 different dimensions. These were western oriented measures, math, verbal and school self-confidence, general self-esteem, physical abilities and so forth. These statistics always say the results are equally applicable to Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal students. They're equally understood so there is no misrepresentation at least statistically speaking. There is a huge problem with this research in that it was from a western oriented measure. It was not culturally - I won't say valid but it wasn't from our culture or it wasn't with us. It wasn't by us. It was from a western perspective. This leads on to a second paper I wrote. This is where the damage really took part. I wrote this paper or drafted it in 2009. I published it in 2012. It had a really unfortunate title, is explaining away Aboriginality. What I tried to prove in this paper was if we looked at the Indigenous students rate of disengagement and compared it with non-Indigenous students, Indigenous students tend to disengage more and repeated the finding over and over again. So how can we close the gap, so to speak. The key variable I used was whether Indigenous and non-Indigenous students were confident at school. That is they're confident in their abilities and feelings at school. Once you controlled for differences of confidence at school, the difference of disengagement disappeared. The moral of the story was all we have to do is increase Indigenous students' actual confidence at school. It sounds like a really great finding but still it's based on a foundation of western based measures, Eurocentric measures. I started a project of Australian Indigenous mentoring experiences and this is where I started to criticise my actual research. AIME has done some excellent work and had some really powerful results. Basically the research looked at a whole heap of measures. Finally we included an Indigenous measure, how confident were the Aboriginal kids in the classroom. What was really great AIME saw the Aboriginal children who took part having an increased sense of confidence about their identity, in the classroom and their own self concept and a whole heap of other western measures and outcomes as well. I was still uncomfortable with this. This is complicated but basically I wanted to know, well, what is the strongest predictor or protector for stopping Indigenous students disengaging and the answer was school self-concept. There were some other variables that were protective as well, as well from disengagement from school. There was also a very weak but also a protective factor about Aboriginal identity in the classroom. So the more confident Aboriginal kids were in the classroom the less likely they would disengage. There was still something wrong with this, I was taking the wrong approach. The moral of the story I found, I interrogated the data a bit more. One of the strongest predictors for Aboriginal students been confident at school was how safe they were in the classroom about their identity. It was a strong predictor, a strong level of self-concept which then became an even stronger protective factor against Indigenous students disengaging from school. Basically we have this Indigenous measure working with a non-Indigenous measure to produce something even more powerful. I want you to keep that in mind when you're designing your research evaluations and so forth. It's very important to consider research from our own perspectives. Just for the final slide, I'm a little bit over time but I'll finish off, is you need to have a look out is even if these quantitative measures aren't too simplistic. Just asking students, do you feel good about being Aboriginal in the classroom is not enough. It's still way too general. My point here is you're looking at research by a Aboriginal scholar Karen Martin where she found some of the important traits about what’s important about being Aboriginal to be passed on to children was the notion of family history, pride in identity, food practices, showing respect, knowing country. There's also seminal work by Cherly Kickett-Tucker, she asked the Aboriginal youths themselves and they came up with 30 different facets, 30 different ideas that were important to them of what it meant to be Aboriginal. It moves well beyond just feeling good about being Aboriginal, so to speak. I'm just going to highlight this actual - I'm not sure if you can see the pointer. The figure with the three colours, red, yellow and green. In this particular project that I was involved in we actually formulated a measure looking at different facets to what it meant to be Aboriginal for Aboriginal students and it was worded in a way that also non-Indigenous students can answer the questions as well. We had a general about my culture and so forth. I'm going to refer back to my earlier research about these non-Indigenous self-perceptions and self-concepts. Of those 12 dimensions, I think nine of them, non-Indigenous students were significantly stronger. Indigenous students were less than non-Indigenous students. Remember these are western measures. In this study where we centred on Aboriginal stand points and how we measured the items, the red and yellow are actually Aboriginal student respondents in two separate groups and the green is non-Indigenous respondents. You can see across the board, Indigenous students regardless of which group had a stronger sense of identity than non-Indigenous students. We reversed the results depending on how we asked the question or from whose stand points we asked the question. Keep that in mind for your research. Here's an idea of some of the questions we asked. You can use these if you want, feel free, but adapt and ask your students, your Aboriginal representatives what are important, what will be important to measure from Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander stand points. I will call it quits there if that's okay. Don't forget our Aboriginal stakeholders and our Torres Strait Islander stakeholders. That's what's most important.

KATELYN:  Thank you Gawaian. You made some really important points about the importance of Indigenous data sovereignty and also the importance of really considering the data rights and interests of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people and ensuring that they're secured. We've only got a couple of minutes for questions so if anyone wants to put one in the Q&A, please feel free to do that and Maria and Gawaian are both happy to answer questions after today's Webinar. I have a question or two I'd like to ask you, Maria and Gawaian, if Maria you'd like to join us again. Maria, I really like how you talked about the who, what, when and how evaluation and you used that table. Could staff use that template to map out their plan and do you know of any other resources they could draw on?

MARIA: Absolutely feel free to use that. The logic model comes from the Centre for Disease Control in the US and it’s actually used a lot in social marketing no matter what the cause it's just a great way of presenting the information. Those resources have come from social marketing resources that I use. Feel free to use that table. I think it's a nice way. Another resource, and I'll quickly share with you, I mentioned about ways to do a survey that's relatively easy that doesn't require a lot. So one I use is mentimeter before. It's a free service. We often use it in teaching. You can create your own survey. These are some that I just created six minutes ago. Just to show you. When you can go into it, I'll just give you a little quick tour. You can actually add your questions by adding a slide and then you can say over here what type of slide it is. If I just pop down I might say, add a slide. It gives me all these options, multiple choice, short answer quiz, whatever. Once you've created it, you can then open your survey up and this is how it works. This is an app. You can have your participants download the app on to their phone. All they do is go into it, even through the browser, they put this code in. If any of you are super keen out there, you can type the code in and you literally answer the question on your phone right there in real time. It's really quick and simple and you get a really nice summary of the results there. Freely available as well. The fact that you can did you ever it on a phone is just even better. So if you get your students - participants to do that, that's easy. I did the little info graphic just using Canva. Again, a free online graphic info graphic creator. When you log in you can create - this is the one I created here. You've got lots of different options of lay-outs and options. You can type it up and put those out too. Just wanted to share those with people as accessible ways. I think mentimeter in particular is quite cool.

KATELYN:  That's great Maria. That's really useful. Gawaian, in relation to Indigenous data sovereignty, are there useful resources or publications for staff to read more and learn more about that?

GAWAIAN:  What's great about the movement is they're producing lots of open access works which are quite accessible. Won’t say it’s an easy read though but I would say your first starting point and it’s mentioned in the latest round of AIATSIS ethics would be to start with the most basic of protocols and most important protocols as well in research all together. There is a section within Indigenous data sovereignty in the latest... what's really important about this is the emphasis on Aboriginal community and Aboriginal led research. So please never forget that. In terms of the movement itself just very quickly, there's the Maiam nayri Wingara data sovereignty collective web page and there's easily accessible information on that. We also have a couple of open access edited books by Tahu Kuktuai and John Taylor. It was released from ANU in 2016. That's a great open access resource. The whole book is free to download. There's one that's just been released, lead editor Maggie Walter and Kukutai just this year. I strongly advise getting that as Kukutai paid a small fortune so everyone can read it open access in that regard. Find some good reading there hopefully.

KATELYN:  Great. Sarah is with us so we've almost run out of time. Thank you, Gawaian and Maria for great presentations. I think there were lots of useful and practical tips you offered and important things to think about in terms of evaluating programs so thank you.

SARAH:  Yeah, thank you everyone. That was just two really terrific presentations and thank you to Katelyn for organising this. I particularly like the mix of really very practical applications that Maria provided, but also the really deep thinking that Gawaian brought to the discussion about how this evaluation needs to be framed and the importance of it being culturally appropriate. So I think really interesting presentations today. As we mentioned at the beginning, this presentation will be recorded and available on the website, the NCSEHE website. I've just put that up there in case anyone is not familiar with where we're located. So if you would like to go on to our website we have a whole range of resources there that are all freely available and downloadable. If you have any questions about today's presentation or you'd like to pose some questions to Maria, Gawaian or Katelyn, then please just email us and we can let them know. We also have Twitter and Facebook. NCSEHE does release an E newsletter every couple of weeks. So if you'd like to sign up for that one, go to our web page and you'll be invited to sign up for the newsletter. So with that I think we have run out of time. So I'm sure you'll join me in thanking everyone. Katelyn's report should be out early next year but we do have some great little booklets that just cover her Fellow - what she's doing in her research. Again they're available if you'd like one of those and thank you everyone.

KATELYN:  Thanks, Sarah.