Regional Development Australia Wheatbelt Inc Submission to the Productivity Commission Indigenous Evaluation Strategy

August 2019

An Australian Government Initiative

Contents

Introduction

Regional Development Australia Wheatbelt Inc. (RDAW) makes this submission as a stakeholder and on behalf of the WA Wheatbelt's Aboriginal population. RDAW is a locally based, not-for-profit, incorporated association governed by a volunteer committee and funded by the Federal Government. A key role of RDAW is to build and strengthen partnerships across all levels of Government with industry, communities and other regional stakeholders to facilitate economic investment and development in the region.

The Wheatbelt region has an Aboriginal population of around 4,000 out of a total population of approximately 75,000. The region comprises the traditional country of the Ballardong, Yued, Willman and Nadji Nadji Noongar people and covers 156,000 square kilometres incorporating 42 Local Governments made up of over 200 communities.

In 2018, RDAW initiated a project to facilitate and increase development of Aboriginal businesses and community enterprises in the Wheatbelt. The project titled, the Noongar Enterprise Development Support (NEDS) had been in planning since early 2016 and was in response to a directive from the then Minister, the Honourable Warren Truss, for Regional Development Australia (RDA) Committees to engage and initiate increased economic participation of Indigenous populations in their RDA Regions. The minister's directive had specific relevance for RDAW as the economic and employment profiles of the WA Wheatbelt Aboriginal population was characterised by high rates of unemployment, long term welfare, poverty and low rates of labour force participation.

This submission responds to questions that RDAW felt it had the capacity to address and from the position of RDAW's experiences in developing the delivery and evaluation processes of the NEDS project.

What objectives should a strategy for evaluating policies and programs affecting Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people seek to achieve?

The key objectives an evaluation strategy should take into account are assessing the outcomes from an Aboriginal Torres Strait Islander perspective as well as from a main stream perspective. A key component in undertaking evaluation of the effects of policies and programs, is understanding the context and relevance or lack thereof of such policies and programs on Indigenous populations (Kelaher et al 2018). The relevance of policies and programs are to a large degree dictated by the Indigenous traditional world view which encompasses holistic perspectives linking cultural values, morals and lore that guide and determine attitudes, perceptions and behaviours (Kicket-Tucker & Ife 2018). This is enshrined in the two fundamental axioms put forward by the Aboriginal philosopher, Graham (1999) being:

1. "The Land is Law": that is the land is defined as sacred and in being sacred, is the foundation of meaning which in turn governs the people's humanity and relationships.

2. "You are not alone in the world": which acknowledges and enshrines the connectedness of the kinship system and its role in determining the sense of self for the individual within the system.

While these axioms capture the key beliefs underpinning the traditional Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander World Views, consideration should also be given to the contemporary Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander World Views that have been shaped by 220 years of colonisation.

Colonisation and post neo-colonialism feature as disrupters of traditional Indigenous Worldviews and have shaped the development of contemporary Indigenous Worldviews through assimilation policy mechanisms such as the Western Australian Aborigines Act 1905. This and other Australian state's Acts literally took control of the lives of Aboriginal people through the office of the Chief Protector who had the legal authority to regulate where they could live, who they could marry and if they or others would raise their children.

The central outcomes of such policies was to lead to the forming of Indigenous contemporary worldviews within a context of enforced dependency and social constructs of distrust of government authority discharged through government agencies (Goodall 1999; Litwin 1997).This distrust was well founded, as submissions to the National Inquiry into the Stolen Generation (HREOC 1995) illustrated that government agencies and representatives had failed to adequately protect removed children and not consulted parents in regard to agencies decisions concerning the children. In addition to failing to protect the children and the exclusion of parents from consultation processes, the relevant Government agencies historically exuded a dominance discourse and a disregard of care which only changed in the mid 1970's (Van Krieken 1992).

Therefore in considering evaluation approaches to indigenous policies and programs, it is important for those initiating the evaluation processes to acknowledge Indigenous Worldviews and the separation those worldviews delineate between mainstream and Indigenous expectations of policy/programs outcomes.

What is the best way to address mainstream programs in the Indigenous Evaluation Strategy?

Optimally there should be accountability on the part of the government agency providing the funding and the agency delivering the program. A key element of this would be, as Hudson (2017) proposed, building evaluation into program design as a functioning action iterative process of ongoing adjustment and improvement in delivery and outcomes.

At the same time, as noted by Kelaher et al (2018), Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people should be included and given ownership and leadership from the design stage through to delivery and evaluation of the program. The importance of including Elders and community leaders in the delivery and evaluation processes of programs is further reiterated by comments drawn from Waterworth et al (2015) study in which one respondent observed (p.7):

 "*Old ladies, old men and elders, they've got great influence* [on others' health behaviour]." and another said (p.11):

 "*We'd spent literally months on these being culturally appropriate and sensitive pamphlets with images of Aboriginal people and terminology, same sort of thing. "Hey you mob, get deadly" [In an Indigenous context this colloquialism implies enthusiasm, encouragement or appreciation], and they were of no interest to these people whatsoever.*"

It could be speculated in regard to the second comment, that despite the efforts of the program deliverers, that particular program did not achieve its intended outcomes. However an evaluation of why it had not may have identified the reasons for the lack of success.

In terms of Closing the Gap, the lack of success in achieving targets suggests that the predominately top down approach may be limited due to a lack trust and engagement and acknowledgement of cultural protocols with target populations and setting outcomes that do not take into account Indigenous Worldviews.

For example, in terms of trust, a participant in Waterworth et al (2015) research observed:

"They're not going to start trusting a government organisation, when they've lost trust in them because of historical events. So they're going to be less likely to listen to a health message if it comes from the government, than if it comes from Aboriginal people."

This comment highlights the importance of trust in the communication and the influence the lack of trust has in disrupting communication pathways. Basically as Gibson (2003) found, the validity of the information is based on the trustworthiness of the communicator and if the communicator is a stranger, the decision to trust or distrust is transferred to the agency or associates known to the parties involved.

At the same time recognising the cultural protocols of hierarchy within Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander clans and communities should be considered as an imperative. In the 2012 Social Justice Report (Australian Human Rights Commission 2012), Mick Gooda noted that Aboriginal governance in post-colonial Australia had to adjust to the formal and informal rules of non-Aboriginal systems especially those in all levels of government.

In the current context there are a multiplicity of Indigenous governance models including the family model, the hub-and-spokes model, and/or equal representation model, that are subject to the diversity of Australia's First Nations cultures, heritage, environments and histories (Australian Indigenous Governance Institute 2013-2016). These multiple forms of governance include:

- families and clans within a single settlement may each have their own traditional leaders and governance networks;

- some groups may be traditional landowners with related governance rights to the land on which a settlement has been established, others are not;

- some groups that have been historically resettled together (i.e. on missions for instance);

- some local leaders may represent a whole geographic community, or several linked communities of identity, skin group and kinships and;

- some 'community' organisations may look after the rights and interests of all the residents; others may focus on a particular group in a community or region, skin group or kinship

The differences between Indigenous and non-Indigenous governance as stated by the Australian Indigenous Governance Institute, is that while non-Indigenous governance has an organisational focus, Indigenous governance is more associated with community. Thus the key difference is organisational governance shapes the management functions of an organisation while Indigenous governance guides the pathways for the overarching integration of Indigenous Worldviews based on beliefs and values derived from traditions and customs. This overarching integration of Indigenous Worldviews as defined by the Australian Indigenous Governance Institute sets out the cultural obligations for:

- the way people own and care for their country, arrange a ceremony, manage and share their resources, and pass on their knowledge;

- networks of extended families, their relationships and their roles in Indigenous governance;

- the way people arrange community events to engage, develop and sustain alliances across kinships, skin groups, identities etc;

- the voluntary capacity and undertakings of Indigenous men and women within their own communities, and as governing members on a multitude of informal local committees and advisory groups.

Therefore it should be acknowledged by those who develop and deliver government policies and programs and those who evaluate such programs, that Indigenous Australian governance cannot be separated from its traditions and culture. This was a key point recognised in the Law Reform Commission Western Australia (2005) discussion paper that also noted that although customary law had somewhat changed within urban Indigenous communities it continued to be an integral belief influence for many in those communities.

The importance in including Indigenous participation in the design, implementation and evaluation phases of programs is further endorsed by Kelaher et al (2018) in their recommendation that (p 73):

Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander leadership and ownership should be supported at all phases of the program planning and evaluation cycle.

There is strong recognition that Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people need to be involved in program development and evaluation. However, this often consists of consultation rather than leadership roles. Where Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander leadership is recognised, it is more likely to be at local levels of decision making, often when program parameters have already been defined. Meaningful engagement of Aboriginal and Torrs Strait Islander people at any point in the program planning and evaluation cycle will add value. However, improving the benefit delivered through evaluation to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people will require a systemic approach to engagement that enables both leadership and ownership.

How can the challenges and complexities associated with undertaking evaluation be overcome — both generally, and in Indigenous policy specifically?

In general terms, overcoming the challenges and complexities associated with undertaking evaluation initially rests with determining if a program will be effective, efficient and appropriate (Owen 2007). As an example the NSW Agency for Clinical Innovation (ACI) (NSW ACI 2013) included the following in its assessment of the prerequisites that needed to be met prior to initiating a program:

- do they meet the needs of the community?
- are they achieving their intended outcomes?
- or producing unintended outcomes?
- is there a better way of achieving those outcomes?
- are they aligned to current Government priorities?
- should they be continued, expanded, modified or discontinued?
- can resources be allocated more efficiently?

These initial filters also contribute to understanding why the evaluation is being undertaken and what is being measured which may include performance or change in the target population (CDC Healthy Communities Program ND). However the critical constituent of undertaking an evaluation is whether it is implemented as 'formative' or 'summative' process. A formative approach is undertaken during development and implementation and is used to monitor and adjust delivery to improve outcomes while a summative evaluation is enacted once the program is established and measures the programs

performance in meeting its objectives and goals (CDC Healthy Communities Program ND). In addition there is a third evaluation approach which is utilised by ACI being 'process' evaluation that assess the program's implementation and the quality of implementation (NSW ACI 2013).

It could be proposed as indicated in NSW ACI approach, that embedding the evaluation process at the program design phase may alleviate the challenges and complexities of undertaking evaluation. This approach sets baseline data and enables the capability to compare metrics as the program progresses rather than simply reporting on derived benefits of the program. It also makes provision for ongoing consultation with all stakeholders during the design process which ensures that the evaluation incorporates and measures what all parties involved consider to be important.

As previously noted in the submission, embedding evaluation into the design process has been recommended for evaluation of Indigenous programs. Hudson (2017) recommends embedding local input and evaluation into program design and practice and that (p.21):

"Evaluation should not be viewed as an 'add on' but should be built into a program's design and presented as part of a continuous quality improvement process. Where funding constraints do not allow for an external evaluation, funding should be provided to organisations for self-evaluation."

Correspondingly Hudson (2017) advises program providers that (p.21):

"Evaluation should not be viewed as a negative process but rather as an opportunity to learn. If your organisation does not have the capacity to hire an external evaluator consider hiring a professional evaluator to help with the development of an evaluation framework and for some advice/training in undertaking self-evaluations."

Equally Kelaher et al (2018) felt that there needed to be more Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander involvement in program design processes to ensure transparency of program planning, delivery and evaluation to communities.

These recommendations suggest that including evaluation in the program design and implementation may not only alleviate the complexities of the process but substantially reduce the cost of evaluations which according to Hudson (2017), was at that time, an average of $382,000.

To what extent do Australian Government agencies currently undertake policy and program evaluation?

A review of the literature indicated that only 8% of a 1,082 Indigenous programs had been evaluated prior to 2016 (Hudson 2016). This low level of Indigenous program evaluation was substantiated by the Steering Committee for the Review of Government Service Provision (SCRGSP) 2016 review that identified just 24 Indigenous programs that had undergone thorough evaluation. Added to these low rates of evaluation was the results of a review of programs transferred to PM&C (2014) that found just 30% had been evaluated in the previous five years and only 12% had provided for evaluation processes.

It would also appear that there is a low rate of evaluation of government delivered or NGO government funded health related programs. This is based on two observations. The first being the high volume (568) of such programs identified in Hudson's (2016) report, which comprised just over half of the total programs Hudson identified. It could be speculated that the cost of evaluating the programs at a much lower rate of around $100,000 than the average of $328,000 as identified by Hudson (2017), would still preclude many from being evaluated.

The second observation takes into account the high levels of expenditure along with duplication of programs of programs or unnecessary delivery of services that have delivered little improvement in Indigenous health outcomes. In the 12 years to 2009, funding for Indigenous health programs increased 328% from $115 million to $492 million (Hudson 2009) with little or no impacts on the overall health wellbeing of Indigenous Australians. In addition Hudson (2009) found that an absence

of planning had resulted in the development of a discordant labyrinth of Indigenous health programs responding to perceived needs rather than evidenced needs.

As a result, with no management oversight, programs commenced or continued purely because funding could be secured with no requirements for evidence to inform needs. In some instances this included a lack of consultation with communities or identification of need. In one case this led to a remote community receiving a suicide prevention program despite suicide not being an issue in the community. In addition several of the community members had previously been flown at high cost to another community to undertake suicide prevention training (Hudson 2017).

Further indications of a lack of evaluation of policy and programs are demonstrated in the example of Roebourne in WA where 400 programs were delivered by 67 providers in a community of 1,150 (Hudson 2016).

However RDAW in developing the Noongar Enterprise Development Support (NEDS) project, went to great lengths to ensure that the project was not duplicating provision of a similar service and was targeting a need. RDAW also ensured that Aboriginal people were actively involved in the project's design; lead the delivery of the project and are involved in the evaluation of the project. The following case study illustrates RDAW's approach in this process.

A case study

Engaging Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people in project design and evaluation: The Regional Development Australia Wheatbelt Inc. experience

In response to the many other questions posed by the issues paper, this submission draws on the experience of Regional Development Australia Wheatbelt (RDAW) in developing, implementing and evaluating an Aboriginal economic engagement project that RDAW initiated and is currently being delivered. The project is funded by the Department of Social Services (DSS) Strong and Resilient Communities- Inclusive Communities Grant.

The project titled, Noongar Enterprise Development Support (NEDS), is delivered across the Ballardong and Yued Noongar Clan Regions by two Noongar Project officers that live in and have strong cultural connections in the respective regions. A key objective of the project is to increase Aboriginal economic participation in the region. This is through providing practical on ground support and capacity building for Aboriginal individuals, families and communities who wish to start businesses or develop community enterprises.

The NEDS project was RDAW's response to a directive from the then Minister, the Honourable Warren Truss, for Regional Development Australia (RDA) Committees to engage and initiate increased economic participation of Indigenous populations in their RDA Regions. The directive resonated with RDAW as the economic and employment profiles of the WA Wheatbelt Aboriginal population was characterised by high rates of unemployment, long term welfare, poverty and low rates of labour force participation.

Project development phase

Concept development involved two Aboriginal community leaders from the Wheatbelt and three RDAW representatives. The Aboriginal community leaders drove discussions which outlined strategies that would support project delivery and successful outcomes. The community leaders also directed RDAW to engage with Elders and community leaders from other shires in the Wheatbelt and encourage them to participate in the design of the project.

This approach became a prerequisite in the project design process with it becoming less about RDAW consulting with the various stakeholders than listening. Project design became a process of incorporating the information derived from meetings with Elders, community leaders or representatives of Aboriginal Corporations and then taking the updated design back to the relevant parties for further assessment and if needed, adjustment.

Desk top review of data and literature

Needs assessment

The desk top review assessed and quantified the need for the program based on data derived from ABS 2011 Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Community Profiles triangulated with Government and NGO agencies reports, journal papers and other relevant secondary sources.

Gaps assessment

Gaps in services delivery were defined by availability and accessibility of services for Wheatbelt Aboriginal clients and identified via an internal RDAW review of government and NGO services based on where services were located and modes of interaction between Aboriginal clients and services.

It was found that all services were based in Perth and other WA regions and operated from an online platform with only two providing face to face options in the Wheatbelt and these were located in a major population centre.

Effectively the location of services and online delivery mode excluded many of the region's Aboriginal population from accessing the services. This was due to either an unwillingness to leave their Country and travel to Perth or not having access to a vehicle and/or being able to afford the cost of travel. Correspondingly, only 43% of Aboriginal households in the Wheatbelt had internet connection which was compounded by the low computer literacy levels reported by Elders and community leaders. Of those with internet access the higher cost of data in the region deterred access to the online services.

Project design

The design of the project incorporated all the learnings derived from listening to the Aboriginal people who were involved in the process. These learnings ensured that the project proceeded with a focus of cultural sensitivity, appropriateness, respect and relevance. These are encapsulated in the structures of the project as shown below.

- The appointment of Aboriginal project officers with Clan and Country connections with the target populations and non-Aboriginal interactions with the target populations kept to an absolute minimum.
- The NEDS project is publicly presented as distinct projects in the Ballardong and Yued regions with each being titled in its clan's language, and the project officers having their own branded project websites, emails, banners and pamphlet letterheads. RDAW and the funders, DSS are acknowledged in smaller print on the bottom of the page as intended.
- NEDS is the project officer's project- not RDAW's. The project officers have control and are responsible for delivery processes, resourcing and providing assistance and support for clients. RDAW's roles are to provide governance, management oversight, professional development and administrative support for the project officers. RDAW is invisible in the delivery of the project, except where invited.

Evaluation

From the outset, RDAW made provision to embed evaluation into the project. This decision was made for the following reasons.

- RDAW has a responsibility to inform public and private funders of how their money has been spent in terms of:
  - outputs
  - outcomes
  - impacts
  - Returns on Investment (social and/or economic)

- To the best of RDAW's knowledge, there are or have not been any of the same or similar 'grass roots' business capacity building projects undertaken in Australia and that the project could have the potential to become a model for Indigenous business capacity building.

- Given the somewhat empirical nature of the project, RDAW believes it is obligatory to monitor and evaluate every aspect of the project from concept through delivery, conclusion of funding and the end goal of handover of the project to an Aboriginal Corporation.

Evaluation process

The project has and is monitored and evaluated across many levels that are as follows.

- NEDS project officers collect quantitative and qualitative information before, during after engagements with clients. This information is passed onto RDAW's Director and the Research Evaluation Project Support Officer.

- The project officers also assess what is working well and not so well, options for improvements as well as social or economic opportunities or barriers to clients starting a business.

- NEDS project officers also provide online (Data Exchange) and milestone reports to DSS on the number of new and ongoing contacts, progress of engaged clients and feedback from clients.

- RDAW also reports to DSS and includes additional evaluation of changes in attitudes and responses in the broader community.

Current assessments

In the past 12 months project officers have undergone a comprehensive program of professional development which has considerably increased their confidence in autonomously working with clients. Their confidence has risen to the point where they are developing their own resources with language and concepts that are more aligned with their client's language and understanding. As such, early evaluations of the project indicate that it is on track to deliver anticipated outcomes and has strong potential to deliver a number of beneficial unanticipated outcomes with one fundamental outcome being empowerment of Ballardong and Yued people.

Discussion

The experience of RDAW in developing, implementing and embedding evaluation in the NEDS project shows that involving Aboriginal people in the processes from the outset gives the project/program a greater opportunity to deliver beneficial outcomes. While more time was possibly taken in developing the project through taking each design feature back to the Elders and community leaders for their feedback, the final design and delivery processes reflected their viewpoints and has given the project more chance of achieving beneficial results.

Equally, involving the project officers early in the evaluation process has provided additional insights that have led to adjustments that have improved delivery of the project, particularly in terms of what was not working so well. At the same time, providing the project officers with the opportunity to assess, critique and be involved in improving the delivery processes, has given them a greater sense of professional and personal ownership of the project.

The involvement of the Aboriginal project officers has also effectively brought an Aboriginal context to the evaluation process from both Worldview and local perspectives. This has been and is an important element in the delivery and evaluation of the project as in the first instance, they understand the influences that Indigenous Worldviews have in the socio-economic interface. Similarly in terms of local perspectives, the project officers understand the social constructs of Indigenous disadvantage from a lived experience and in a way that the non-Indigenous RDAW representatives would never be able to.

This is a key point that should be central in examining evaluation of policies and programs and was previously put forward to the Productivity Commission by Les Malezer in 2012 at the Better Indigenous Policies Roundtable proceedings. Malezer noted (p. 69):

"Conventional evaluation methodologies used by government fail to comprehensively understand the full range of factors that contribute to the successful delivery of services to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander clients. Consequently, there is a failure to understand how programs for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities can be delivered and evaluated in a framework of self-determination.

Evidence from Australia and internationally consistently shows that community empowerment and involvement are the precursors for long-term economic development. Accordingly, Indigenous social policy should be evaluated in the context of self-determination and empowerment for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples."

The other factor that is excluded, disregarded or simply overlooked is that non-Indigenous participants and/or agencies involved in project (and evaluation) design and delivery are coming from a position of social power and are engaging with a people who are essentially, socially disempowered as illustrated by the following comments from (Waterworth et al. 2015) research.

"All these dependencies were put upon us. And then it's monkey see, monkey do. My mother didn't get money when she was working. She used to get flour, sugar, tobacco." (p.9)

"[Indigenous] people are so disempowered that they don't even connect, "OK I can do that, I can make this [health behaviour] better". (p.8)

"A lot of Aboriginal people are sick of being told how to live their lives and being criticised for how they live their lives and they want to hold onto the things that are important to them." (p.11)

The imbalance of power in exchanges between non-Indigenous providers and Indigenous participants can also create social inequities derived from provider's over-expectations of the level, type and/or pace of change where culture is recognised as a key factor in changing behaviours (Hardin 2015).

Conclusion

In conclusion, the RDAW experience demonstrates that the complexities and challenges of incorporating evaluation into project design and involving Aboriginal representatives and stakeholders in the project design and evaluation processes can be done, albeit with a commitment of effort.

In ingraining evaluation into policies and/or programs, the underpinning questions for policy makers and program providers are: what are the intended outcomes within Indigenous socio-cultural, economic and historical contexts and if the policies or programs are holistically addressing the issues or are a reductionist exercise of simplifying a problem to fit an outcome.

References

Australian Indigenous Governance Institute. (2013-2016). Fact Sheet 1: Understanding Governance. Retrieved from http://www.aigi.com.au/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/iga_factsheet_1.pdf

Australian Human Rights Commission. (2012). Social Justice Report 2012; Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commissioner. https://www.humanrights.gov.au/sites/default/files/document/publication/social_justice_report_2012.pdf

CDC's Healthy Communities Program (ND) Building Our Understanding; Key concepts of evaluation. Retrieved from https://www.cdc.gov/nccdphp/dch/programs/healthycommunitiesprogram/tools/pdf/eval_planning.pdf

Gibson, L. (2003). Trust and the development of health care as a social institution. Social Science and Medicine, 56: 1453-1468.

Goodall, H. 1999. Telling Country' Memory, Modernity and Narratives in Rural Australia. History Workshop Journal, 47, 161-190.

Graham, M., 1999. Some thoughts about the philosophical underpinnings of Aboriginal worldviews. Worldviews: Global Religions, Culture, and Ecology, 3 (2), 105–118.

Hardin J (2015) Everyday translation: health practitioners' perspectives on obesity and metabolic disorders in Samoa. Critical Public Health 25: 125–138.

Hudson, S. (2017) Evaluating Indigenous programs: a toolkit for change; CIS research report; RR28.

Hudson, (2016) Mapping the Indigenous Program and Funding Maze. Research Report 18, CIS publications.

Hudson, S. (2009) Closing the accountability gap : the first step towards better indigenous health policy

HREOC (Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission) 1997. Bringing them home; Report of the national inquiry into the separation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children from their families. Sydney, NSW.

Kelaher, M., Luke, J., Ferdinand, A. & Chamravi, D. 2018, An Evaluation Framework to Improve Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Health, The Lowitja Institute, Melbourne.

Kickett-Tucker, C., & Ife, J. (2018). Identity in Australian Aboriginal Communities: Koordoormitj in the Essence of life. In S. Kenny, McGrath, B., & Phillips, R. (Ed.), The Routledge Handbook of Community Development. United Kingdom: Routledge.

Law Reform Commission of Western Australia. (2005). Aboriginal Customary Laws. Project 94, Discussion Paper. Perth, WA.

Litwin, J. 1997. Child protection interventions within Indigenous communities; An anthropological perspective. Australian Journal of Social Issues, 32, (4) 317-339.

NSW Agency for Clinical Innovation (2013). Understanding Program Evaluation: AN ACI Framework. HS13-033. NSW.

Owen, J., 2007, Program evaluation: forms and approaches- third edition, Guilford Press, New York

PM&C (2014), 'Indigenous-Specific Programmes: Internal Review Report'.

Productivity Commission 2013, Better Indigenous Policies: The Role of Evaluation, Roundtable Proceedings, Productivity Commission, Canberra.

SCRGSP (Steering Committee for the Review of Government Service Provision) 2016, Overcoming Indigenous Disadvantage: Key Indicators 2016, Canberra: Productivity Commission.

Van Krieken, R. 1992. Children and the state; social control and formation of Australian child welfare. Sydney, NSW, Allen and Unwin.

Waterworth, P., Pescud, M., Braham, R., Dimmock, J. and Rosenberg, M. 2015. Factors influencing the health behaviour of Indigenous Australians; Perspectives from support people. PLoS ONE 10, (11), e0142323,doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0412323.