Ninti One Limited

Submission to the Indigenous Education Review—Draft Report

Ninti One Limited

ABN: 28 106 610 833

PO Box 3971, Alice Springs, NT, 0871

Ninti One Limited Contacts:

Jan Ferguson, Managing Director: 0401 719 882; jan.ferguson@nintione.com.au

John Guenther, Principal Research Leader: 0412 125 661; john.guenther@nintione.com.au

Introduction

Ninti One welcomes the opportunity to comment on *the Indigenous Education Review—Draft Report*. Ninti One is a not-for-profit, national company that builds opportunities for people in remote Australia through research, innovation and community development. Ninti One manages the research activities and partnerships of CRC for Remote Economic Participation (CRC-REP) and engages in other activities for the benefit of Australians living in remote areas. The CRC-REP is focused on addressing the high levels of social, economic, health and education disadvantages experienced by people living in remote regions and, in particular the impact of economic exclusion on the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander population. The CRC-REP has established a unique collaborative research platform that works with communities, businesses and people in remote regions of Australia to systematically investing ate and provide practical responses to the complex issues that drive economic participation. One of the CRC-REP research projects, Remote Education Systems, is investigating how remote education systems can best respond to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community expectations, aspirations and needs. The project aims to find out how remote Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities can get the best benefit from the teaching and learning happening in and out of schools

The Remote Education Systems project has been gathering data and consulting stakeholders of remote education in Western Australia, Northern Territory, South Australia and Queensland over the last two years. The project is led by three senior researchers based in Alice Springs and supported by four post-graduate students based in Adelaide, Darwin and Kalgoorlie. To date, about 650 stakeholders, including community members, teachers, principals, government agencies, academics, businesses and non-government organisations, have engaged in the project. The team has conducted surveys in 10 remote communities and has conducted interviews and focus groups with more than 150 stakeholders. The team has analysed publicly available data from the Australian Bureau of Statistics 2011 Census and five years of data for very remote schools, from the myschool website.

It is within the context of the extensive learnings coming from the project that the Remote Education Systems team offers a response to the Northern Territory (NT) Indigenous Education Review Draft Report. There are several findings and recommendations in the Report that the RES project findings do support. However, we believe there are others that warrant further considerations. The response presented here is focused on education for students from or in very remote parts of the Northern Territory, and those communities where schools have a predominantly Aboriginal population. The response is divided into a number of sections which cut across many of the chapters. Rather than take a chapter by chapter approach, the team has considered the Report under thematic headings. Our key responses headline each section where we believe that consideration is warranted.

Supported recommendations and findings

The suggestion that 'bush schools' are different from 'town schools' (Recommendation 1) is an important distinction, which we believe deserves a policy response. RES research supports a different systemic response to bush schools (Bat & Guenther, 2013). There are marked differences,

not only in the outcomes from these schools, but the context is notably different as well, which we discuss below. We also note and affirm the assertion that remoteness is not in itself the cause of apparent failure of schools (p. 47).

We also affirm the need for evaluation as highlighted in a number of recommendations (5, 6, 19c, 37d) and the finding that a number of programs run without 'clear and unambiguous evidence to measure success' (p. 44). Our research has found it very difficult to obtain data or public reports of evaluations, which point to the effectiveness, success or failure of programs. There is considerable reporting of activity and plenty of so-called 'what works' examples, but few that are built on sound evaluations. We also see that there are plenty programs, where the evidence is drawn from studies based in non-remote contexts, but whether that evidence translates the same way in remote and very remote contexts is often untested and unchallenged.

The recommendation (18) which supports the development of Clontarf-like programs for girls, is one we would also affirm. We do not see the need for a one size fits all program though. There is scope for programs that support the sporting, academic, and creative aspirations of girls (and boys), many of which could promote individual identity, excellence and success. The need for programs that support girls' aspirations as future mothers is very important , given that about one-quarter of all remote Indigenous women become mothers below the age of 20 (Thompson, 2013).

Our research also affirms the need for better local community engagement, particularly as indicated in Recommendations 23 to 26. Our findings suggest that where community engagement is effective, it comes about, not as the result of a system-wide approach through the development of partnership agreements or engagement strategies, but through effective local leadership, which encourages community participation in schools and school participation in the community. Hence, Recommendation 23 is particularly important. If this is followed through it will be likely that a range of approaches will be adopted. Most importantly, this recommendation will support the promotion of local voice and leadership such that the school is seen as belonging to the community.

The remote context

> **Response 1   It is recommended that Remote education be described as transformative, constructive process rather than in terms of deficit, and problem.**

As discussed in the 'Supported recommendations and findings section', we welcome a distinction between 'bush' and 'town'. We note this distinction will be fine-tuned, as a geographic distinction may not completely hold (author comments at the Alice Springs public meeting 24/2/14 (ASpm24/2). However, the distinction remains important, as it has the potential to recognise and incorporate the perspectives, understandings, realities and goals of remote students and their families.

Our research suggests that understanding the aspirations remote people hold for education and their life choices is critical to providing education that is situated in the context and responsive to its users (Sam Osborne & Guenther, 2013). This means working with communities to meet their aspirations through action and to shape new understandings. Approaching this as an opportunity rather than as a problem may be more productive for achieving long-term transformation. For this reason we see the framing of the 'bush' as a 'major problem' as counter-productive. While acknowledging the complexities of life and work in remote contexts, it is crucial to move from 'problem' to 'context'. Indeed, it is important to move away from a deficit model as it can undermine any kind of transformative pedagogy, which the author has advocated (ASpm24/2).

The Review rightfully identifies the following for school improvement and long-term transformation:

- positive and skilled leadership;
- genuine community engagement and employment in the education enterprise in on-going and embedded ways; and
- effective orientation and training of visiting teachers to best understand the context and to approach it with respect and hope.

However, an explicit expression of student's needs should be considered. This can be addressed by recommending culturally responsive, locally relevant curriculum and successful learning experiences for students (Silburn, Nutton, McKenzie, & Landrigan, 2011, pp. 33-40). A genuinely responsive program of community engagement would ensure it is not top down and would recognise traditional decision making and communication processes. Attention to these factors has potential to yield greater returns (Helme & Lamb, 2011; Silburn et al., 2011) than any attendance or instruction program (Wright, Arnold, & Dandie, 2012).

We welcome acknowledgement of the need for education to cater for teenage and young adults (ASpm24/2), who do not attend or remain at boarding schools. However, we are concerned at the lack of attention to this group in the Draft Report. Further comment is provided later in this submission. Excessive focus on young children has potential to disenfranchise significant older age groups. Communities are networks of related kin and should not be framed as discreet groups—learning communities are worth supporting. A positive program in this area is Families as First Teachers (FaFT) initiative. However, if meaningful learning opportunities are not available to young adults then positive role models and pathways crucial for their younger kin are limited. Given these young people are just a few years from being the next cohort of parents, their empowerment and well-being is central to the success of their children in education.

We welcome the author's comments (ASpm24/2) on cross-agency collaboration to address some of key well-being issues that lie outside of education provision (such as healthcare, mental health services, infrastructure) that interact with education. We support this holistic development approach.

Attendance

> **Response 2.** **The evidence presented in the Report suggests a shift from the focus on attendance as a primary goal to one of meaningful student engagement in learning at school.**

There has been a lot of recent attention given to the importance of attendance in remote schools. We agree that attendance is important for a variety of reasons. Attendance however, is not the same as educational success, which in turn is not the same as learning. In much of the discourse around school attendance, as identified in some of our research papers, it seems that those three concepts are conflated into one (see for example Sam Osborne & Guenther, 2013). Avoiding these essential distinctions may lead to unintended consequences.

Despite the many efforts to do so, systems have over recent years failed to improve attendance rates. And to this extent, our research concurs with the findings presented in the Draft Report at Table 4 (see for example Guenther, 2013b). We note throughout the Report, the repeated reference to evidence-based practice and strategies which should drive what the system does. The Report

itself suggests that the *Every Child, Every Day* strategy has failed (p. 85) based on the evidence of the four years to 2012. There is no clear evidence or data that show that any intervention, including the School Enrolment and Attendance Measure (SEAM) is actually working. Indeed the evaluation of the SEAM trial (Wright et al., 2012) pointed to its failure to make a difference in remote communities. Therefore, implementation of 'stronger measures' (p.86) alone may not achieve desired outcomes.

We contend, a) that attendance strategies in remote communities do not work, and b) that the link between attendance and academic outcomes is at best weak, accounting for only about 10 per cent of improved outcomes (Guenther, 2013a). Other evidence based on longitudinal analysis, suggests that there is no link between attendance and outcomes (Ladwig & Luke, 2013).

The problems associated with coercive attendance strategies are alluded to in the Report (p.87). Our observations in many very remote schools across three jurisdictions would suggest that the problem of 'disaffected and disengaged' students is indeed one reason why attendance strategies tend not to work. Another reason is that schools are ill-prepared for sudden shifts in student populations. Finding additional staff at short notice is invariably a problem for many remote schools, as is finding staff who have the necessary skills to work effectively with EAL/D students or those who are disengaged. This reality highlights the problems associated with staffing schools on the basis of attendance rather than enrolment. Our observations and reading of the literature suggest there are other ways of engaging chronic non-attenders in learning. In the Northern Territory we find several alternative ways of engaging children and young people in meaningful learning, for example:

- Edmund Rice's Flexible Learning Centre, in Alice Springs
- Learning on Country programs in Arnhem Land
- The Veranda Education project at Wadeye
- Children's Ground in Jabiru

Each of the above examples have a different emphasis depending on the context. Rather than a sole focus on attendance, each one focuses more on engagement in learning. We would encourage the Review to consider examples such as these and build on those successful programs. While Clontarf may be a useful example of how to effectively engage students, it is not the only one. There are several alternative models that could be considered (see for example Maughan, 2010; Partington et al., 2009; The Aurora Project, 2014). Coming out of our research, we have proposed the idea of a 'Red Dirt Curriculum' (S Osborne, Lester, Minutjukur, & Tjitayi, 2013), which encapsulates the idea of a cultural and contextually relevant curriculum and which gives students every opportunity to explore opportunities for learning and economic engagement outside their communities.

Given the Australian Government's Remote School Attendance Strategy (RSAS), and its School Enrolment and Attendance Measure (SEAM) it may prove a duplication of resources for the Department of Education to do the same kind of thing.

Language matters

> **Response 3** **Consideration should be given to the development of a systemic strategy for the use of first language in learning, in response to aspirations of school communities.**

There is some confusion which stems from the use of 'literacy' to include the broader idea of language. 'Literacy' has been expanded from the traditional 'reading and writing', to include the interpretation and production of different communication modes (including spoken, written, images,

audio, non-verbal) for various socio-cultural purposes The confusion is not evident when thinking about first language English-speaking students, whose language proficiency is largely given and English literacy development flows from this. This is not the case for students who have to learn a new language to access instruction, the curriculum and develop initial literacy skill in the new language.

For EAL/D students, every lesson is a language lesson. While language must be developed for literacy related skills and knowledge, language is also needed in order to learn maths and science. The cognitive load for all learning is increased with the language demands, and this is where the teacher's skill, across all teaching—not just literacy—teaching, is important. This is also where, with careful language planning and team planning, instruction in first language can play a central role.

To develop effective practice for English language instruction, there is a need for a whole of system and whole of school approach with a unified EAL/D program, which includes a policy and implementation framework. This would include engagement of teachers with qualifications and/or experience in teaching English as an Additional Language/Dialect (EAL/D); professional learning opportunities within and out of schools for all staff and developing understandings and practices that would be part of a whole school improvement program. Staff needs to develop skills for levelling, moderation and assessment. There are effective tools available. However, there is no off-the-shelf package for this. Expertise could be drawn from within the Department and from other jurisdictions, to facilitate this.

The rejection of the use of first language in literacy development (p.7) should be considered to leave the possibility of reviewing settings where there is community commitment. We have been unable to find an evidence base to reject dual language programs (Devlin, 2011), and there is no evidence to show that students in NT schools teaching English-only have better results than schools using first languages as an instructional language and for early literacy learning (Devlin, 2010). The evidence base for the educational benefits of the use of planned first language instruction is however, strong (Coleman, 2011; García, 2011; McCarty, 2009; McIlwraith, 2013; Ouane & Glanz, 2010; Silburn et al., 2011).

Local Indigenous knowledge, including language, does present economic opportunity, for example in cultural tourism opportunities, Natural Resource Management, traditional healing (Arnott, Guenther, Davis, Foster, & Cummings, 2010; Butler & Hinch, 2007; Fogarty, 2012)—not forgetting the important employment opportunities that come from translation and interpretation services. We strongly recommend innovative and concerted approaches to incorporating this in remote education.

Beyond the opportunities presented by use of local languages in education, there are also international obligations under the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (United Nations, 2007), which under Article 14 states that

> *Indigenous peoples have the right to establish and control their educational systems and institutions providing education in their own languages, in a manner appropriate to their cultural methods of teaching and learning.*

Community engagement

> **Response 4.** **'Community engagement', is better conceived as a collaborative process that genuinely listens to, seeks out and accepts community input**

The report contains a range of recommendations for discussion that relate specifically to community engagement (3,6,7,21,22,23,25) and governance (or 'precursor bodies'; 24,26). These are important areas for consideration that we support as critical for improving remote schooling. There is, however, a need to further examine what 'community engagement' means in practice. Of some concern, for example is recommendation 25:

> *Focus community engagement on existing agreements where these are valued and the implementation of specific Department strategies (e.g. residential facilities for secondary students).*

This highlights the problematic nature of unequal concepts of consultation and community engagement. The underutilisation of 'power-sensitive' conversations (Haraway, 2004) has to some extent caused this divide between school and community. There are alternative ways of seeing community engagement. For example, through a community engagement approach to research and inform remote education practice, Wearne and Yunupingu (2011) surveyed families across five Arnhem Land communities, summarising with the following statement:

> *Children need to be competent in both western and Yolngu teachings. Yolngu culture is paramount and western education must be embedded in a learning context that respects and affirms traditional Yolngu cultural knowledge, traditions and practices. (p.11)*

Building on this type of process and evidence gathering as a foundation for 'community engagement' is far more likely to see engagement with the kinds of things that boarding schools can offer young people in very remote communities. The need to engage parents and families in approaches to mental health and wellbeing, for example (recommendations 19,20) or curriculum more broadly (other than early childhood, see recommendation 6,7) should be given consideration and supported. .In very remote contexts, this point becomes more pressing as language, values and ontologies are not congruent with the life experience of teachers and mainstream resources and assumptions are not effective. This area is more fully discussed in some of our recent research papers: S Osborne (2013) and S Osborne, Minutjukur, Tjitayi, and Lester (2013).

School councils can be an important vehicle for engaging the community in schooling. Our research supports this priority. Whilst in central Australia, active and informed school governing councils are not the norm in many remote communities, in the APY Lands (SA), this has been an embedded and mandatory part of remote school functions, even in schools where enrolments would be considered too small to be allowed to open in the NT. These recommendations open the door for models such as the Independent Public School model as developed in WA. Recommendation 24 therefore is well stated in calling for support for principals and a staged approach to building capacity for local school governance models**.**

There are several examples where very remote community members perform important roles in informed decision making through structures under ORIC (Office of Registered Indigenous Corporations). Organisations such as NPY Women's Council, Nyangatjatjara College, and the Warlpiri Education Training Trust (WETT) have been doing this successfully for some time and offer valuable

learning to principals and school systems where governance structures and processes can be unfamiliar to school leaders.

The Report rightly points to the need to attract and expect prepared and high quality teachers and school leaders to drive a remote school improvement agenda. We believe there is a need to clearly articulate and define what skills are required beyond mainstream leadership skill set to successfully operate in a remote and cross cultural context.

Recommendation 31(c) seeks synergy between 'NT teacher education institutions and 'Departmental priorities and the requirements for bush teaching.' This is an important goal for both Batchelor Institute of Indigenous Tertiary Education (BIITE) and Charles Darwin University (CDU). It is disappointing that very few CDU trained educators end up in remote schools. To this end, the Remote Education Systems project has identified 'growing the help we want' as a key strategy for improving the quality of teachers and education leaders attracted to NT remote schools. This would require formal partnership arrangements with CDU and interstate universities to encourage a long term relationship that supports pre-service teachers who are interested in pursuing a career in NT remote schools. It would include having input into courses and content to best prepare these students for success in their work. It goes well beyond 'attracting'. We are suggesting something along the lines of a Bachelor, Honours or Masters in remote education that would require students to engage in a relationship with a remote community or region as a pre-service teacher. A practicum and an action research project as well as specific subjects for effective preparation could position emerging educators for long term success in their work in a remote community school. Subsidising courses and travel to communities as well as incentives for successful completion of professional practice (e.g. completion of 2, 3 or 5 year terms) could be considered as a way of achieving the desired outcomes.

Such an approach would strengthen the claims of recommendations 26, 30, 31, 34 and 35 and begin to build a cohort of experienced remote educators and site leaders that builds capacity in the workforce to fill a range of roles, including stepping up to regional leadership roles. However, to achieve this will require a strategic approach with necessary support and infrastructure from central offices.

Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander educators are currently underutilised as local school and community assets. The push towards English language priorities, boarding schools and teacher standards has potential to further alienate Aboriginal educators from remote Aboriginal education. As suggested earlier, place based approaches to curriculum (see S Osborne, Minutjukur, et al., 2013) and areas such as mandated child protection education and mental health and wellbeing promotion in schools (see S Osborne, 2013) are important opportunities to build local capacity, imagination and aspiration. 'Strengthening programs to increase Indigenous teacher numbers and quality' (recommendation 28) is an important statement. In this regard, the Report introduces concepts such as raising standards, performance management and professional expectations. Whilst we agree that these are all important and worth pursuing, more consideration could be given into how Indigenous educator engagement in remote schooling can be revitalised and transformed. Achievable and flexible training arrangements including community based delivery are essential. Raising the bar in terms of mainstream standards is likely to decrease participation from remote Aboriginal educators unless there is a significant and concurrent investment of funding as well as transforming the orientation and vision of remote schooling to better reflect the 'red dirt' aspirations and priorities of the community.

Secondary education

Response 5. **A full range of secondary school options for all NT students including local, regional, distance, semi-residential and full boarding schools should be considered.**

Notwithstanding the Review's constraints in terms of providing additional resources and its concerns about providing quality education, the directions suggested by the Report have implications for equity and access to education. The current *Northern Territory of Australia Education Act,* is described under the title as

> *An Act to make provision for the availability of education to all people of the Northern Territory and in particular to provide for the access of all children to educational programs appropriate to their individual needs and abilities.*

We note the intent of the Minister to update the Act, but we would hope that this fundamental goal is not changed.

The primary focus for secondary education given in the Report appears to be towards the provision of residential boarding options. Our research findings do support the need for developing a range of boarding options for students, but not as a single solution. There are a number of boarding options for different purposes in the NT and on offer interstate that NT students attend. The Review would be well aware that current boarding facilities are underutilised as demand for this type of education is not meeting supply at present. To date, there has been little or no evidence available as to the number of students who run away from boarding schools within weeks and never return. Again, the Review could look more intensively at local secondary provision where every effort is made to ensure local access for secondary students, no matter what the school size (APY Lands would be a good example). There are many examples across the NT where larger 'bush' schools have successfully delivered secondary programs with verifiable outcomes. Our research shows one size rarely fits all and communities are likely to make different decisions about post primary age schooling when given a chance.

There are many well-funded programs and scholarship options for very remote students. Despite the claim that the Indigenous Youth Leadership Program (IYLP), for example is intended for remote students to have access to interstate and NT boarding options our observations suggest that relatively few very remote NT students are getting these opportunities. IYLP brokers select students who offer a high degree of probability of completion and transition to higher education. In response to this, our research has proposed the development of intensive short-term boarding experiences so that remote students who are not able to cope with long-term residential boarding are still given an opportunity to engaging in learning outside their communities, while at the same time remaining connected with education within their communities.

The Review team appears concerned at the lack of engagement with locally delivered secondary programs. There are a few examples of programs where young people do engage in learning programs that the Review could consider. In the top end as well as central Australia, Learning on Country programs draw on partnerships between schools, non-government organisation (NGOs), Land Councils, interstate schools and universities to engage young people with both mainstream and Indigenous knowledge systems where cultural knowledge and the environmental sciences form the basis for learning and interagency collaboration. Many remote schools have an exchange school partner, but many of these partnerships have developed over a period of years to reflect what could

be described as a 'knowledge exchange' relationship. This includes reciprocal visits and sharing of school and community knowledge assets to enrich and share learning experiences. Some of these partnerships form a support network for NT remote students who choose to take up boarding opportunities in or near their partner schools. These kinds of partnerships are worthy of consideration.

In the APY Lands, a combination of local delivery, regionally based semi-residential options and boarding in Adelaide is offered, recognising that students need a range of options for success. The Umuwa based Trade Training Centre (TTC) offers skill specific accredited training such as mechanical skills, hospitality, conservation and land management and woodwork certificates. This model has developed into a semi-residential program focussing on student 'work exposure' experiences in partnership with the Yulara based facility at Nyangatjatjara College. The TTC and Work Exposure programs have developed for a number of years but in the near future, eight very remote young people will begin apprenticeships at the Ayer's Rock Resort.

This is the result of a consistent approach to local delivery and regional semi-residential programs. The same approach is evident in our RES project's conception and elaboration of a 'Red Dirt Curriculum' (see S Osborne, Minutjukur, et al., 2013) where communities work with professionals in the fields of environmental science, linguistics, mental health and wellbeing, corporation law, Aboriginal histories, tourism, music and the arts to deliver a range of dynamic and relevant accredited studies in secondary education using the local and regional (semi-residential) delivery model. These approaches better prepare very remote young people for post school engagement in employment than metropolitan approaches to training and curriculum.

Across central Australia, community led investment (e.g. WETT) has developed a series of community based learning centres. These centres are flexible and responsive to community learning demands and have a partnership to delivery and accreditation. These learning spaces are in high demand and enjoy high levels of community support and demand (see Kral & Schwab, 2012).

We believe this section of the report could be further developed and enhanced with further analysis and considerations given to existing successful initiatives such as the ones described above.

What is missing from the Draft Report?

> **Response 6 .** **The final Report would benefit from a) considering additional literature from a range of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander authors; b) considering the available research evidence in remote education, c) consulting with more remote communities and schools d) considering the full range of boarding options currently available to Northern Territory students, within and outside the Territory e) fully addressing a number of the Review's Terms of References**

In developing its final report, the Review could consider:

A) Additional literature from Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander authors

At present, there are too few references to many Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander authors on the topic of education and what works. There are numerous excellent references that should be consulted. For example (though not restricted to):

Nakata, M. (2008). *Disciplining the savages, savaging the disciplines*, Canberra, Aboriginal Studies Press.
Ford, P. L. (2010). *Aboriginal Knowledge Narratives and Country: Marri kunkimba putj putj marrideyan*, Brisbane, Post Pressed.
Sarra, C. (2011). *Strong and Smart: Towards a Pedagogy for Emancipation*, New York, Routlege.
Yunkaporta, T. (2009), *Aboriginal Pedagogies at the Cultural Interface*, Draft Report for DET on Indigenous Research Project conducted by Tyson Yunkaporta, Aboriginal Education Consultant, in Western NSW Region Schools, 2007-2009:, Retrieved May 2011 from http://8ways.wikispaces.com/file/view/draft+report.doc.
Arbon, V. (2008). *Arlathirnda Ngurkarnda Ityirnda: Being-Knowing-Doing, De-colonising Indigenous Tertiary Education*, Teneriffe, QLD, Post Press.
Price, K., Ed. (2012). *Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Education: An introduction for the teaching profession*. Port Melbourne, Cambridge University Press.
Purdie, N., Milgate, G. and Bell, H., Eds. (2011). *Two Way Teaching and Learning: Toward culturally reflective and relevant education*. Camberwell, ACER Press.
O'Keefe, K., Olney, H. and Angus, M. (2012), *Obstacles to success: Indigenous students in primary schools*, Retrieved April 2013 from http://www.appa.asn.au/reports/Obstacles-to-success.pdf.

B) Additional literature on education in remote Australia

While we acknowledge the breadth and depth of the task faced by the Review in a relatively short period of time, the literature and evidence reviewed is constrained and excludes significant contributions in the the available literature as it relates to education in very remote Australia. Ninti One's Remote Australia Online portal would serve as a valuable starting point in this regard (see http://www.nintione.com.au/resources/search/remote%20education). Further, we would urge the Review to consider literature from the international context. Canada, for example, has similar contextual issues and there is much that could be learned from its successes and failures.

C) Further visits to a range of schools and community consultations

We note that the Report is a draft report only and the Review still had some work to do. However, based on the list of schools consulted (Appendix Two) it appears that only a relatively small

proportion of the 79 very remote schools with more than 80 per cent Aboriginal enrolment, were visited. While not all those schools are government schools, and noting that the terms of reference exclude non-government schools, it would be worthwhile to find out what is working across the range of schools in the Northern Territory. Additionally, we believe that the Review would benefit from consulting more broadly community members and organisations across the NT. Further visits to boarding schools

D) Considering a full range of boarding school options

Further, given the emphasis on boarding schools and hostels as a preferred model, it would seem sensible to learn from the experiences of all NT boarding facilities, including Tiwi College, the facility at Wadeye, St John's College, Kormilda College, Marrara College and St Philip's College. It could also be beneficial to consider the Wiltja facility in Adelaide, CAPS in Esperance, Worawa in Healesville and Djarragun College in Gordonvale, all of which attract students from remote communities. We believe that a more considered approach, based on a broader consultation with boarding stakeholders, would produce a better model.

E) Fully address some of the Terms of Reference

Our reading of the Draft Report suggests that a number of the Terms of Reference for the Review have not yet been fully addressed. For example, under the heading of Resourcing Effort, the Review was to

> *Evaluate the cost-effectiveness and equity of the allocation of targeted resources to schools to support education service delivery to Indigenous students.*

The Draft Report discusses the NT and Australian Government budget allocations with a commentary on funding arrangements and makes recommendations about these. However, it does not provide an evaluation of cost effectiveness.

Under the heading of Partnerships the Review was to

> *Identify opportunities and mechanisms for greater collaborative working arrangements with other agencies and the Australian Government.*

Beyond partnerships with communities, the Review has to date offered few ways that it can work more effectively with the Australian Government, with the non-Government school sectors, or with other related service providers (with the exception of some discussion about integrated service delivery in the chapter on Primary education). Our reading of the literature suggests that collaborative partnership arrangements between government agencies and non-government service providers are essential from a cost-effectiveness point of view but also from a service delivery point of view. We would be happy to provide examples and assist the Review in identifying opportunities and mechanisms for greater collaborations.

References

Arnott, A., Guenther, J., Davis, V., Foster, D., & Cummings, E. (2010). Evaluation of the Akeyulerre Healing Centre. Darwin: Charles Darwin University,, Social Partnerships in Learning (SPiL) Consortium.

Bat, M., & Guenther, J. (2013). Red Dirt Thinking on Education: A People-Based System. *The Australian Journal of Indigenous Education, 42*(Special Issue 02), 123-135. doi: doi:10.1017/jie.2013.20

Butler, R., & Hinch, T. (2007). *Tourism and indigenous peoples: Issues and implications*. Oxford: Elsevier.

Coleman, H. (Ed.). (2011). *Dreams and realities: Developing countries and the English language*. London: British Council.

Devlin, B. (2010). Evidence, policy and the 'Step'model of bilingual education in the NT: a brief outline: Charles Darwin University.

Devlin, B. (2011). A bilingial education policy issue: Biliteracy versus English-only literacy. In N. Purdie, G. Milgate & H. Bell (Eds.), *Two Way Teaching and Learning: Toward culturally reflective and relevant education* (pp. 49-70). Camberwell: ACER Press.

Fogarty, W. (2012). Country as classroom. In J. Altman & S. Kerins (Eds.), *People on country : vital landscapes indigenous future* (pp. 82-93). Annandale: The Federation Press.

García, O. (2011). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. Oxford: John Wiley & Sons.

Guenther, J. (2013a). Are We Making Education Count in Remote Australian Communities or Just Counting Education? *The Australian Journal of Indigenous Education, 42*(Special Issue 02), 157-170. doi: doi:10.1017/jie.2013.23

Guenther, J. (2013b). *Towards educational advantage in very remote Australia: An analysis of 2012 NAPLAN data: what does it tell us about remote education in the last five years?* Paper presented at the Australian Association for Research in Education, Adelaide. http://www.aare.edu.au/publications-database.php/8299/towards-educational-advantage-in-very-remote-australia-an-analysis-of-2012-naplan-data-what-does-it-

Haraway, D. (2004). Situated knowledges: The science question in feminism and the privilege of partial perspective. In S. Harding (Ed.), *The feminist standpoint theory reader: Intellectual and political controversies, *. New York and London: Routledge.

Helme, S., & Lamb, S. (2011). Closing the school completion gap for Indigenous students. Canberra: Closing the Gap Clearinghouse.

Kral, I., & Schwab, R. (2012). *Learning spaces : youth, literacy and new media in remote Indigenous Australia*. Canberra: CAEPR, ANU E press.

Ladwig, J., & Luke, A. (2013). Does improving school level attendance lead to improved school level achievement? An empirical study of indigenous educational policy in Australia. *The Australian Educational Researcher*, 1-24. doi: 10.1007/s13384-013-0131-y

Maughan, C. (2010). Remote Education Systems: Discussion paper: NintiOne, Cooperative Research Centre for Remote Economic Participation.

McCarty, T. L. (2009). Empowering indigenous languages–What can be learned from Native American experiences? In T. Skutnabb-Kangas, R. Phillipson, A. K. Mohanty & M. Panda (Eds.), *Multilingual education for social justice* (pp. 125-139). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

McIlwraith, H. (Ed.). (2013). *Multilingual Education in Africa: Lessons from the Juba Language –in-Education Conference.* London: British Council.

Osborne, S. (2013). Kulintja Nganampa Maa-kunpuntjaku (Strengthening Our Thinking): Place-Based Approaches to Mental Health and Wellbeing in Anangu Schools. *The Australian Journal of Indigenous Education, 42*(Special Issue (2), December 2013), 182-193. doi: 10.1017/jie.2013.25

Osborne, S., & Guenther, J. (2013). Red Dirt Thinking on Aspiration and Success. *The Australian Journal of Indigenous Education, 42*(Special Issue 02), 88-99. doi: 10.1017/jie.2013.17

Osborne, S., Lester, K., Minutjukur, M., & Tjitayi, K. (2013). *Red Dirt Curriculum: Reimagining Remote Education*. Paper presented at the Sidney Myer Rural Lecture 3, Desert Knowledge Precinct, Alice Springs. Video recording retrieved from http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=za6w8ph_VDg&feature=youtu.be

Osborne, S., Minutjukur, M., Tjitayi, K., & Lester, K. (2013). *Red Dirt Curriculum; Reimagining Remote Education*. Paper presented at the Sidney Myer Rural Lecture, Desert Knowledge Precinct, Alice Springs.

Ouane, A., & Glanz, C. (2010). *Why and How Africa Should Invest in African Languages and Multilingual Education: An Evidence-and Practice-Based Policy Advocacy Brief*. Paris: UNESCO.

Partington, G., Galloway, A., Sibbel, J., Gray, J., Grote, E., Gower, G., & Goh, K. (2009). Longitudinal Study of Student Retention and Success in High School (Follow The Dream): Centre for Indigenous Australian Knowledges, Edith Cowan University.

Silburn, S., Nutton, G., McKenzie, J., & Landrigan, M. (2011). Early years English language acquisition and instructional approaches for Aboriginal students with home languages other than English: A systematic review of the Australian and international literature. Darwin: Menzies School of Health Research, The Centre for Child Development and Education.

The Aurora Project. (2014). The Aspiration Initiative Retrieved February 2014, from http://www.auroraproject.com.au/node/428#The_Aspiration_Initiative

Thompson, F. (2013). Mothers and Babies 2010 *Northern Territory Midwives' Collection*. Darwin: Department of Health.

United Nations. (2007). *United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples*. Retrieved from http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/documents/DRIPS_en.pdf.

Wearne, G., & Yunupingu, M. (2011). 'Into the Mainstream': Supporting parental engagement in the education programs offered in five northeast Arnhem Land Yolngu communities.

Wright, E., Arnold, H., & Dandie, S. (2012). Improving School Enrolment and Attendance through Welfare Reform Measure (SEAM): Social Policy and Economic Strategy Group, Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations.