



VIEWPOINT

What do we know about evaluation in Indigenous higher education contexts in Australia?

James A. Smith^{*a, b, c}, Kellie Pollard^b, Kim Robertson^b, Sue Trinidad^c

^aMenzies School of Health Research, Australia

^bCharles Darwin University, Australia

^cCurtin University, Australia

Indigenous participation and achievement in education is an issue of international significance. Within Australia, the *Review of Higher Education Access and Outcomes for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander People* (Behrendt, Larkin, Griew, & Kelly, 2012) provided a clear mandate for investing in policies and programs that support Indigenous pathways, participation and achievement in higher education. While there have been notable investments and significant national reforms in Indigenous higher education over the past few years, the recommendation within this report to develop a monitoring and evaluation framework is yet to be actioned. Similarly, in 2015 prior to its abolishment, the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Higher Education Advisory Council recommended the development of a 'performance framework', which also appears to have been ignored. In parallel, the Productivity Commission, Australian National Audit Office and subsequently the Australian Government have emphasised the importance of strengthening evaluation in Indigenous program and policy contexts across Australia. The release of the Indigenous Advancement Strategy Evaluation Framework in 2017 is one recent example. Bringing these two national conversations together, and drawing on current scholarship in this space, this paper describes what we currently know about evaluation in Indigenous higher education contexts in Australia. We point towards key areas for action to move this agenda forward as a means to better support Indigenous participation and achievement in higher education.

Keywords: Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander; Indigenous; evaluation; education; higher education; policy

Introduction

Increasing Indigenous¹ participation and achievement in higher education is an issue of global significance. Scholars from Canada, New Zealand, United States and Australia have been particularly vocal about this issue for multiple decades (Kirkness & Barnhardt, 1991; Jefferies,

¹ For the purposes of this paper, Indigenous refers to Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander people and/or Australian first nations people, unless specified otherwise. This term is used for brevity. The authors acknowledge the diversity of views with regard to preferences for using these terms.

1998; Smith, 2000; Deloria, 2001; Battiste, 2002; Guillory & Wolverton, 2008; Behrendt, Larkin, Griew, & Kelly, 2012). This has paralleled international Indigenous education advocacy efforts and subsequent investments, such as the establishment of the World Indigenous Nations Higher Education Consortium (WINHEC) in 2002; and the establishment of the World Indigenous Nations University (WINU) in 2014. WINHEC has been particularly influential in driving discussions about the need for ensuring quality cultural standards in higher education through the development of an international accreditation program (Malina-Wright, Robertson, & Moeke, 2010). These global advances have been built on the *United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples* (United Nations, 2008); and the *Coolangatta Statement on Indigenous Peoples' Rights in Education* (Task Force of the National Organizing Committee of the 1993 World Indigenous Peoples' Conference on Education, 1999). These landmark declarations specifically recognise the sovereign rights of Indigenous peoples, calling for Indigenous people to lead and make decisions about their education destinies. This has ultimately seen targeted investments aimed at widening participation in Indigenous higher education in multiple countries. Yet, globally there has been minimal attention to building a robust evaluation evidence-base to drive further improvements (Frawley, Smith, & Larkin, 2015). In this paper, we use the Australian Indigenous higher education context as an example to illustrate the challenges associated with undertaking evaluation in this space. We explain why novel approaches, which align to contemporary global discussions about data sovereignty and Indigenous rights, are urgently required.

In Australia, widening participation in the context of Indigenous higher education has been discussed as a policy priority for more than four decades (Behrendt et al., 2012; Anderson, 2016). Indigenous students have long been identified as one of six priority equity groups within the Australian higher education system (Bradley, Noonan, Nugent, & Scales, 2008; Behrendt et al., 2012; Liddle, 2016). Some of these students also fall into other under-represented categories, including students from low socio-economic status backgrounds; students from regional and remote areas; and students from non-English speaking backgrounds (Bennett et al., 2015). This means Indigenous student exposure to inequities in higher education can be cumulative. Whilst there has been a steady growth in widening participation and completion among Indigenous higher education students in Australia, this has not yet reached parity with non-Indigenous student cohorts (Wilks & Wilson, 2015; Anderson, 2016; Liddle, 2016). Not surprisingly, there has been an incremental increase in strategies aimed at improving higher education access and outcomes for Indigenous people (Behrendt et al., 2012; Anderson, 2016; Frawley, Larkin, & Smith, 2017a; 2017b). Yet, the evidence-base to inform strategy development has been weak and in some instances non-existent.

Different approaches and activities have emerged that respond to evolving Indigenous higher education and equity policy and program landscapes (Anderson, 2016; Smith, Trinidad, & Larkin, 2017). These include the provision of enabling programs, scholarships, tutorial assistance and academic support, community engagement, partnership development, mentoring and workforce capacity building, including the establishment of senior executive level Indigenous positions within universities (Wilks & Wilson, 2014; Fredericks, Lamey, Mikecz, & Santamaria, 2015; Fricker, 2015; Hall & Wilkes, 2015; Priestly, Lynch, Wallace, & Harwood, 2015; Smith, Trinidad, & Larkin, 2015; Smith, Larkin, Yibarbuk, & Guenther, 2017; Wilks, Radnidge, & Wilson, 2017). Such activities have highlighted the importance of intelligent investment in planning, implementing and *evaluating* Indigenous higher education programs in Australia (Frawley et al., 2015). The latter concept – evaluation – has been identified as an important lever for system improvement. However, it has largely remained at the margins of government and university action. In this paper, we aim to examine what we currently know

about evaluation in Indigenous higher education contexts in Australia. We also discuss the respective implications for strengthening evaluation in this space. But first, it is important to understand evaluation in the broader Indigenous affairs context.

Discussion

Evaluation in Indigenous affairs contexts in Australia

In early 2017, the Australian Government Minister for Indigenous Affairs announced a significant investment of \$10 Million per year into the monitoring and evaluation of Indigenous programs funded through the Indigenous Advancement Strategy (IAS).² This commitment responded to numerous calls to strengthen evaluation in Indigenous affairs contexts in Australia (Productivity Commission, 2013; Department of Families, Housing, Communities Services and Indigenous Affairs, 2014; and Hudson, 2016). At the same time, there has been a rapidly growing discourse in Australia that the quantum and quality of evaluation evidence being generated in response to Indigenous policy and program investments is poor (Hudson, 2016; 2017; Muir & Dean, 2017). Hudson (2017) claims “in general, Indigenous evaluations are characterised by a lack of data and the absence of a control group, as well as an over-reliance on anecdotal evidence” (p. 13). Indeed, the need to produce more high quality evaluations that generate evidence to drive future policy and program improvements is pivotal (Productivity Commission, 2013; Hudson, 2016; 2017). A lack of robust and comprehensive evaluation evidence, whether quantitative or qualitative in nature, appears to be stifling Indigenous focused policy and program development, implementation and reform. Yet, as Muir and Dean (2017) note, “developing an Indigenous-focused evaluation culture will not guarantee an evaluation’s success; however, the absence of such culture is likely to make the evaluation task more difficult and less likely to meet local community needs” (p. 2). We now take a brief look at the role the Australian Government is currently playing in attempting to address these concerns.

Government reporting and evaluation in Indigenous contexts

In response to previous issues identified by the Productivity Commission about the evaluation of Indigenous programs, the Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet (DPMC) released a draft Evaluation Framework for the Indigenous Advancement Strategy in October 2017. This new framework articulates that robustness, relevance, credibility and appropriateness are best practice principles for underpinning Indigenous evaluation work (DPMC, 2017). A key element of the framework is the separation of performance (i.e., monitoring grants and activity reviews) from evaluation (process, impact, outcome and cross-cutting evaluations) (DPMC, 2017). Previously there have been minimal attempts to divide concepts of performance and evaluation in this way within Indigenous affairs contexts – perhaps with the notable exception of the *Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Health Performance Framework*, which has been used as a reporting framework in the health sector for over a decade (AHMAC, 2017).

Whilst the IAS Evaluation Framework outlines that activities must be respectful to Indigenous Australians, there is minimal detail about what this may constitute and how this could be achieved, other than a cursory note that participatory methods are encouraged. Perhaps the most important element of the IAS Evaluation Framework is the concept of cross-cutting evaluations. This approach insinuates that there is potential to link evaluation work in Indigenous contexts within sectors, such as between schools and universities; and between sectors, such as health and education. There is also potential to expand the concept of cross-cutting evaluation work between Indigenous and equity contexts, but an understanding of the complex legislative

² The IAS commenced in July 2014, and is the way in which the Australian Government funds and delivers a range of programs targeting Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.

arrangements and philosophical underpinnings which govern Indigenous higher education is important to understand the challenges in this regard.

At present, there are numerous programs that support Indigenous higher education in Australia. The Indigenous Student Success Program (ISSP) and the Higher Education Participation and Partnership Program (HEPPP) both fall under the *Higher Education Support Act 2003*. ISSP is administered through the Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet, whereas HEPPP is administered through Department of Education and Training (DET). This means both programs fall under different Ministers – the Minister for Indigenous Affairs, and the Minister for Education and Training. To avoid any confusion, it is important to note that HEPPP is an equity-focused program targeting low SES students. It is not considered to be an Indigenous higher education program. However, the recent HEPPP evaluation indicated that 19% of HEPPP projects were targeted towards Indigenous students from low socio-economic backgrounds (see ACIL Allen Consulting, 2017). This equated to 15% of the total program funding – an estimated \$150.45M from 2010-2016 (ACIL Allen Consulting, 2017). This is a conservative estimate given that some HEPPP programs have involved Indigenous students, without them necessarily being a targeted beneficiary. It can be argued that HEPPP is an incredibly important part of the broader Indigenous higher education policy landscape, although perhaps more implicit than explicit.

There are also other programs aimed at providing financial assistance to Indigenous students either directly or indirectly. Funding for ABSTUDY falls under the *Student Assistance Act 1973*, with different components administered through the Department of Social Services and Department of Human Services. In addition, funding for the Away from Base (AFB) program falls under the *Appropriation Act* and operates under dual guidelines associated with the *Indigenous Education (Targeted Assistance) Act 2000*. AFB funding is quarantined as part of the IAS and is administered by DPMC.

Confused? Rightly so. This quagmire of different Acts, departments and programs makes Indigenous higher education in Australia difficult to navigate and helps to explain why it has become the complex jigsaw it is. It has also made cross-jurisdictional and international comparisons difficult, and muddied calls for tighter reporting and accountability. We argue that a cross-government evaluation of the combined effectiveness of different Indigenous higher education policies and programs is urgently required. We recognise the current system is complex and multi-faceted, but we need to know whether the current situation is meeting the diverse needs of Indigenous students across Australia and the aspirations of the nation's Indigenous peoples. The recent call for cross-cutting evaluations within the IAS Framework reiterates the need for such an approach.

Until recently, there had been little evaluation of financial incentives that support Indigenous students to participate in higher education. We know that payments through ABSTUDY have not significantly increased since the 1980s, despite financial strain remaining a significant barrier to participation in higher education for Indigenous students. A recent report from the House of Representatives Standing Committee on Indigenous Affairs (2016) recommended an independent review of ABSTUDY. The Australian National Audit Office (ANAO, 2017) has since completed an audit of ABSTUDY in relation to compliance and performance measures associated with the administration of ABSTUDY by the Department of Social Services and the Department of Human Services. However, the parameters of the audit did not extend to include an evaluation of the effectiveness of ABSTUDY programs in relation to improving educational outcomes for Indigenous students. It was merely an audit of departmental performance. The need

for an evaluation of the impact and outcome of ABSTUDY remains.

A critical element of the above discussion involves understanding that Australian Universities are required to report against the funding they receive. This is an accountability measure, routine for governments, and includes reporting against targeted funding related to Indigenous and equity focused higher education programs. For example, ISSP has an annual reporting requirement, consistent with its past equivalents. The purpose of ISSP is to provide scholarships, tutorial assistance and support services to Indigenous higher education students. The reporting parameters outlined in the reporting template were co-developed with key stakeholders within the Indigenous higher education sector, including those involved in a time-limited Indigenous Advisory Group. ISSP performance funding allocations are currently based on Indigenous student enrolments, success and completions data. This data is routinely collected through the Higher Education Information and Management System (HEIMS) managed by the DET. To remain eligible for ISSP funding, universities are also required to maintain and report on an Indigenous Education Strategy, Indigenous Governance Mechanisms and Indigenous Workforce Strategy. This reporting has been established as a descriptive process - primarily activity-based reporting. At present, reporting on the effectiveness and efficacy of investments from an impact and outcome perspective is not required. It does, however, reflect a movement towards monitoring systemic and structural factors within higher education institutions. This is a welcome transition. The intent to undertake a review of ISSP guidelines and reporting processes has already been flagged for 2018 and is likely to assist in making further quality improvements within the ISSP itself.

It is clear, from the information presented above, that a national Indigenous monitoring and evaluation framework would need to be robust enough to traverse multiple Ministers, departments and programs; *and* be flexible enough to suit very different university contexts and student aspirations. At present, the extent to which government reporting is driving university evaluation processes in Indigenous higher education contexts is unclear. Further qualitative research about the ways in which evaluation data is being collected and used in this space, and the respective drivers for undertaking such work, is urgently required. But what do we currently know?

Evaluation in equity focused higher education contexts: Can this help?

Prior to embarking on a discussion about the need for a national Indigenous higher education monitoring and evaluation framework, it is useful to note that there has been a parallel discussion in relation to the equity and higher education national agenda. As Downing (2017) notes:

Despite significant funding flowing into higher education for programs aimed at improving participation, access and success, there still exists a limited amount of systematic evaluation taking place within the sector. In some institutions (including universities, research centres and centres of excellence), a greater level of onus has been felt in recent years for the need to ascertain whether funding sources such as the Higher Education Participation and Partnerships Program (HEPPP) have led or are likely to lead to positive equity-related outcomes. (p. 19)

Substantial progress has already been made in developing measures of equity performance in higher education in Australia. For example, Naylor, Baik, & James (2011) developed the *Critical Interventions Framework* for advancing equity in Australian higher education. This was subsequently revisited by Bennett et al. in 2015 through the development of an *Equity Initiatives Framework*. An important aspect of the second framework is an explicit acknowledgement that

the framework should be modified according to both context and stakeholder needs (Bennett et al., 2015). That is, there is a clear recognition that a one-size-fits-all approach is not necessarily going to work in an equity and higher education space. In parallel, the National Centre for Student Equity in Higher Education (NCSEHE) developed *A Framework for Measuring Equity Performance in Australian Higher Education* (Pitman & Koshy, 2015). This work was guided by that which had already progressed in the health sector a decade prior, with specific reference to the *Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Health Performance Framework*. In its final recommendations to the Australian Government before being abolished, the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Higher Education Advisory Council (ATSIHEAC, 2015) acknowledged the work of the NCSEHE and provided a solid basis from which to further monitoring and performance framework discussions in the Indigenous higher education landscape.

More recently, the national review of the Higher Education Participation and Partnerships Program has spurred increased interest in improving evaluation. Indeed, there was a recommendation and subsequent policy commitment to develop an evaluation framework as part of the review (ACIL Allen Consulting, 2017). The policy commitment was fast - an expression of interest (EOI) for the development of an evaluation framework was released within days of the release of the report, with an expectation that the framework would be ready within less than six months. This tight timeframe drew criticism from the equity and higher education sector. The EOI was subsequently abandoned and a decision was made by DET to pursue the development of the evaluation framework internally. This work remains in process at the time of writing.

A well-articulated submission to the Reform of the Australian Government Administration in 2010 indicated the risks inherent in such an approach by stating that “most evaluation activities within the Australian Public Service [APS] are shaped by people who have no professional technical expertise in evaluation” (Diamond & O’Brien-Malone, 2010, p. 2). The submission also identified that evaluation functions within each APS agency should be centralised to maximise the use of limited evaluation expertise (Diamond & O’Brien-Malone, 2010). DPMC currently has a model of this nature, hence its capacity to develop the IAS Evaluation Framework, as previously discussed. However, DET – where the evaluation framework for HEPPP is to be developed - does not currently have a centralised evaluation unit. As O’Brien-Malone and Diamond (2010) articulate in a separate submission about the development of the Australian Government’s research workforce strategy:

...the knowledge base which underpins evaluation is highly technical, and good intentions and being a skilled bureaucrat do not equate to having knowledge and skill in evaluation. This failure on the part of departments to recognise that evaluation is a profession with a detailed, technical, knowledge base has to stop if government is to get good value from its evaluator dollar. (p. 10)

We are not suggesting that DET does not have the evaluation capacity and capability in-house to undertake this task. Rather we are suggesting that there are risks associated with pursuing an evaluation framework in this way. Whilst there is significant potential to acknowledge emerging frameworks that relate to equity and higher education in Australia, there are also unique considerations specific to the Indigenous higher education landscape that need to be included. At this juncture it is important to note that there are both synergies and differences in equity and Indigenous policy agendas in Australia that need to be recognised and addressed as part of this conversation (Bunda, Zipin, & Brennan, 2012; Nakata, 2013; Smith, Trinidad, & Larkin, 2017). We start to unpack these further below.

Evaluation in Indigenous higher education: Is there a problem?

In 2012, the *Review of Higher Education Access and Outcomes for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander People* (Behrendt et al., 2012) stated that:

While considerable data was available through departmental program-based reporting to monitor progress, there was not always sufficient evidence to assess the overall success or otherwise of specific programs. In some cases, there were no independent evaluations of programs for the Panel to draw on. (p. 154)

The review subsequently recommended that the Australian Government and universities work together to develop a national Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander higher education monitoring and evaluation framework (Behrendt et al., 2012). However, this recommendation is yet to be formally actioned. More recently, in its final advice to government ATSIHEAC (2015) provided a number of recommendations to accelerate the pace of change in Indigenous higher education. Working towards an agreed national minimum data set and framework for Indigenous higher education was a strategy recommended to provide critical support for assessment of progress at a system level (ATSIHEAC, 2015). In this sense, concepts of ‘evaluation’ and ‘performance monitoring’ were broadly conflated. This contrasts the separation of these concepts as advocated through the release of the draft IAS Evaluation Framework. Irrespective of the way in which these concepts overlap, the need for a national monitoring and evaluation framework has also been heightened by the recent release of the *Universities Australia Indigenous Strategy 2017-2020* (Universities Australia, 2017), which outlines a broad range of targets for Australian universities. There appears to be some broad alignment with reporting parameters associated with ISSP. Of course, the variables that have impacted on widening participation in Indigenous higher education contexts in Australia, are not limited to Indigenous student enrolments, success and completions, as currently captured through the ISSP. There are also a range of historical and contemporary social policy and systemic barriers to education, that also need to be considered in the context of evaluation in Indigenous higher education in Australia, and arguably elsewhere across the globe. These are discussed further below.

Contextualising evaluation in Indigenous higher education

It has previously been noted in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander education contexts, that outcomes frameworks need to be developed flexibly so that educational responses are tailored to local needs at systemic and institutional (school) levels (ACIL Allen Consulting, 2014). As Frawley, Smith and Larkin (2015) explain:

One key challenge we face in Australia is to move beyond basic process and impact evaluation approaches about Indigenous higher education pathways and transitions. We need to develop more sophisticated evaluation models that reflect more rigorous, comprehensive and nuanced understandings of what Indigenous higher education trajectories look like, the inherent complexities they bring, how they can best be navigated, and the tangible outcomes Indigenous-specific programs can achieve. This includes the capacity to examine and monitor new and innovative institutional and organisational culture change to reform Indigenous education within higher education settings...emerging evaluation approaches that build on Indigenous knowledge systems could be useful in this regard. These will need to privilege Indigenous epistemologies, ontologies and axiologies. (p. 10)

The notion of incorporating Indigenous knowledge systems into evaluation in Indigenous higher education contexts aligns well with recent commentary about the concepts of decolonising

methods and data sovereignty within Indigenous research contexts. Indeed, we argue that repositioning Indigenous knowledges as being a central element and core philosophy underpinning evaluation in this space is critical. The seminal work of international Indigenous scholars, Smith (2012) and Kovach (2010) is particularly influential in relation to the use of decolonising research methods. For example, the privileging of narrative forms of qualitative evidence, such as Indigenous student success stories, can provide important contextual information about achievements in the Indigenous higher education landscape (Frawley, Ober, Olcay, & Smith, 2017). Similarly, the work of Indigenous academic Maggie Walter (2010; 2016) is equally important in relation to concepts of data sovereignty and the culturally appropriate use of statistical data. In an attempt to increase the cultural appropriateness of statistical data reporting and usage, recent scholars have developed a draft quality framework for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander higher education data and statistics (Drew, Wilks, & Wilson, 2015). This aligns with claims made by Bunda et al. (2012) that:

The administrative gaze of policy...swallows Indigenous peoples' identities in the fetish of statistics, objectifying through numbers. In doing so, it continues long-standing colonial processes for categorising the 'Other' so as to avoid recognising social-cultural differences that challenge the legitimacy of whitestream-centred power. (p. 943)

Whilst these concepts have seldom surfaced (at least not explicitly) in discussions about *evaluation* in Indigenous higher education contexts, they are poignant for future discussions. They are particularly relevant at a time when Indigenous governance is increasingly being (re)emphasised as an important factor in Indigenous higher education policy and program contexts (Universities Australia, 2017). They also correspond with the national instability experienced in relation to government supported co-ordination of Indigenous higher education; expressed goals to grow the Indigenous higher education professional and academic workforce; and increasing expectations to improve cultural competency in Australian universities (Universities Australia, 2011; 2017). We argue that further commentary and the privileging of Indigenous standpoints through evaluation in Indigenous higher education contexts will enhance evaluation effectiveness, and produce better quality and more comprehensive data to inform policy, program and system improvements. The work of Foley (2002; 2003a; 2003b) and Rigney (1999; 2011) is particularly useful in suggesting how Australian Indigenous standpoint theory could be used as a means to reframe the way evaluation in Indigenous higher education contexts is approached. An approach that privileges an Indigenous stance aligns with parallel literature emanating from an Indigenous *research* realm (Foley, 2003a; Ardill, 2013; Nakata, 2013).

In addition to the epistemological and ontological positioning and privileging of Indigenous standpoints, a Whole-of-University (WOU) approach to Indigenous education has been repeatedly recommended by peak bodies and advisory groups over the past few years (Behrendt et al., 2012; ATSIHEAC, 2016; NATSIHEC, 2017; Universities Australia, 2017). It is probable if this transition occurs, that there will be new expectations about what to evaluate, and how to evaluate, and key investments supporting improved outcomes for Indigenous students participating in higher education in Australia. Some scholars argue for alternative evaluation frameworks that respond to emerging calls for WOU approaches to 'Indigenise' universities (Frawley et al., 2015; Rigney, 2017). Rigney (2017) has already presented a conceptual Design and Evaluation for Indigenisation (DEFI) that can guide institutional change. This sentiment is reiterated in a recent report about accelerating Indigenous higher education prepared by the National Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Higher Education Consortium (NATSIHEC, 2017). The report talks about the need for the DET, the Tertiary Education Quality Standards

Authority (TEQSA) and NATSIHEC to work together to determine WOU quality standards and accountabilities in relation to measuring the quality of Indigenous student and staff participation in universities (NATSIHEC, 2017). It also outlines that strategies used to incorporate Indigenous knowledges within universities should be included as a measure of quality in the provision of higher education (NATSIHEC, 2017). NATSIHEC recommends a process whereby NATSIHEC and TEQSA work collaboratively to evaluate performance of universities against Indigenous imperatives on an annual basis (NATSIHEC, 2017). This seems sensible. The World Indigenous Nations Higher Education Consortium (WINHEC) has already developed a global Indigenous-led higher education accreditation process (Malina-Wright, Robertson, & Moeke, 2010) that could be used to inform reforms of this nature in Australian universities. This accreditation is explicitly about cultural standards and protocols. At present, the Wollotuka Institute at the University of Newcastle and Batchelor Institute of Indigenous Tertiary Education in the Northern Territory, are the only two organisations in Australia that have received WINHEC accreditation status. Behrendt et al. (2012) and Universities Australia (2017) have also pointed out the utility of WINHEC accreditation as a means to monitor university performance in relation to enhancing Australian Indigenous higher education outcomes.

Akin to discussions about the incorporation of Indigenous knowledges into higher education institutions, there have also been parallel calls to more explicitly embed Indigenous pedagogies into university curricula. Larkin (2015) has convincingly argued that the objective of Critical Race pedagogy is to create inclusive approaches that recognise and support spaces where Indigenous students can learn from culturally relevant pedagogies. The concept of embedding Indigenous knowledges into university curricula has also been reinforced in the *Universities Australia Indigenous Strategy 2017-2020* (Universities Australia, 2017), but there is little guidance about how universities can monitor and evaluate investments of this nature. There is an increasing urgency for Indigenous higher education stakeholders to identify ways to capture and implement innovative conceptual designs that are explicit. Perhaps drawing on the aforementioned Indigenous knowledge systems and Indigenous standpoints would be a useful starting point?

Conclusion

There are multiple recommendations emergent in key national reports and from peak bodies that demand the development of an Indigenous higher education monitoring and evaluation framework. To date, there has been minimal government and/or university response to such calls. Limiting factors have been a poor articulation of exactly what such a framework might look like; how it might be developed; who is best positioned to develop it; and the timeframe in which it should be developed. That is, the Indigenous higher education sector has not been collectively engaged in high-level strategic discussions of this nature, and further qualitative research with policy-makers (particularly those in DPMC and DET) and Indigenous scholars/thinkers working in higher education institutions across Australia would help to guide this conversation, but the imperative is to enact an effective innovative evaluation framework now. Understanding the enablers of, and barriers to, change in this space needs a nuanced perspective in further research. In parallel, contemporary scholarship about the application of Indigenous research methods and Indigenous knowledges as they relate to evaluation in Indigenous higher education contexts is required to aid such perspectives. A useful starting point could be the articulation of the principles and philosophical assumptions that underpin such work, with particular reference to key global documents that consistently emphasise Indigenous rights within education contexts (Task Force of the National Organizing Committee of the 1993 World Indigenous Peoples' Conference on Education, 1999; United Nations, 2008). Doing so would mean that concepts such as self-determination and data sovereignty could underpin

further conversations. Indeed, Indigenous methods, concepts and standpoints could potentially re-conceptualise the purpose of monitoring and evaluation in Indigenous higher education. This could include further discussion about what should be monitored and evaluated, when, why, how and by whom. Indigenous standpoints are epistemologically and ontologically different from parallel frameworks current in the broader equity and higher education space, but we argue that they are not necessarily incompatible. Rather, it is important to understand the synergies and differences to examine these intersections more critically. An Australian Indigenous informed evaluative framework would benefit from progress in New Zealand, Canada, United States and Norway, where strategies designed to empower Indigenous design and input have resulted in improved, targeted investments for Indigenous students in higher education. The Australian Government, NATSIHEC, Universities Australia, TEQSA, and the National Centre for Student Equity in Higher Education, along with all Australian universities should commit to engaging in a joint national strategic conversation about evaluation to move this agenda forward. This effort would make a significant contribution to the international Indigenous higher education landscape and enhance action aimed at widening the participation of Indigenous students both in Australia and globally.

References

- Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Higher Education Advisory Council (ATSIHEAC). (2015). *ATSIHEAC recommendations: Accelerating the pace of change in Indigenous higher education*. Final Advice from ATSIHEAC to the Australian Government.
- ACIL Allen Consulting. (2014). *Evaluation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Education Action Plan 2010-2014: Final Evaluation Report*. Report to the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Education Advisory Group of the Education Council. ACIL Allen Consulting in collaboration with La Trobe University and Phillips KPA.
- ACIL Allen Consulting. (2017). *Evaluation of the HEPPP: Higher Education Participation and Partnerships Program*. Report to Department of Education and Training. ACIL Allen Consulting.
- Anderson, I. (2016). Indigenous Australians and higher education: The contemporary policy agenda. In A. Harvey, C. Burnheim & M. Brett (Eds.), *Student equity in Australian higher education: Twenty-five years of a Fair Chance for All* (pp. 221-239). Singapore: Springer Nature.
- Ardill, A. (2013). Australian sovereignty, Indigenous standpoint theory and feminist standpoint theory. *Griffith Law Review*, 22(2), 315-343.
- Australian Health Minister's Advisory Council (AHMAC). (2017). *Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Health Performance Framework: 2017 Report*. Canberra: Australian Government.
- Australian National Audit Office (ANAO). (2017). *Administration of Youth Allowance (student) and ABSTUDY – ANAO Report 51, 2016-2017*. Canberra: Australian Government.
- Battiste, M. (2002). *Indigenous knowledge and pedagogy in First Nations education: A literature review with recommendations*. Prepared for the National Working Group on Education and the Minister of Indigenous Affairs, Indian and Northern Affairs Canada. Ontario.
- Behrendt, L., Larkin, S., Griew, R., & Kelly, P. (2012). *Review of Higher Education Access and Outcomes for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander People: Final Report*. Canberra: Australian Government.
- Bennett, A., Naylor, R., Mellor, K., Brett, M., Gore, J., Harvey, A., Munn, B., James, R., Smith, M., & Whitty, G. (2015). *The Critical Interventions Framework Part 2: Equity*

- initiatives in Australian higher education: A review of evidence and impact*. Report prepared for the Australian Government with funding through the Higher Education Participation and Partnerships Program.
- Bradley, D., Noonan, P., Nugent, H., & Scales, B. (2008). *Review of Australian higher education: Final report*. Canberra: Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations.
- Bunda, T., Zipin, L., & Brennan, M. (2012). Negotiating university 'equity' from Indigenous standpoints: A shaky bridge. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 16(9), 941-957.
- Deloria, V., Jr. (2001). Higher education and self-determination. In V. Deloria Jr & D.R. Wildcat (Eds.), *Power and place: Indian education in America* (pp. 123-134). Colorado: American Indian Graduate Center and Fulcrum Resources.
- Department of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs. (2010). *Directory of Commonwealth Government evaluations, audits and reviews of Indigenous-specific and relevant mainstream programs: 2002-2014*. Compiled by the Office of Indigenous Policy Co-ordination, Department of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs, Commonwealth of Australia.
- Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet (DPMC). (2017). *Indigenous Advancement Strategy Evaluation Framework: Exposure Draft October 2017*. Canberra: Australian Government.
- Diamond, M., & O'Brien-Malone, A. (2010). *Evaluation: A neglected but vital reform*. Submission to the Parliament of Australia – Senate Finance and Public Administration Committee Inquiry into the Ahead of the Game Blueprint for the Reform of Australian Government Administration.
- Downing, L. (2017). The emerging equity evaluation landscape in higher education. *Evaluation Journal of Australasia*, 17(1), 19-29.
- Drew, N., Wilks, J., & Wilson, K. (2015). *Developing a culturally appropriate data quality framework for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander higher education statistics: Discussion paper*. Sydney: University of Notre Dame.
- Foley, D. (2002). An Indigenous Standpoint Theory. *Journal of Australian Indigenous Studies*, 5(3), 3-13.
- Foley, D. (2003a). "A Dichotomy: Indigenous epistemological views". *Journal of Australian Indigenous Issues*, 6(3), 13-28.
- Foley, D. (2003b). Indigenous epistemology and Indigenous standpoint theory. *Social Alternatives*, 22(1), 44-52.
- Frawley, J., Smith, J., & Larkin, S. (2015). Beyond Bradley and Behrendt: Building a stronger evidence-base about Indigenous pathways and transitions into higher education. *Learning Communities: International Journal of Learning in Social Contexts*, 17, 8-11.
- Frawley, J., Larkin, S., & Smith, J. (2017a). Indigenous pathways and transitions into Higher Education: An introduction. In J. Frawley, S. Larkin & J. A. Smith (Eds.), *Indigenous pathways, transitions and participation in Higher Education: From policy to practice* (pp. 3-11). Singapore: Springer Nature.
- Frawley, J., Larkin, S., & Smith, J. (2017b). From policy to practice in higher education: Cross-cutting issues in Indigenous pathways, transition and participation. In J. Frawley, S. Larkin & J. Smith (Eds.), *Indigenous pathways, transitions and participation in higher education: From policy to practice* (pp. 273-277). Singapore: Springer Nature.
- Frawley, J., Ober, R., Olcay, M., & Smith, J. (2017). *Indigenous achievement in higher education and the role of self-efficacy: Rippling stories of success*. Perth: National Centre for Student Equity in Higher Education, Curtin University.

- Fredericks, B., Lamey, T., Mikecz, M., & Santamaria, F. (2015). Enabling people to 'see what they can be': The community Aspirations Program (CAP-ED). *Learning Communities: International Journal of Learning in Social Contexts*, 17, 54-63.
- Fricker, A. (2015). Speaking with one voice: A partnership approach in RMIT's 'I Belong' program. *Learning Communities: International Journal of Learning in Social Contexts*, 17, 30-43.
- Guillory, R., & Wolverton, M. (2008). It's about family: Native American student persistence in higher education. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 79(1), 58-87.
- Hall, L., & Wilkes, M. (2015). "It's a safe environment for us Indigenous students": Creating a culturally safe learning space for Indigenous Pre-Tertiary students. *Learning Communities: International Journal of Learning in Social Contexts*, 17, 112-122.
- House of Representatives Standing Committee on Indigenous Affairs. (2016). *Interim report: First steps for improving educational opportunities for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students*. Canberra: The Parliament of the Commonwealth of Australia.
- Hudson, S. (2016). *Mapping the Indigenous program and funding maze – Research Report 18*. Sydney: The Centre for Independent Studies.
- Hudson, S. (2017). *Evaluating Indigenous programs: A toolkit for change - Research Report 28*. Sydney: The Centre for Independent Studies.
- Jefferies, R. (1998). *Maori participation in tertiary education: barriers and strategies to overcome them*. Prepared for the Te Puni Kokiri. Wellington: Ministry for Maori Development.
- Kirkness, V., & Barnhardt, R. (1991). First Nations and higher education: The four R's – respect, relevance, reciprocity, responsibility. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 30(3), 1-15.
- Kovach, M. (2010). *Indigenous methodologies: Characteristics, conversations and contexts*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Larkin, S. (2015). Critical Race Theory and Indigenous higher education: Towards a remaking of the university. In H. Huijser, R. Ober, S. O'Sullivan, E. McRae-Williams & R. Elvin (Eds.), *Finding common ground: Narratives, provocations and reflections from the 40 year celebration of Batchelor Institute* (pp. 43-52). Batchelor, NT: Batchelor Press.
- Liddle, C. (2016). First peoples: Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander participation in higher education. In A. Harvey, C. Burnheim & M. Brett (Eds.), *Student equity in Australian higher education: Twenty-five years of a Fair Chance for All* (pp. 53-67). Singapore: Springer Nature.
- Malina-Wright, V., Robertson, B., & Moeke, T. (2010). *WINHEC Accreditation Handbook: Higher Education*, 3rd Ed. Prepared by the WINHEC Accreditation Authority.
- Muir, S., & Dean, A. (2017). *Evaluating outcomes of programs for Indigenous families and communities*. Child Family Community Australia (CFCA) Practice Resource. Melbourne: Australian Institute of Family Studies.
- Nakata, M. (2013). The rights and blights of the politics in Indigenous higher education. *Anthropological Forum*, 23(3), 289-303.
- National Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Higher Education Consortium (NATSIHEC). (2017). *Accelerating Indigenous higher education: Final Report*. Report for the Australian Government Department of Education and Training to accelerate education and employment outcomes for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people in the Indigenous higher education sector. National Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Consortium.
- Naylor, R., Baik, C., & James, R. (2013). *A Critical Interventions Framework for advancing equity in Australian higher education*. Report prepared for the Department of

- Industry, Innovation, Climate Change, Science, Research and Tertiary Education. Melbourne: Centre for the Study of Higher Education, University of Melbourne.
- O'Brien-Malone, A., & Diamond, M. (2010). *Research to government and back again: Addressing cross-sectoral mobility*. Response to the consultation paper on meeting Australia's research workforce needs: A consultation paper to inform the development of the Australian Government's research workforce strategy.
- Pitman, T., & Koshy, P. (2015). *A framework for measuring equity performance in higher education: Framework document*. Perth: National Centre for Student Equity in Higher Education.
- Priestly, A., Lynch, M., Wallace, C., & Harwood, V. (2015). Pathways to success: AIME's educational mentoring model. *Learning Communities: International Journal of Learning in Social Contexts*, 17, 44-53.
- Productivity Commission. (2013). *Better Indigenous Policies: The role of evaluation*, Roundtable Proceedings, Productivity Commission, Canberra, 22-23 October 2012.
- Rigney, L. (1999). Internationalization of an Indigenous Anticolonial Cultural Critique of Research Methodologies. *Wicazo SA Review*, 14(2), 109-121.
- Rigney, L-I. (2011). *Indigenous higher education reform and Indigenous knowledges*. Review of Indigenous higher education consultancy for the Behrendt Review. May, 2011. University of South Australia.
- Rigney, L-I. (2017). A design and evaluation framework for Indigenisation of Australian universities. In J. Frawley, S. Larkin & J. Smith (Eds.), *Indigenous pathways, transitions and participation in higher education: From policy to practice* (pp.45-63). Singapore: Springer Nature.
- Smith, G. (2000). Maori education: Revolution and transformative action. *Canadian Journal of Native Education*, 24(1), 57-72.
- Smith, J., Trinidad, S., & Larkin, S. (2015). Participation in higher education in Australia among under-represented groups: What can we learn from the Higher Education Participation and Partnership Program to better support Indigenous learners? *Learning Communities: International Journal of Learning in Social Contexts*, 17, 12-29.
- Smith, J., Trinidad, S., & Larkin, S. (2017). Understanding the nexus between equity and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander higher education policy agendas in Australia. In J. Frawley, S. Larkin and J. Smith (Eds.), *Indigenous pathways, transitions and participation in higher education: From policy to practice* (pp. 15-30). Singapore: Springer Nature.
- Smith, J., Larkin, S., Yibarbuk, D., & Guenther, J. (2017). What do we know about community engagement in Indigenous education contexts and how might this impact on pathways into higher education? In J. Frawley, S. Larkin and J. Smith (Eds.), *Indigenous pathways, transitions and participation in higher education: From policy to practice* (pp. 31-44). Singapore: Springer Nature.
- Smith, L.T. (2012). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and Indigenous peoples* (2nd Ed.). London: Zed Books.
- Task Force of the National Organizing Committee of the 1993 World Indigenous Peoples' Conference on Education. (1999). *The Coolangatta Statement on Indigenous Peoples' Rights in Education*. Presented at the World Indigenous Peoples' Conference on Education, Hilo, Hawai'i, August 6, 1999.
- United Nations. (2008). *United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples*. United Nations.
- Universities Australia. (2011). *National best practice framework for Indigenous cultural competency in Australian Universities*. Canberra: Universities Australia.

- Universities Australia. (2017). *Universities Australia Indigenous Strategy 2017-2020*. Canberra: Universities Australia.
- Walter, M. (2010). The politics of the data: how the Australian statistical Indigene is constructed. *International Journal of Critical Indigenous Studies*, 3(2), 45-56.
- Walter, M. (2016). Data politics and Indigenous representation in Australian statistics. In T. Kukutai & J. Taylor (Eds.), *Indigenous data sovereignty: Towards an agenda* (pp. 79-97). Canberra: Australian National University Press.
- Wilks, J., & Wilson, K. (2014). 'Can't be what you can't see': *The transition of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students into higher education: Literature Review*. Prepared by the University of Notre Dame, Southern Cross University and Batchelor Institute of Indigenous Tertiary Education for the Office of Learning and Teaching.
- Wilks, J., & Wilson, K. (2015). Indigenous Australia: A profile of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander higher education student population. *Australian Universities' Review*, 57(2), 17-30.
- Wilks, J., Radnidge, E., & Wilson, K. (2017). Indigenous Tutorial Assistance Scheme – Tertiary tuition and beyond: Transitioning with strengths and promoting opportunities. *Australian Universities' Review*, 59(1), 14-23.