



COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA

Official Committee Hansard

**HOUSE OF
REPRESENTATIVES**

STANDING COMMITTEE ON INDUSTRY, SCIENCE AND
INNOVATION

Reference: Research training and workforce issues in Australian universities

MONDAY, 11 AUGUST 2008

DARWIN

BY AUTHORITY OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

INTERNET

Hansard transcripts of public hearings are made available on the internet when authorised by the committee.

The internet address is:

<http://www.aph.gov.au/hansard>

To search the parliamentary database, go to:

<http://parlinfoweb.aph.gov.au>

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
STANDING COMMITTEE ON INDUSTRY, SCIENCE AND INNOVATION

Monday, 11 August 2008

Members: Ms Vamvakinou (*Chair*), Fran Bailey (*Deputy Chair*), Mr Bidgood, Mr Champion, Mr Cheeseman, Dr Jensen, Mr Johnson, Mr Ramsey, Ms Rishworth, Mr Symon

Members in attendance: Fran Bailey, Mr Cheeseman, Dr Jensen, Mr Ramsey, Mr Symon, Ms Vamvakinou

Terms of reference for the inquiry:

To inquire into and report on:

1. The contribution that Australian universities make to research in Australia, including:

- The contribution of research training programs to Australia's competitiveness in the areas of science, research and innovation;
- The effectiveness of current Commonwealth research training schemes; and
- The adequacy of current research training schemes to support Australia's anticipated future requirements for tertiary-qualified professionals in a wide range of disciplines.

2. The challenges Australian universities face in training, recruiting and retaining high quality research graduates and staff, including, but not limited to:

- Adequacy of training and support (including income support) available to research graduates in Australia;
- Factors for graduates that determine pursuit of a career in research;
- Opportunities for career advancement for research graduates and staff;
- Factors determining pursuit of research opportunities overseas;
- Australia's ability to compete internationally for high quality researchers; and
- Whether Australia's academic workforce is ageing, and the impact this may have on Australia's research capacity.

WITNESSES

CHIRGWIN, Dr Sharon, Post Graduate Coordinator, Batchelor Institute of Indigenous Tertiary Education 1

FRASER, Professor Joe, Pro Vice Chancellor, School of Education, Arts and Social Sciences, Batchelor Institute of Indigenous Tertiary Education..... 1

HERBERT, Professor Jeannie, Vice Chancellor, Batchelor Institute of Indigenous Tertiary Education 1

STEPHENSON, Professor Peter, Pro Vice Chancellor, Research, Batchelor Institute of Indigenous Tertiary Education..... 1

Committee met at 10.16 am

CHIRGWIN, Dr Sharon, Post Graduate Coordinator, Batchelor Institute of Indigenous Tertiary Education

FRASER, Professor Joe, Pro Vice Chancellor, School of Education, Arts and Social Sciences, Batchelor Institute of Indigenous Tertiary Education

HERBERT, Professor Jeannie, Vice Chancellor, Batchelor Institute of Indigenous Tertiary Education

STEPHENSON, Professor Peter, Pro Vice Chancellor, Research, Batchelor Institute of Indigenous Tertiary Education

CHAIR (Ms Vamvakinou)—Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. I declare open this public hearing for the inquiry into research training in Australia being conducted by the House of Representatives Standing Committee on Industry, Science and Innovation. The inquiry arises from a request to this committee by Senator the Hon. Kim Carr, the federal Minister for Innovation, Industry, Science and Research. Written submissions were called for and 102 have been received to date. The committee is now conducting a program of public hearings, and inspections. This hearing is the fifth of the inquiry.

Although the committee does not require you to give evidence under oath, I should advise you that these hearings are formal proceedings of the parliament. Consequently, they warrant the same respect as proceedings of the House itself. It is customary to remind witnesses that giving false or misleading evidence is a serious matter and may be regarded as a contempt of parliament. We thank you for your submission and now welcome you to make a brief opening statement before we proceed with questions.

Prof. Stephenson—Thank you. I will start. We were not entirely sure of how the proceedings would work. We are expecting to respond to a series of questions at some stage. To open, I would like to welcome you and point out that this response, which was prepared back in May, I guess, is one of the responses we feel we have made to many of the reviews that are going on at the moment in both the department and also DEEWR, so it fits in with the series of responses with the higher ed review and the innovations review. You could say that we are somewhat ‘reviewed out’, but we are pleased that the effort is being acknowledged and that you have come up this way to talk with us in more detail.

The main point to make in opening is to say that research and research training at this institute is very new. We started postgraduate studies the year before last—the masters by research—and we commence our PhD program this semester. That is what we would consider are some very early beginnings of our previous primary role of TAFE or VET training and more recently, since 1999, higher education training. Batchelor has incrementally developed from a teacher ed college to a TAFE college, to an institute offering degrees and now a university, without the name university, offering postgraduate studies.

This is fairly new terrain for us. That is not to say that we have not had for a long time academics here involved in research, but it is the research training side that we are now moving

into through being able to provide postgraduate students into some of these grants that we have been successful with.

From what we consider is a fairly young experience here, we have experience from other universities. It is some of those that we would like to share in more detail with you—how they particularly impact on the likelihood of Indigenous postgraduates to come into programs and to successfully complete programs. I suppose that will be the emphasis of what we would like to talk about today.

Prof. Herbert—I would like to say a couple of words and mine are probably a little more general. Firstly, I think it is really critical to understand that developing research capacity in Indigenous students is a really critical component of education, as far as I am concerned—and that has been my own experience. It is really important to acknowledge that Indigenous people have really only been engaged in the higher ed sector for just over 30 years, and we have come from a very low base. In a place like Batchelor, we are still coming from a very low base in regard to many of our students.

One of the things I stress in every submission that I make about Batchelor is that it is really important for people to understand the huge issue we have here to do with previous educational disadvantage. That previous educational disadvantage plays itself out in a number of ways. Firstly, we have a lot of people—and, in this, we are no different to many schools right across the country these days—who come in with very limited literacy and numeracy skills and who are almost halfway through primary school education. So we are trying to pick people up from there and take them through enabling programs to access VET or higher ed programs. There is that aspect of it.

Another aspect is that a huge number of our students have no English language skills, so teaching spoken and written English is a really important area for us. Remember also that the students who do come in who may have some English language skills are often second-, third- or fourth-language speakers in their English. We really need to deal with issues of literacy—and, when I say ‘literacy’, I do not just mean literacy in terms of reading; I am talking about literacy that enables one to operate effectively within mainstream Australian society. These people do not have social literacy and work literacy. They are not able to engage in that mainstream society, which is a huge issue if we are talking about, as we are today, Indigenous people coming into the workforce. That issue cannot be overlooked and we must address it. For us, research, particularly participative research where we work with communities as they progress through identifying their learning needs and acquiring the learning that they need to move on to their next set of goals, is a really critical issue.

Personally, I know that, if Indigenous people can come up through the higher ed sector, achieve the undergraduate qualifications and then move on into postgraduate, it is like opening up an entire new world to them. Many of us have been lucky if any of our family members have finished secondary school. To say that we are coming from a place where you do not have a knowledge of university is one way of putting it, but, in reality, we come from places where, within the family, there is no understanding of education, even at a secondary level.

My own grandmother was totally illiterate in terms of being able to write and read—she was certainly not illiterate in the social sense—and my mother had basic primary school to about

grade 4. You can see that I am one of the fortunate ones because I grew up in a family where education was seen as something of value and the means of getting forward. But there are a lot of people who do not come from families like that.

Basically, education has not delivered to Indigenous people. Education has held out a promise. They have been told that they will get employment and they will be able to enrol in studies and so on if they come in and do it, but it has never delivered. I think that it is time in this country that we acknowledge that and that we resource Indigenous education appropriately. Places like Batchelor need to be recognised for what they deliver. That recognition has not happened to date; I am hoping that it will not be far away.

I want to touch quickly on research itself within this context. We are beginning from scratch, and it is going to take time to develop a viable postgraduate program. By ‘viable’, I mean the number of students coming out with postgraduate qualifications at the end, but I mean viable also in an economic sense. That is going to take us some time. One of the issues that we are up against is the resistance within the Indigenous communities in this country to research and researchers. That is part of the colonial history, where people still perceive researchers as coming in and taking away their knowledge and never delivering on the promises that were made about what would be shared and what would come back.

The other side of that is that Indigenous people have been excluded from education for so long in this country that they are very reluctant to go there. I think that is part of the phenomenon that we see at the moment where people really are very wary about engaging in education. There is only so long that you can continue showing your trust and having that trust abused. I do not think that any of our governments—state, territory or federal—have come to really comprehend what it is that they are dealing with in Indigenous education and Indigenous people engaging in education in this country. For me, that is pretty scary.

One of the issues is that there are too many people whose opinions are being sought who actually have never been educators and have never worked in the sector. I think it is critical that teachers and people like us who work in universities, VET institutions or whatever come to the table and engage in the conversation that says, ‘Where are we going wrong here? How do we get this moving through from sector to sector?’ Until you have that conversation, we are all operating as separate little sectors.

I really do believe that governments need to recognise that fact and they need to value the expertise that is in schools and in institutions. There is plenty of expertise there. There are Indigenous units in most universities around this country. Many of them are already going into postgraduate programs and encouraging people to train and become engaged as researchers. We need Indigenous people who are teachers, educators, researchers and so on to sit down with their mainstream counterparts and discuss the mess that is Indigenous education today and what we are going to do about it. Thank you.

CHAIR—Does anybody else want to comment or will we just go straight to questions and answers? Okay. I will ask the first question. Obviously, quite a number of issues have been raised. Perhaps I can use your words, Jeannie, and ask you what is probably a very broad-ranging question. I am interested to know how the trust has been broken in relation to mainstream education and Indigenous communities in Australia—and why.

Prof. Herbert—The why part is probably the easiest. I think trust has been broken because Indigenous students have not received the quality of education that was their right as students in whatever sector. As concerns the why, we have a little team here that delivers cross-cultural communication training and so on. I think few universities in this country have actually ensured that Indigenous studies, perspectives or knowledge are included in their teacher education programs.

We have argued, at least for the 20 years that I have been working in this area, that this is a critical means of preparing teachers to go out into our schools. We are not saying that it is something that should only be taught to people who are going to teach in the Northern Territory or go to remote communities out in Queensland or whatever. This knowledge needs to belong to every teacher in this country. Teachers are often not aware of the ethnic background of the students in their room, so they need to have this capacity to teach to diversity. I think that is a really critical issue that we do not do well; we do not front up to those responsibilities.

I am now talking as a member of the Indigenous Higher Education Advisory Council and we have had some very close dialogue with VCs in the past year about the need to provide cultural competencies in all staff in universities and to make those cultural competencies relevant in terms of graduate attributes for all students coming out of universities. We have in principle agreement. They agreed with our argument that you need to start with the universities because it is the universities that are actually producing the teachers, the nurses and whoever else is coming out—doctors and any other professionals. So we have that agreement now and we need to work out how that actually happens. That is a first step.

The other step, once you have started working in the universities, is to actually start working in the schools because there is still an enormous ignorance. That is why I said the why is easy. The reason that that trust has been broken is because of the level of ignorance in this country around the reality for Indigenous people—the racism that Indigenous people live with every day of their lives in every aspect of their lives.

CHAIR—From what you are saying, is it fair to say that that kind of failure of the education symptom—if that is the case—to absorb and understand the needs of Indigenous children, particularly at the very early stages of their learning, is one reason why there obviously has been a failure to deliver? Is that what you think the problem is—that the education system has not incorporated the Indigenous perspective in a way which is meaningful, serious and comprehensive from the very beginning, working its way right through consistently and comprehensively over the years and that, therefore, government policy has not been on top of what is actually needed?

Prof. Herbert—In a broad sense, yes. I started life as a primary teacher and had 25 years as a classroom teacher, so I am not talking about something that I have not experienced myself. I have also spent many years as a guidance officer doing professional development and so on with teachers, and I know that teachers on the ground do not always get a lot of support in terms of acquiring those skills.

I think we are beginning to see some changes with groups such as APAPDC—Australian Principals Associations Professional Development Council, for those who do not know—who are endeavouring to address these issues at the principal level, because that is where it has to

happen. For many years, principals have not responded to the needs of Indigenous students within their schools, in recognition of their real learning needs. So you have that happening there. But we also need to have it happening in the universities and in the schools.

So, yes, I would say that, over years, the education policies have not really addressed the issue of Indigenous. I understand the language around diversity and catering for diversity. I guess that, in a sense, the responsibility comes back to the school to interpret what 'catering for diversity' really means within your school community and within the terms of the students that make up your student body. Does that answer your question?

CHAIR—I am sure that my other colleagues want to pitch in. I will give the deputy chair an opportunity first.

FRAN BAILEY—Thank you very much. I am sure we will come back to some of the teaching issues you have raised, as both the chair and I are former teachers as well. I have two daughters who say, 'Once a teacher, always a teacher, no matter what you do.' However, I want to turn our attention for a moment to those fantastic young people who have overcome enormous odds to get to the stage where they are seriously considered as research students. This inquiry has heard of a number of obstacles that people have in continuing with research. Such obstacles range from the amount of the stipend received and the competition for earning much more in the wider world than in focusing on research.

You have identified a cultural problem within Indigenous communities, which is that research is not viewed favourably for those cultural reasons. Are there other reasons that add to the difficulties of encouraging Indigenous people into research, given the importance of it? In addition, are there other issues that any of you could suggest to us that would assist us in making recommendations to deal with all of the obstacles, including those cultural ones that you have referred to?

Prof. Herbert—I think I put those up there purely and simply to background what it is that we are talking about. Sharon is the person here who needs to address issues do with students in particular.

Dr Chirgwin—Can I first take a point with your saying 'fantastic young people'? Most of my students are actually 50 years old.

FRAN BAILEY—Actually, I made this mistake earlier when we were having coffee. It is important for us to understand that.

Dr Chirgwin—I think it is extremely important for you to understand that. I would like to reinforce what Jeannie has been saying. We have people who start a journey sometimes not literate at all. They come maybe to Batchelor College or maybe somewhere else and start an access course. From that access course, we have to skill them in literacy and numeracy. We are talking about people who sometimes come from communities where there is no such thing as written material. There is no paper. There is no new idea. There are no things as we know them. They may have radio stations and television, but a book? You would be very pushed sometimes to find in communities a book to read. That is the first thing I will say.

Some of them are very good at numeracy when it comes to things like cards but not when it comes to other numeracy skills. For example, I spent a considerable time with one lot of graduates teaching them about the concept of percentage—and that is not something which they understood. We are talking about people who have to go through the education system slowly and, in the meantime, you just cannot imagine the life that happens to them. The things they sometimes go through in one week, others go through in one lifetime. All of these things are happening and interfering with their education.

FRAN BAILEY—Can you give us some quick examples of that? Obviously, we are working from a pretty low base of knowledge, given that I think most of us did not even realise that we were not dealing with young people.

Dr Chirgwin—What do you mean?

FRAN BAILEY—You have just mentioned the experiences that people would go through.

Prof. Fraser—Repeated fatalities, deaths and violence; trying to engage with government processes from a place that has one public phone that does not work—‘Who are you?’ ‘I’m a common ‘J’ Jones.’ ‘Oh, we only have a Bruce Jones.’ There is no understanding of people’s position—people changing names for cultural reasons, for deaths; students coming here and then having multiple calls a day from children who are trying to get a family member to go home—teenage children; and husbands who do not want their wives away. People are being bombarded constantly by issues that impact on their education. It is significant.

FRAN BAILEY—I just thought it was important to get that on the record.

Dr Chirgwin—There are just so many things. I do not think mainstream Australia has any idea about what their lives are like. That is the first thing. They come from access and go perhaps to a VET course. They move from a VET course—a lot of them, if they are lucky—into a degree. Here, primarily, I would say, it would be education, linguistics and some would go into social sciences. A lot of them, once they get into a degree—and they even go to the first or second year—are very highly prized by government departments. Here you have someone that has a smattering of education and a wealth of experience. I will probably cut across people’s sensitivities here, but they also, in many instances, act as a token Indigenous person in a particular institution or department. So they go into work and, because they are the token Indigenous person—and one of my students wants to do research on this—they get all of the burdens for every single thing that happens with respect to Indigenous. They have to learn the new culture of a workforce which is totally different to perhaps education, community or whatever it has been. They are in a totally alien culture, often not mentored or looked after properly, with all of these extra burdens.

Generally speaking, many of these people go in and out of employment; a lot of the lucky ones finish their degree. People come to me with burning issues that, as Indigenous people, they want to research; they have seen them in the course of working in a government department. I have had people from mental health, for example, who have seen mental health workers in communities or in areas stressed out because they cannot cope with the huge demands of Indigenous mental health workers.

I have people who are concerned about things like the suicide rate of 14-year-old new mothers. Why has this happened? It has never happened in our communities before. What is all this about? I have people concerned about the impact of black American culture on small Indigenous communities. These are burning issues. They want to do something about them.

So these people come to me. I have research training units, but I also have a problem because many of them again, even though they may have got through their degree, still need help. The biggest help—and I was just talking with some of the colleagues at the back—is confidence. Many of them lack confidence. One of the jobs that is very time consuming is to give those people confidence—‘You can do this. We’ll help you; we’ll step you through.’

The training units that we have are very important; they are modelled on JCU. We take them step by step through a series to try and teach them—‘Okay, this is what research is about. This is Western world research.’ I add a little bit of Chinese research because I think it is very important that they understand that other groups were ripped off besides Indigenous people. That is one thing I do. There are other cultures. There is Western culture and there are Asian cultures. Then we start to look at their own possibilities as researchers.

We place great importance—and I will pick up on something that Jeannie said—on the ethics unit. One of the things that we hope to do at Batchelor Institute is to train our researchers to behave with the highest priority of ethics and put something back. You do not take; you give something back. So we are hoping that most of our researchers come out with a product that they will put back. In some instances, it will be a tangible product—maybe go back to a community and say to the community, ‘Here are some booklets. Here are some posters. Let’s talk about it. This is what we have done.’ They must be seen to put something back and not do, as so many people do, go in—‘Yes, we want this from you. Okay,’ up and out and they never hear from them again. That is what we are hoping to do—train them.

The other thing that we emphasise is that, just because you are Indigenous, it does not mean to say that you are going to understand every Indigenous person. This is something which I have found quite interesting. Indigenous people from all over Australia come here and want to be my research students. I currently have some from New South Wales. They had no idea of how strongly the Territory feels about their land and their own language. We talk about people in the Territory as language groups. We would never lump all of our people into being Koori or Murri. My God, you would not dare describe somebody from the TI—a Torres Strait Islander—in the same breath as you would someone from the Centre. So we do celebrate this diversity and we teach our students about it. ‘You must appreciate this diversity in your research,’ is one very, very important principle. Just because you are Indigenous, it cannot be expected that you will be accepted; you have to understand and observe the protocols of particular groups. That is just another issue. I do not know whether I have wandered off the track a bit here.

FRAN BAILEY—Perhaps I could draw you back, if that is all right. This committee is about listening to all of what you have to say but, at the end of the day, our job is to make recommendations. We all take this very seriously and we want to be able to make recommendations that would assist you in doing the sort of work that you need to do, so we want any suggestions you may have.

Dr Chirgwin—Have I what!

FRAN BAILEY—I thought you might have.

Dr Chirgwin—Firstly, a whole of lot areas need fixing up. When my students come as researchers, there is a different set of rules to their funding, and that is one important thing. That causes huge problems. When they are an undergraduate, we have IEP, Indigenous Education Program, funding and away-from-base funding. As undergraduates, they are travelled; they come to Batchelor and they are accommodated, fed and looked after. As soon as they become a postgraduate, under the rules today, no. You get \$2,080 to travel and no other support, except for incidentals and hardship, under Abstudy rules. That is just so difficult. Firstly—I hope you will have a look around the campus and you will see residential—there is very little accommodation here outside for students. We now have a mine down the road and we have tourists. Students cannot afford to pay market value.

Prof. Herbert—Rents here are over \$300 a week for a very basic one- or two-bedroom shack.

Mr RAMSEY—Did you say that they get \$2,000 a year?

Dr Chirgwin—They get \$2,080 to travel, under the Abstudy travel allowance.

Mr RAMSEY—Do they have to find their accommodation out of that as well?

Dr Chirgwin—No. That is just their airfare. They are expected to pay for any accommodation.

CHAIR—Is there no support specifically for accommodation?

Dr Chirgwin—No. That is the first thing. The other thing is that I have been having a lot of trouble with Centrelink all around Australia. My students come from all over the place. Palmerston is great. I have a relationship with them. We understand each other because they have seen the evolution of Batchelor. In Centrelink, in some places, they have an arrangement with Qantas. The students come in and say, 'I want to go to Batchelor; I want to travel there.' They say to them, 'Okay, we will do your travel,' and they spend that whole \$2,000 to get them there. Why? Let us look at where most students come from. I have one from Goodooga, New South Wales. He has to go from Goodooga to Dubbo, from Dubbo to Sydney and from Sydney to Darwin.

Prof. Herbert—And then to Batchelor.

Dr Chirgwin—And then to Batchelor. That is one lot of \$2,000 blown. I have people from Dalby, Queensland—Dalby to, I do not know, Townsville and Townsville to Darwin. That is your \$2,000. Therefore, I can only afford to see them once a year, and they need to be on campus with me.

CHAIR—You have said that Centrelink and Qantas have an arrangement.

Dr Chirgwin—Yes.

CHAIR—How does that work? Two thousand dollars seems like a uniform, standard allocation that would not necessarily fit everyone's travel requirements.

Dr Chirgwin—It does not.

Prof. Herbert—It certainly does not for people coming from remote and rural locations such as those.

CHAIR—Is the \$2,000 always blown?

Dr Chirgwin—Yes.

CHAIR—Most would be out of pocket, but is there ever any change left over? I am trying to work out what the arrangement is.

Prof. Herbert—Fares to Darwin are fairly horrific these days. If you do an Alice Springs-Darwin return, it is \$880. That is just within the Territory.

Dr Chirgwin—Some of them have to get from smaller communities—

Prof. Herbert—We are the end of the line.

Dr Chirgwin—to Alice Springs, and that is humungous. That is \$800 for some of them. So the first thing is, yes, \$2,080 is totally inadequate. Sometimes it will only cover one trip. I need them here. I need them accommodated here. I need their accommodation paid for. While you might think this is an equity thing, that it is a bit unfair, I would say that, no, it is not. They just would not have the money to get an education. It is one of the stumbling blocks for a researcher to get the training they need. We have to think of other, innovative ways to get our students here and to support them. They do not have the ability to come here and exist.

Have a look again at the demographic. A lot of them are 50 to 60 years old. They have family responsibilities. Even if they get Abstudy, it is just not sufficient. If you want researchers, there has to be an acknowledgment that they are valuable and some sort of financial incentive is needed to get these people. They are there and they are willing, but there are huge financial disincentives at the moment for them to participate—not only in terms of the money they lose but in terms of what they are expected to outlay. That is the first thing. I find Abstudy totally inadequate for researchers; the support is just totally inadequate for them. I am sure that is the same for other Indigenous students all around Australia that have to go to the centres where they would get their training.

CHAIR—Do you want to add anything else? I will go to another question, if you have finished, Sharon.

Dr Chirgwin—No. I have said too much.

CHAIR—No. It is fine.

Mr SYMON—I am glad that we have swung around to this side of it. I have asked the following question at similar hearings before about the resourcing of students, but I would like to ask the question now about the resourcing of the institute. In terms of your research training scheme funding—and from what you have just said, I suspect I know what the answer is—do you think the amount of money that the institute gets to support a student going through the PhD process is enough? Is it relevant to what they do? Is there a case to be put that, because you are in a remote area and dealing with an out of the ordinary group of students—out of the ordinary in many ways, geographically or culturally—a greater percentage of funds should be sent to the university or, in this case, the institute to allow that research to happen and to run it from this side? I am talking about resources that you can provide. I note that one of your submission lines calls for an allowance for computer software and textbooks. I am not sure whether that is from the student or university side; I suspect that it is from the side of the institution. But, taking all of that together—and it is not just here; from evidence we have heard previously, there are many other places where students do not even have their own desk or computer to use while trying to finish a PhD, which I think would make things very hard—I would like to hear your thoughts, if I may.

Dr Chirgwin—The short answer is yes. Now do you want the long answer?

Mr SYMON—I would like a little bit more, yes. Thank you.

Dr Chirgwin—Definitely, I would like to see, as we have indicated in the submission, moneys allocated for a personal computer. It would be nice if we could have one that could access things in remote areas, which would be an added cost.

Prof. Herbert—That is, if there is the infrastructure in remote areas.

Dr Chirgwin—That is another thing. We have the situation where, if someone wanted to go out and work in communities, the only technology they could rely on would be satellite technology, which is an additional cost. Huge costs are involved for people who want to do research in remote communities in terms of what we have already indicated in transport and accommodation. In addition, there is the business of giving things back to remote communities. We are very cognisant of the fact that we do not just rock in with nothing; we take food and resources for the people—and that is an important aspect of our research.

Books are a major issue for our students. Because we are remote, these days, with electronic means, we do everything through electronic journal research online. Yes, that is another additional cost. Some of our projects, as you can see, involve a lot of travel and those that involve continual travel will eventually get costly. We are not talking about cloning or huge things here but, yes, we do need to be funded.

I have no problem with any sort of scheme that brings with it a responsibility because I think that is also good training. We have floated a scheme where perhaps students buy a computer from us that is their own or do something like that. We have talked about many ways that we could go with respect to that. I would like to see funding allocated according to the type of project it is.

Prof. Stephenson—Perhaps I could add to this, Sharon. Thank you for that question, Mike. Stepping beyond Batchelor, if you like, on this issue, we were at a higher education congress meeting in Sydney very early this year and we listened to VCs and PVCs from all the universities. They were talking about the coming higher ed review and how concerned they were about various things. They were most concerned about research money. All of them made the point that, without their high numbers of overseas full-fee-paying students, their research agenda and their research output would be very, very low because clearly it is there and it helps cross-subsidise the true cost of research to institutions, particularly the big ones. That gives a picture that, for research and research training to do well, it is costly. That is one way to view that picture.

We do not have full fee paying overseas students and we are establishing, as we have already said, from a very low base research for Indigenous people that can improve their lot, if you like. There is no doubt in my mind that the research interest of Indigenous people when they come here, at least—and to a large extent in other places—is not about an individual career researcher trajectory. They are not coming in in order to have their own career development. They are here, I guess, on a kind of collective community researcher responsibility. Some of them end up in academic careers and career progression, like Jeannie and Joe, but often it is not where it starts.

So from that point of view—and what Sharon has already outlined—we feel the extra costs associated with deep and quality mentoring and supervision and support where people are already behind the eight ball. That comes at a cost in terms of time and resources, much more than perhaps other universities would be able or willing to give. We are giving it at huge cost to our institute now—we are only a small number—but we are very concerned about how we will be able to maintain that, because we know we will get interest from people when they see that they are getting that kind of support. We will just have trouble maintaining it without stronger input, I guess.

With Batchelor and beyond Batchelor, one of the views, apart from an ongoing and higher input of funding from the start—there have been some interesting conversations coming from across the Tasman with the way New Zealand is operating. One of the latest views of government there is to double the return upon student postgraduate completions to the institute for Maori graduates so that universities across New Zealand have financial incentive to bring in, mentor and support students through to completion. So it is a bonus funding for Indigenous outcomes in New Zealand. That is another possibility for your list of recommendations, perhaps: stronger front-end support, for all those reasons plus more, and stronger incentives. Incentives are not our reason here, but they would assist in dealing with the huge shortfall relative to the population of Indigenous people in postgraduate and research courses and careers.

Prof. Fraser—Just one point on from that, we were having a discussion about the institutions that focus heavily on producing Indigenous researchers, and what happens at the end. At the end, if you graduate somebody with a masters or a PhD, they will be poached very, very quickly away from the institution in which you have developed them and spent all that effort and time. So, if some places do not participate in the researcher development but can buy them at the end, the cost may be higher at that point, but they have not had five, six, eight years of giving support, pastoral care and mentoring. If we bring a student in, we might have to do all the enabling and then to finish the undergrad it is likely to be about eight years because of community issues and withdrawals and everything else. Then you have to go through all the

pastoral care and development for a masters, so now you are talking eight years plus six or five. Then, at the end, you have graduated somebody who you have now quite well trained and is going to contribute to your institution but who will get poached away very quickly by an institution that possibly has no interest in the developmental work initially because of the cost, both personal and in dollar terms, of supporting someone through that whole process. So an idea like an outcome doubling the payment at the end—if you lose somebody, at least that compensates—

CHAIR—This is for the institution to be compensated for the loss of that investment. Is that why you are suggesting that?

Prof. Fraser—This one is from New Zealand, which was separate.

Prof. Stephenson—Obviously, the completion payment to all universities through the IGS and RTS means—that is how unis are paid these days on completions. We are saying that, if it were doubled, it might give them cause and resources to nationally help pick up the percentage of Indigenous postgraduates.

Mr RAMSEY—Does that actually mean that you are turning students away who want to do postgraduate studies because you are underresourced; each student is actually costing you too much as they go through the system and then you have to say to people, ‘I’m sorry, we just can’t handle any more’?

Prof. Stephenson—We are not at that stage but, mind you, we are very close to capacity already with our current funding. We are aware that that capacity, even as it is, means that on the numbers—our target and our funding—the two do not match. As I said, we cannot cross-subsidise with international students, we cannot cross-subsidise from our higher ed pool from DEEWR and we cannot cross-subsidise from our VET funding from NT DEET. We are close and we do feel that, into the future, that is going to be a significant issue in terms of ballooning out the numbers, if you like.

Dr Chirgwin—Having been at other mainstream universities and supervised students, with some of the 22-year-old boys, you might see them once or twice and off they go and do their little project. They come back, they are at writing-up stage, you give them a good talking to and off they go again. You have a look at bits and pieces of their work. We are talking about some people who need help every step of the way. We talk about personal learning plans for our postgraduates. We are going to look at what their needs are and tailor our research training to them. As you can imagine, that is extremely time intensive and very costly. What Peter was alluding to is that the number of people we have within the institute who can train and can be afforded that time is very limited.

One of the things that we did look at—and I think this has already been mentioned—is a mentoring scheme where we can have paid mentors. Again, I will bring up the fact that we have ITAS tutoring for undergraduates, which is a support system from the Commonwealth. They are not eligible for that as postgraduates. A lot of it, as I have already indicated, is a confidence-building thing—having someone who can talk to them and say, ‘Yes, you can do it.’ If there were some other scheme which was a mentoring scheme where we could have people who would listen them and act as intermediaries and support them—if there were a paid scheme for

postgraduates that was equivalent to the ITAS—I think that would be an extremely good step in the right direction. We need that. One of the things that we also need is the postgraduates to mentor those coming behind them and to fulfil that role. At the moment they are not able to do that because we are not able to have them on campus all the time because of problems we have with the funding. So it is a vicious circle.

CHAIR—Rowan, do you have any other questions at this point before I go to Darren?

Mr RAMSEY—Yes, I have. Firstly, I will just explain a little about me. My electorate actually covers South Australian APY lands, and I have a number of Aboriginal communities out west of Ceduna and down Yorke Peninsula. I must admit that, until I was involved with this committee, my focus was more on school education and how we achieve better outcomes there. That has great bearing on what happens at a place like Batchelor, which you have already touched on. So I come here, like others, with probably some degree of ignorance. I would like someone to run through with me what Abstudy funding actually means, because I do not have a good handle on it, and how that compares with youth allowance and Austudy, and what the deficiencies are in the basic Abstudy funding program that you can identify, if indeed there are deficiencies.

Prof. Fraser—There is a table that outlines it. Up to 25, if you are a dependant, off the top of my head. I am a bit dodgy on these figures but we could get them for you.

Prof. Herbert—I can give you a paper. I have a paper sitting on my desk in my office that has been developed. Are you planning to look at the submissions to the higher education review?

CHAIR—They do not come within our jurisdiction.

Prof. Herbert—Simply because there was a section in there on research and—

CHAIR—You could provide us with that information?

Prof. Herbert—The only reason I am asking is because IAC had a number of attachments to their submission that would be very useful to you in terms of the data, the statistics and everything else.

CHAIR—Perhaps we could follow that up.

Prof. Herbert—DIMA had done the research for it. They are statistics that will be useful to you. One of those papers was the funding spot on to the Abstudy. I can get that; I have it over there. I will get that before you go, just in case you do not get the other. The other thing I was going to ask was: would you like a copy of our submission to that higher education review? There is only a small section in there on research and innovation, but there is a whole lot of other issues. You would understand with education how much it all intertwines. That may be of value to you, too.

Mr RAMSEY—That is good for now. I would like to have a chance to talk a lot about schooling with you, but it is probably not directly relevant to this. We might get an opportunity afterwards perhaps.

Mr CHEESEMAN—I listened closely to some of the evidence that you provided this morning and noted also what is in your submission. Within that you have indicated that most of your research students are in their 50s and 60s. Presumably, most of your Batchelor students are in that sort of age demographic as well. Am I correct in assuming that?

Prof. Stephenson—It is quite a broad range for our undergraduates. The principle that we could work on today is that it is a late start; it is not ‘I’m out of school; here’s my TER’. It is kind of ‘I’ve come through a longer, slower pathway’.

Prof. Herbert—This is not something that is peculiar to Batchelor. Traditionally, this has been the way it has been in Indigenous higher ed. It is starting to change in the major cities where you have people coming through year 12 and on, but traditionally it has not been that way.

Mr CHEESEMAN—You have indicated that a lot of your Batchelor students from here are highly sought after by the Territory government, by state governments and, presumably, by the Commonwealth. As organisations, are they often encouraging their Indigenous staff to take up research opportunities in universities, sponsoring students and doing all those sorts of things that obviously do happen in the mainstream? Do those sorts of opportunities exist there?

Prof. Fraser—I have been involved in three different universities and Aboriginal units. In each of those places—Sydney, Newcastle and here—students will come in, will do a year of undergrad study and be offered work, and it is crunch time. It is then: ‘Do I continue study?’ If the answer is yes, then it is about trying to negotiate with the employer for release to continue at a reduced load—or to not continue at all. If you are getting paid full-time work, it is a fairly attractive option. So you find students trying to balance both of them. Generally, you end up with support programs in departments like cadetships, post-graduate programs and the like. ICP is an example of that, being the national Indigenous Cadetship Program. So there are mechanisms in there, but often there are only a number of those that are available.

There are mechanisms available but they are not necessarily beneficial in an education sense where you are a third or two-thirds of the way through a degree and you are now faced with a choice about what you do. Do you take a reduced load and blow it out to four or five years while you are working, or do you turn down a job and wait until you finish?

Mr CHEESEMAN—Are there any recommendations that you would like us to consider?

Dr Chirgwin—I have just got to say something. Recently, we had a publicity campaign with the NT government. I have been negotiating with someone from DEET regarding their provision of a formal scheme of release where people will be paid to do research, and this is for upgrading their qualifications. We have targeted Indigenous professionals with a first degree. I have had many inquiries from people. They are actually going to look at financial incentives. Something was said to me about 10 per cent; I do not know what that was about. I would have to check that. But they have decided that they are going to support them by enabling them to be released for a proportion of time during their work week, which they will spend on their research, and there will be some sort of financial incentive. I think that is an important way to go. If you have people who have a first degree and are working, then you should give them the opportunity, with time and perhaps even a financial reward, to engage in upgrading by research.

I would particularly like to see them sometimes engaging in research projects which align to their work, because that makes it even easier for them. I have found those the easiest ones to manage. That would be my reply. I have had a lot of interest in this, including police and people from the health department. I have also had a couple of interstate people—they were ex-Northern Territory government workers—and they picked up on this. I have someone who wants to do some stuff on the culture of Centrelink for Indigenous people, which would be extremely interesting.

Prof. Fraser—I would also add one thing, if I could. Again, there was a bit of discussion recently about us providing postgraduate studies for Indigenous academic staff. At the end of that, you could pretty much presume that, if somebody wants mobility, they can move and will get a reasonable job pretty much wherever they want to go. The idea of maintaining some kind of salary during that period of study is important. If I am going to study half time, will I take a half-time salary? Not unless I can afford to, and that is not likely. So there needs to be some sort of incentive where maybe you could access the top-up salary for somebody while they were doing half-time teaching and half-time study. At the end of that, you are still running the risk of our people moving out of the institution. So, if you make the financial commitment yourself as an institution, you really are at the mercy of any other institution which wants staff. A lot of institutions have the capacity to offer lecturer Cs to people who might already be a B, once they have completed. You have to have the capacity then to up salary and keep people, at which point you slow down your pathway through that research program. So even a program that might provide some salary equity for people who are undertaking a half-time load on the understanding that the institution may not keep those people anyway might be useful to investigate.

Prof. Herbert—Could I just give you a statistic that may help to put this into some sort of perspective. This has come out of some IAC material. It refers to the very low number of Indigenous people engaged as researchers in universities. It states: ‘The number of Indigenous doctoral candidates needs to increase by 600 per cent and academic staff by nearly 400 per cent to reach population level parity.’ So we are talking about something that is huge. As I hope we have indicated, we are coming from such a low base that ours is even larger.

CHAIR—You obviously have a huge task ahead to reach some sort of acceptable parity. That is not going to happen without a financial commitment that actually targets the specific needs and difficulties around this issue of researchers from Indigenous communities.

Prof. Stephenson—The main issue for me in this is entry. It is getting people to entry and resourcing people through. Joe’s points about where they go from there are all valid, but there are not many Indigenous scholarships advertised. Most of those that are advertised are around post-graduate funding fellows and all that kind of thing. There are many opportunities—post-doctoral and post-master’s degree qualification. Institutes and funding agencies are falling over themselves trying to get Indigenous people to even apply for those. ARC has been very unsuccessful in getting many Indigenous people to apply for Indigenous post-doctoral fellows. The opportunities are huge once they finish. They have so many choices. But it is getting them in and it is getting them through that that 600 per cent figure reflects.

Prof. Fraser—Contributing to the national agenda for Indigenous research as an institute is important, but we also need to be able to afford to do that. The ongoing cost in recognition of all

the things that are encompassed in that does not necessarily translate to a return at the end if somebody exits the building.

Mr CHEESEMAN—You were talking about the issue of value of education and resistance to research and researchers. Is this specifically in the Indigenous studies area, or is this to research and researchers more generally?

Prof. Herbert—More generally.

Mr CHEESEMAN—As in pretty much everything?

Prof. Herbert—You need to remember the historical context. It was anthropologists and, in due course, various waves of other people who moved through, looking at Indigenous people as something strange and wonderful that you needed to examine.

Prof. Stephenson—Health research is another.

Prof. Herbert—Health research is everywhere now.

Prof. Stephenson—It is one of those huge issues when a government, whether the NT or the federal, says, 'We are going to do another survey of housing quality,' which is seen as research. Along with human based research, it is very invasive. They go through the house and check how many taps work, how many beds are there, whether there is a fridge and how many there are of this or that. It is comprehensive, and people in the community do not recognise the difference between that kind of data-gathering questionnaire work of government and research by researchers from academia, where they still invade the house and do studies on people. What the people do understand is that that happened two years before and one year before that, and the house is still the same. So it is that notion that this stuff keeps coming and we do not see any change.

Prof. Herbert—Could I add something. I think that one of the really important ways in which Indigenous researchers are dealing with that issue is what Sharon was talking about before, where you do not go and engage with a community in terms of doing research without making sure that there is something that you are giving back to that community. There are a couple of models around, and we are starting one, family and community wellbeing training, which is actually based on an action research process that engages the community in the decision making about what they want out of the training, what they actually want to have done and setting their own goals. The researchers from the institution become like a backup support, if you like. So that is going to turn the negative stuff about research into a positive in the longer term. That is the way we see it.

FRAN BAILEY—As long as you get those results.

Prof. Herbert—Yes. It is happening. Have you been to Queensland?

Mr CHEESEMAN—Not yet.

Prof. Herbert—Have you been to JCU?

CHAIR—No, we will next week.

Prof. Herbert—When you go to JCU, ask them if you can have some information about the School of Indigenous Australian Studies empowerment program that is being operated up in the gulf. Yarrabah is a community just south of Cairns where some wonderful results have come out of using that kind of action research process to engage the community and enable them to see that you can actually use research to change your life and take control. I think that is a really important outcome.

Mr CHEESEMAN—That is sort of getting into the next question I had. Like Rowan, I would like to chat to you offline about getting kids into schools and how you keep them there. In terms of what this committee is studying, I would like your views on how you engage the Indigenous community to make university studies more attractive and then, after that, make research more attractive. You have touched on it. But, putting it very simplistically, if you could do one thing to get more Indigenous people into university, what would that be? If you could do one thing to get more of those students that are in an undergraduate program to be interested in a career in research, what would that be?

Prof. Fraser—Just a simple question to end with! I think it is making education and research relevant. I think that what works is a whole lot of work by a whole lot of people over a whole lot of time. I have got this really wonderful document by Elkin; it was a policy on Indigenous education in Australia and it was written around 1940 or 1950—there is no date on it. But everything that Elkin says in those five pages exists today very strongly. He starts with the social policy of the day: protection, which he says will make people paupers in their own country; correct. He then talks about four main points that need to be addressed. He says that education is about Europeanising Aboriginal people in everything but colour; that is seen to be an appropriate education. I think education and research has to be relevant, their families have to see it as relevant and there almost has to be some cultural continuity. Where it works with a changing age demographic is where children have seen their mothers or another family member graduate and so you start seeing family members coming through. I do not think it is one thing. For me, it needs to be relevant, it needs to be engaging and it has to understand the students' perspective and value what they bring. They should not have to leave everything behind to come into an education system that at present does not understand them.

Prof. Stephenson—Of course we have the VET training as well. In some ways, that is a technical thing and people might grasp that better than they might want to grasp some conceptual stuff with higher ed or whatever. One of the issues we confront here is that question that both of you want to play with. It is the education system. We are trying to overcome the years of a failed education system. If we had the answer to how we get them into doing the degrees, we probably wouldn't be trailing in our quota each year. Getting them into degrees is tough—

Prof. Herbert—and keeping them there is even tougher.

Prof. Fraser—It might appear that it is preferable to have an Aboriginal community illiterate rather than have an Aboriginal community literate in a language they understand at a system level. I think there is a history that shows that.

Mr CHEESEMAN—Something that strikes me is that in a way we seem to have done all the wrong things for all the right reasons over the last 30 or 40 years. How do we actually move beyond that into doing the right things for the right reasons?

Prof. Fraser—With that in mind, a lot of the recent intervention discussion has revisited a whole heap of 1950s social policies: money management, forced employment, control of employment, control of education, relocation and proposed relocation of people. They all are old failed policies. I think there needs to be some looking forward as to how we fix that whole issue, because this education and research issue is a holistic issue, rather than looking at a reaction to some violence or some substance abuse or systematic issues of that nature. There needs to be some vision and social policy that looks at where we want to be and at the value that we place on the people involved rather than it being ‘that violent stuff is really ugly; let’s fix it.’

Prof. Herbert—That is the critical statement: the value that we place on the people involved. One of the reasons that education has failed is that Indigenous people have not been valued in education across any of the sectors.

Prof. Fraser—There is no social policy statement that really articulates any particular bent as to the value of Indigenous people in this country. What is our approach?

Dr Chirgwin—Can I just pick up another thing from what you have said: why not look at what has worked? Why are we always looking at what has not worked? There are things that have worked. Why do we always focus on what has not worked? I think that is the unfortunate thing. There are success stories out there in terms of education and research, and role models. I have to teach my Indigenous researchers about David Unaipon, for goodness sake. Who knows about him? There are role models for people.

Mr CHEESEMAN—It strikes me that there are two role models right here. In your communities, what sort of change has that brought from your perspective?

CHAIR—How has your success or what you are doing impacted on your communities? Is that what you were trying to say, Darren?

Mr CHEESEMAN—That is right.

CHAIR—How is that impacting as a role model on members of the Indigenous community and particularly the younger people whom you are now trying to attract into—

FRAN BAILEY—And other family members.

CHAIR—Yes.

Prof. Fraser—We have both probably come from a similar historical context. We have both moved, we have both valued education and we have both done myriad things outside of the community that we grew up in. For myself, I have tended to work with away-from-base programs with Aboriginal people from all over the country who move into those programs. For some people it works really well and for others it does not. As to the notion of role models, I am

wary about who you put on pedestals, and hopefully I am not one of them because you really need to behave very well if you are going to do that.

CHAIR—I think what we are suggesting is that when someone does something, particularly in research and education, and they get up there and receive their accolades, they will always say that there is one person—one teacher—or a series of people who inspired them. It is role modelling in that sense rather than celebratory status-type role modelling. That kind of impact and inspiration, as you all know, is more important at that level and is very much based on the person who is mentoring you, teaching you or assisting you.

Prof. Herbert—Perhaps I could answer that more in terms of what I have actually done. This is probably why I said before that I see research as being an essential component of education within the context of self-empowerment. I did my PhD on Indigenous engagement within the university. I worked with students from enabling through to undergraduate and into postgraduate to see what they were getting out of it, how they perceived the university system to be responding to their particular learning needs. That, for me, was a real eye-opener. The mere fact that my PhD title was ‘Is success a matter of choice?’ indicated that I was exploring education within that context. I interviewed nearly 49 students, and the fact that nobody at any level of education had ever had a discussion with any of those students about the possibility of their having educational success was, I thought, a terrible indictment of our system. And the fact that most of those students went on to achieve educational success gave me great hope for the future. I am very passionate about the need for postgraduate studies. I believe undergraduate studies take you to a certain level and give you the skills and the competencies that you need to get a job, to go out and be a teacher or whatever. But postgraduate studies take you that step further where you can engage with society and say: ‘This is not right. This is not right for my people and we have to do something about it, and this is what we’ve got to do.’

Mr CHEESEMAN—There was another element to my question. You are now effectively role models within your communities—I know you do not want to be. But you have gone out there and achieved a PhD; you have achieved in the educational sector. People within your community see that as something they can do and that there are benefits to it. This was part of my question: have you seen a flow-through effect from that within your communities and families?

Prof. Herbert—I come from Broome, which is a fairly unique community anyway, and I think Broome has a lot of pretty empowered people. I do not know whether it is something in the water or whatever. Talking now about Indigenous higher ed, I certainly get a lot of feedback from people who have come in under an enabling program. I have seen people who are now finishing doctorates and so on and who say to me, ‘We remember you talking to us about such and such. Thank you for that. That’s what took me there.’ To me, that is the reward.

Prof. Fraser—My answer to that question is that I studied higher ed as a late starter because my mother completed a degree.

FRAN BAILEY—Could I ask one very quick question?

CHAIR—We have got only a few minutes left and the deputy chair has a question and I want to ask about the PhD program and how it is going; that is what I am interested in. I know we are

running out of time. In your closing remarks can you incorporate a response to the PhD program and to the deputy chair's quick question as well.

FRAN BAILEY—Just tapping in to your last response, Joe, and Jeannie, you indicated that your interest and love for education came through your family. I am wondering if there is a role for the women, the mothers within Indigenous communities, and if there is something that we can do that would enable them to have greater influence. A lot of the difficulties and obstacles that you have identified to higher levels of research are cultural, and I am just wondering: is this an area that we should be looking at?

Prof. Herbert—One of the areas that we keep looking at is how we can get more guys into it. The reality on the ground is that it is mainly the women who are doing it and I think that is part of—

FRAN BAILEY—It is a good PhD thesis there.

Prof. Herbert—Yes, it is.

Dr Chirgwin—I have got a masters student from the Tanami who wants to look at why males have taken the back seat and why it is that the females are leading—but that is only for her particular language group in the Tanami.

CHAIR—Just generally across the population the statistics indicate that girls will outperform boys across the board.

Prof. Fraser—You will find that by far the larger part of the cohort are female and older. That has been a trend. I did some work in about 2001 in Sydney and that was the indication then. The average age was higher and the percentage of females was much higher.

CHAIR—I do know that Lynne Fasoli works with some women in communities who are passionate about improving their education so that their children will get a better chance. I think the women are leading the way and they understand the relationship very much.

Prof. Herbert—To respond to your actual question, Fran, is there anything that we should be doing? While Batchelor is located in the Northern Territory and has a really strong focus on remote and rural communities and has very close relationships with many of those communities, in our higher ed operation we draw from around the country. I think that the issues we have been raising here are really important in terms of enabling more Indigenous people to engage with postgraduate studies. If you can achieve that, then you achieve the rest of the changes that are needed. I think that just as importantly as engaging the Indigenous people, it is important to engage researchers across the country in terms of changing the mindset of Australians.

CHAIR—The PhD program is going well, although it is in its early stages?

Prof. Stephenson—It is commencing this semester, so we have got an application base of four to five at the moment.

Dr Chirgwin—Yes.

Prof. Stephenson—At this stage they are working largely in self-interest type research areas. They are passionate about community development and change. We do expect over time, with grants that we receive—and we are now able to put people on a postgraduate award scheme—that we will be able to bring students to projects that we are working with, either directly with government or with industry.

CHAIR—For the purposes of the *Hansard* record, I would like to thank Peter Stephenson, Peter Garrigan, Claudia Hawker and Professor Herbert. Thank you very much for making this visit possible for us. From our perspective, it has been very enlightening. So many issues have been raised and we have had so little time to discuss them, but they do point us in directions that we have not been pointed to date. Certainly we will take them away and give them some thought. It is such a big area, but I am hoping that we can come back with a report with recommendations that hopefully may be able to pick up some of the things you have suggested that relate specifically to Indigenous communities and their participation in research overall. It will not be our task to resolve the schooling aspect of things, although that keeps coming up. As I said to Jeannie outside, it comes up all the time and it is not irrelevant to what we are doing; but I will have to leave that for another day. Thank you very much.

Resolved (on motion by **Mr Cheeseman**, seconded by **Ms Bailey**):

That this committee authorises publication of the transcript of the evidence given before it at public hearing this day.

Committee adjourned at 11.41 am