

Improving the representation of Indigenous workers in the mainstream childcare workplace

Teresa Hutchins

Katie Frances

Edith Cowan University

Sherry Sagers

Curtin University of Technology

This article is concerned with the under-representation of Indigenous workers in mainstream childcare services and the associated problem of the under-representation of Indigenous children in such services. Specifically, it focuses on workforce issues that serve as barriers to both attracting and/or retaining Indigenous staff. The research methods included focus groups, community consultations and interviews with key stakeholders in the childcare field, in order to identify Indigenous childcare workers' needs and preferences as well as those of their children, families and communities. An analysis of international and national literature on the Indigenous childcare workforce provided a context for the evidence presented from the focus groups and individual consultations, and as a point of reference to compare existing understandings to those arising from these discussions. The research findings highlight three key issues that serve as significant barriers to Indigenous people entering and/or remaining in the childcare workforce, and to Indigenous children and families accessing mainstream childcare services: the lack of the provision of culturally safe workplaces, the lack of flexible employment practices, and the lack of opportunities for Indigenous workers to receive on-the-job training.

Introduction

Providing a successful childcare program for Indigenous children and their families rests upon ensuring the availability of an appropriately skilled and willing workforce (the term Indigenous is used here to refer to those people who identify and are accepted as such by their community). It is widely recognised that a childcare policy that focuses upon the supply of places at the expense of addressing workforce issues is not sustainable (Department of Family and Community Services, 2003; Department of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs, 2007; Whitebrook, Sakai, Gerber & Howes, 2001). Furthermore, despite the evidence that Indigenous children would benefit from formal child care, they are less likely to access mainstream childcare places than are other Australian children (Department of Family and Community Services, 2003; Productivity Commission, 2005). The reasons for this are complex, but include the inability of mainstream child care to develop culturally competent service systems that meet the needs and preferences of Indigenous childcare workers, and their children, families and communities. Bamblett and Lewis (2007) underline the importance of culturally competent service systems and argue that children and their families often fall victim to 'cultural abuse' in the form of agencies and practitioners intentionally and unintentionally ignoring, denigrating and even attacking their culture.

Important to the notion of cultural competence is the embedding of cultural information and practices in standards, policies and attitudes. Cultural competence is defined by the US National Association of Social Workers (2001, p. 9) as:

[The ability of] individuals and systems to respond respectfully and effectively to people of all cultures, languages, classes, races, ethnic backgrounds, religions, and other diversity factors in a manner that recognizes, affirms, and values the worth of individuals, families, and communities and protects and preserves the dignity of each.

The inability of mainstream childcare services to develop and provide culturally competent service systems serves as a significant barrier to attracting and/or retaining Indigenous workers in mainstream childcare services, and to Indigenous children and families accessing such services (Waltja Tjutanku Palyapayi Aboriginal Corporation, 2001; Fasoli, Benbow, Deveraux, Falk, Harris & Hazard et al., 2004; Trigwell, 2000).

The research we are reporting thus highlights three significant issues raised by Indigenous people as essential in order to attract and/or retain them in the mainstream childcare workplace and, in turn, to increase the likelihood of Indigenous children and families accessing such services. These include: the provision of culturally safe workplaces with flexible employment practices and opportunities for Indigenous workers to receive on-the-job training. In this article we argue that Indigenous children are poorly represented in mainstream care services and that their under-representation results largely from a lack of culturally safe services and the significant barriers to Indigenous people entering and/or remaining in the childcare workforce.

Background

In 2001, throughout the states and territories of Australia, the Indigenous childcare workforce represented just two per cent of all childcare workers and 1.1 per cent of all childcare coordinators. This amounted to 1,217 Indigenous workers and just 70 Indigenous coordinators (Australian Institute of Health and Welfare, 2005). In 2006, the Australian Bureau of Statistics reported a slight increase in the number of Indigenous childcare workers: 2.4 per cent, amounting to 1,424 of the total childcare workforce population. The number of Indigenous childcare coordinators was not reported (Australian Institute of Health and Welfare, 2008).

The Australian Government's Family and Children's Services (Department of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs, 2007), Bond (2000) and Trigwell (2000) have all acknowledged a shortage of qualified Indigenous childcare workers. This shortage, however, is not confined to Indigenous staff: there is both national and international acknowledgement of the difficulties for mainstream services to attract and maintain a stable, reliable, skilled (non-Indigenous and Indigenous) childcare workforce (DfES, 2006; Community Services Ministers' Advisory Council, 2006; Whitebrook et al., 2001).

In terms of the number of Indigenous children accessing formal child care, reliable statistical information is limited for a number of reasons, primarily having to do with the identification of Aboriginality by children's services and the uneven reporting of children attending some non-mainstream services. A number of authors have, however, cited the poor participation rates of Indigenous children in mainstream government-funded child care (Department of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs, 2007; Pocock, 2002; Priest, 2005). The Australian Government's *Census of Child Care Services* reports figures on the likely number of Indigenous children attending childcare services in each state and territory. In the 2006 Census these figures indicate that almost 11,821 Indigenous children, nationally, were attending long day care, family day care, in-home care, outside-school-hours care, vacation care, occasional care, multifunctional services, multifunctional Aboriginal childcare services, and mobile and toy library services (Australian Government, 2008). Approximately, just two per cent of children in long day care were identified as being from Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander families. This compares with four per cent of the total birth-to-four-year Australian population identified as Indigenous or Torres Strait Islander in the 2006 ABS Census of Population and Housing (Australian Government, 2008, p. 16).

In 2003, in recognition of the problems within the childcare workforce and in response to the Commonwealth Child Care Advisory Council's report, *Child*

Care: Beyond 2001, the Commonwealth Government convened the Child Care Workforce Think Tank. The government acknowledged that staffing shortages in Australian childcare services could 'jeopardise the future quality of care in Australia' (Department of Family and Community Services, 2003, p. 3). The key objectives of this think tank were: to develop cross-sectoral understandings of current workforce issues, and the related issue of greater collaboration between stakeholders; and to develop strategies for addressing current workforce issues which affect the status of child care both as a profession and as a service provision.

The recommendations put forward included: improvements to the rates of pay and employment conditions; an emphasis on training and professional development; and the development of a national workforce planning strategy. Community perceptions of the value of children and children's services were also highlighted as important components of the issues affecting the status of child care. Consequently, the workforce planning project, specifically developed to 'increase the attraction and retention of qualified staff, in particular Indigenous childcare workers' (Department of Family and Community Services, 2003, p. 9), was implemented by the Community Services Sub-Committee (and supported by the Commonwealth Government).

The results of this project, the *National Children's Services Workforce Study*, were published in July 2006. However, the study reports that '[e]thnicity data was not collected in the survey' (Community Services Ministers' Advisory Council, 2006, p. 34). Where data relating specifically to Indigenous workers is recorded, this is limited to statistics which reflect 'a sense of the likely Indigenous workforce ... obtained from the [2001] Australian Bureau of Statistics Census of Population and Housing' (p. 34). The lack of attention to issues specific to Indigenous workers, however, leads to the idea that issues affecting mainstream childcare workers can be extrapolated to the Indigenous experience. In this sense, the survey does little to progress the development

of 'increas[ing] the attraction and retention of qualified staff, in particular Indigenous childcare workers' (Department of Family and Community Services, 2003, p. 9).

The most recent initiatives relating to attraction and retention of childcare workers in mainstream services arise from the Commonwealth Government's budget measures 2008–2009. The following are of particular relevance: a 50 per cent remission value on Higher Education Contribution Scheme/Higher Education Loan Program (HECS/HELP) to all early childhood education teachers working in a regional, remote or high disadvantaged area; the funding of an additional 500 Commonwealth-supported university places for early childhood education qualifications over a four-year period; and funding over four years to remove fees (from 2009) for the diplomas and advanced diplomas of children's services courses delivered at TAFE institutions. These measures are part of the Government's National Early Years Workforce Strategy and the Early Childhood Education Workforce Strategy which aim to improve recruitment and retention in childcare services, provide incentives and opportunities for childcare workers to improve their qualifications and develop expertise in early learning and care. These measures have been implemented to increase the level of qualified staff in preschool and childcare services, particularly in areas of high need (Australian Government, 2008, pp. 144, 147, 148).

In addition to the above initiatives, in October 2005 the Australian Government commissioned a broad-based national consultation with Indigenous communities and service providers to identify childcare needs and preferences of Indigenous families and children. This paper thus draws upon components of the consultations relevant to the above issues. Results from the larger research project will be published in separate articles.

Methodology

A mixed method approach was used in the collection of data. Quantitative data, in the form of descriptive statistics regarding the number of Indigenous childcare workers, and the number of Indigenous children using childcare services was obtained from the 2005 Australian Institute of Health and Welfare report, *The health and welfare of Australia's Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples*, the Department of Family and Community Services 2006 *Census of Child Care Services* and the 2005 Productivity Commission's *Report on Government Services*. Semi-structured 'sets' of questions were used to obtain qualitative data from focus group discussions and individual consultations with relevant childcare and Indigenous networks, service providers, community members and government representatives. A review of national and international literature regarding workforce issues for the childcare industry, with a particular focus on the Indigenous childcare workforce, was also undertaken and provided a context for the evidence presented from the focus groups and consultations.

The sample comprised Indigenous childcare providers (202), Indigenous community members (210), and state and territory government representatives (66) from across Australia. In each state and territory a minimum of one capital city consultation and one rural/regional/remote consultation of service providers and community members was included. Metropolitan consultations were held during the Secretariat of National Aboriginal and Islander Child Care's (SNAICC) state conferences where possible. Rural/regional/remote sites were nominated by SNAICC, FaCSIA and state and territory government representatives.

The research was conducted with attention to ethical guidelines for research with Indigenous and Torres Strait Islander people, as articulated by the NH&MRC's (2003) *Guidelines for ethical research in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander health research*. These guidelines require all researchers to conduct their work according to Indigenous priorities and processes, and with respect to Indigenous values. Ethical approval to undertake the research was

granted by Edith Cowan University's Human Research Ethics Committee. Importantly, the research team included Indigenous and non-Indigenous people with many years' experience working with Indigenous communities.

Limitations of the research included time constraints, the limited sample, and the contested role of government at the consultations because of philosophical differences about the appropriateness of child care and the role of government in the provision of child care.

Findings

A preference for Indigenous staff

The importance of local Indigenous people caring for Indigenous children was emphasised in most community consultations. The primary reasons for the preference of Indigenous staff looking after Indigenous children relate to both a lack of cultural sensitivity and understanding on the part of non-Indigenous staff.

For example, one parent explained:

I took my kids to that other centre [mainstream] and I waited 10 minutes there and no one came to me. When someone did come they asked if I needed something. Well, I said, 'Of course I need something. I wasn't standing here for nothing,' and I stormed out of there. I would never go back there.

Although some service providers and community members acknowledged that they had positive experiences with non-Indigenous childcare staff, many told stories of feeling shamed and disrespected when they had approached a non-Indigenous childcare worker.

Their sentiments were summed up by another parent, who explained:

You want someone who knows your values and customs. If non-Indigenous people are caring for Indigenous kids they should be authentic, have good knowledge about Indigenous values, not just attend a workshop on culture.

—Member of a metropolitan community

The majority of parents also highlighted the need for trust in those caring for their children and the need for non-Indigenous childcare workers to become part of the community. For example, the parents at one service emphasised how their non-Indigenous caregivers had become part of their extended family

They are people we see when we go to gatherings and meetings, they are still involved in our community—they are part of our family.

—Member of a regional community

The development of trust for the majority of parents was most easily achieved, however, when family members were working at the centre.

We must know the people working here, we have to trust the workers who look after our kids; in this community you must be on CDEP¹ to work in child care. Workers should be from the community.

—Member of a remote community

A mix of ages and gender of caregivers was also seen as a preference. In general, the consensus was that it was good to have ‘a mix of people, old and young’. While the important role played by senior women caring for children, and the importance of elders, were acknowledged as important considerations in choosing caregivers, a young women’s group said they would like some young people like themselves because:

¹ The Community Development Employment Projects (CDEP) program is an Australian Government funded initiative for unemployed Indigenous people in selected locations.

Some older people are a bit hard; we don't want the workers to be too old.

—Member of a metropolitan community

Furthermore, while the majority of Indigenous childcare workers are women, the presence of male carers was evident (although no count of their numbers was undertaken). For example, two of the Multifunctional Aboriginal Children's Services had male directors and several employed male caregivers. One of the Multifunctional Aboriginal Children's Services had a male cook and another employed a male 'bus carer'. The importance of men in child care was also raised in several of the community consultations:

Would be good to have some men—boys look up to males, my kids are full-on boys, and they need some male input, including physical activity. There's some interest in child care by men, [but] there is some stigma attached, and it would need to be a certain kind of male.

—Member of a metropolitan community

Having some men would be good, especially for the boys, they can be role models. If men are employed they need to have police clearance, qualifications and experience.

—Member of a metropolitan community

Culturally safe workplaces

A major finding from our consultations was the need for mainstream childcare services to provide a culturally safe workplace in order to attract Indigenous families and retain Indigenous workers. Cultural safety in the workplace incorporates the knowledge that as an individual you can express your

identity, practise your culture and have your values honoured without fear of ridicule, chastisement or prejudice (Hutchins, Martin, Saggors & Sims, 2008).

Culturally safe workplaces were represented in our consultations by those services that had retained their Indigenous workforce over a number of years.

In these services the staff had a strong sense of belonging and commitment. The concept of cultural safety was reflected in many of the staffing practices in these services and the way the staff spoke about their work:

[We] need to have culturally safe services, give a voice to the staff, families and children, where they can use language, have staff from the same culture, have an understanding of family obligations, make a space for sorry business, support their study and training. A place that is inherently safe because of the type of people in the service.

—Service provider from a remote community

Other caregivers said they appreciated having a workplace that allowed them to express their culture and encouraged them to be culturally strong:

Need to be recognised and respected for your individuality, encourage your culture. Families look for stuff they can relate to. It is not just about art work, you need to experience it for yourself. We are a family here. It is just about the way we are with the kids and the families. I love my job. The mobile unit makes kids happy. When it is the wet season, like now, I miss the kids.

—Service provider from a very remote community

Other caregivers, on the other hand, reported stories of working in mainstream services and being chastised for speaking in their own language

or using Creole with the children. Rather than this being perceived as added value it was often treated with suspicion and antagonism. What is clear is that services that are not perceived to be culturally safe are unlikely to be used by Indigenous people—a point emphasised throughout the consultations. As one of the government officials pointed out:

Indigenous staff in mainstream often feel uncomfortable. They are the token black person. The people there don't understand them.

—Government representative from a metropolitan area

This view was reinforced by a service provider who argued:

Services need to get respect from the Aboriginal communities. This respect needs to be earned. Non-Aboriginal people need to learn how to speak to Indigenous populations and ask what Aboriginal people want. They need to be polite and treat Aboriginal people as individuals. Aboriginal people are not all the same. You need to break the cycle of racism.

—Service provider from a metropolitan area

Flexible staffing practices that took into account changing family responsibilities were also important in the provision of culturally safe workplaces and were evident in services that were able to both attract and retain Indigenous staff. For example, the director of one service allowed a caregiver who operated a mobile service in a remote area to swap positions with another caregiver while she attended to her family responsibilities. Another example was found in a regional area, where an extended leave of absence was granted for a caregiver to look after her sick husband. In both instances, the caregivers returned to work once their family responsibilities had been resolved. As one director explained:

The staff here have to have so much flexibility, you have to be prepared that within some months you will have no one, they will disappear, they will take off and do something different. You have to let them do that.

—Service provider from a remote area

On-the-job training

Even though the lack of culturally safe workplaces is a key factor in the shortage of qualified Indigenous workers, the major factor is the lack of culturally appropriate training. Service providers across the country stressed the need for flexible on-site delivery of training. This was believed to be important for a number of reasons. As one service provider pointed out, Indigenous people are:

More likely to start when assured of a position—rather than doing training in hope of getting a job later.

—Service provider from a metropolitan area

Other service providers explained:

Training appears to be daunting to Aboriginal people. Many childcare workers do not do training until they get older, more experienced and more confident; when they've already had their own children. I was about 40 and I got through it. It was hard, but I have managed. Then there was this transition course to get into the Diploma. I did that too. I worked till 5–6 pm and then attended classes. It was hard.

—Service provider from a metropolitan area

For many young women, the last thing they want is to go back to school [for training].

—Community member from a metropolitan area

It is very difficult for many caregivers living in rural or remote areas to leave their communities to attend training colleges or universities:

There are a number of issues for women. Those with little kids don't want to leave the community for training in B (distant city-based site). They want on the job training in J (local community) or at least in K (nearest town) and they want to be paid while they train. They would be happy with CDEP plus top up.

—Service provider from a remote area

Other service providers emphasised the need to recognise the skills that mature age women bring to the workplace and to value current competencies as well as undertake more 'on-the-job' assessment:

To help Indigenous workers to get their qualifications there has to be recognition of skills that caregivers had developed while working. Experienced workers know a lot. There are the theories they need to learn about, but there is lots of things that they do not need to learn.

—Service provider from a metropolitan area

We need to move away from the mainstream training structure. There are childcare workers who have been working for many years. They have the skills and knowledge. People should not be asked to re-learn what they already know. Flexibility is needed in the training arrangements. RPL (Recognition of Prior Learning) is important, recognising the existing strong base and there should be a possibility of fast tracking.

—Service provider from a metropolitan area

Some also expressed the view that on-site flexible delivery by Indigenous trainers would be better able to take account of the differences in learning styles and levels of literacy. For example, there is a need for assessors who are able to be flexible in their assessment practices:

We need more Indigenous assessors to go with students, so that they're not marked down for not reading to the children when in fact they're telling them stories. If we had Indigenous assessors it would help some situations, such as my daughter who volunteered at a centre but couldn't pass the assessment. We need oral assessment, most Murris² are more oral.

—Community member from a metropolitan area

Many childcare workers reported that they could not study at home because of family commitments. They believed that time to study at work was essential, as many were the primary caregivers for large numbers of family members:

Mostly families have a lot of people living in their homes. I have six adults and six kids living with me.

—Service provider from a very remote area

Many students can't study at home because they have the primary role of caring for family, kids, grandkids and so on. There is often what white fellas would call chaos in the home; e.g., large numbers of people living there, no place to put a book, alcohol issues, domestic violence, etc. No quiet place to study.

—Service provider from a very remote area

² Murri refers to Aboriginal people of north and far-north Queensland.

Best practice examples of flexible delivery

There are many good examples of successful training programs for Indigenous childcare workers around the country. Several service providers in Queensland spoke well of the state government's training strategy and, in particular, the Cape/Gulf Remote Area Aboriginal and Torres Strait Island Child Care Network (RAATSICC), and were proud to be obtaining their qualifications:

We put the qualifications on the wall and have a celebration when they get their certificates. It's only a Certificate III but it's everything to them.

—Service provider from a rural area

The Batchelor Institute of Indigenous Tertiary Education in the Northern Territory, Yorganop in Western Australia, and some colleges of TAFE are also providing culturally appropriate and flexible training programs. An example of such flexibility can be seen in the practice of local tutors meeting with their students at a time and place convenient for the students, usually their workplaces and usually after hours. However, while this level of flexibility was highly valued, there was some criticism that tutors were not affording students' current competencies a high enough value in the assessment process. Several service providers themselves noted this as an issue of concern, and thought there should be more on-the-job assessments and less written work:

TAFE teachers don't give credit for workplace learning and don't check for literacy and numeracy.

—Service provider from an outer regional area

Discussion

The central question posed in this paper was 'how to improve the representation of Indigenous childcare workers in the mainstream childcare workplace'. The multiple responses to this question, as obtained through the focus groups and individual consultations, highlight four important issues that serve as barriers to Indigenous people entering and/or remaining in the childcare workforce.

First is the need for cultural safety in the workplace. Cultural safety incorporates the development and implementation of culturally-competent service systems that recognise, acknowledge and value the worth of individuals, families and communities. It also requires attention to, and an understanding of, the historic, sociocultural, political and economic contexts in which Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander disadvantage has developed, as well as ensuring that cultural differences are legitimised in such a way as to preserve the dignity of people and cultures (TICHR, 2005). Thus, cultural safety is more than having a cultural sensitivity to individuals. Rather, it requires the embedding of the value and importance of cultural differences in policies and practices that guide systems and organisations. Such safe workplaces require a commitment to diversity in the selection of staff, the adoption of Aboriginal and Islander perspectives in policies and programs, developing partnerships with local Indigenous organisations, providing opportunities for non-Indigenous staff to learn first-hand from Indigenous experts, and facilitating them to overcome gaps in their knowledge.

Second, another important aspect of cultural safety is the need for flexible employment practices. The overriding cause of retention problems in mainstream services differs between Indigenous and non-Indigenous workers. For non-Indigenous workers, turnover is closely related to dissatisfaction with pay and conditions (Community Services Ministers' Advisory Council, 2006). For example, the *National Children's Workforce Study* (2006) noted that, in relation to opinions about how better to retain staff, the three statements with the most agreement were: 'workers in the sector should have higher wages' (96 per cent); 'pay for in-service training' (87 per cent); and 'raise the profile

and status of workers' (86 per cent) (Community Services Ministers' Advisory Council, 2006, p. 69). In addition to concerns about pay and conditions, a long-expressed concern for mainstream services trying to retain non-Indigenous staff is that, once staff leave the workforce to begin families or undertake further study, they tend to be lost to the industry forever (Bellm et al., 2002; Community Services Ministers' Advisory Council, 2006, p. 5). The consultations highlighted that this is not so much an issue for Indigenous workers who often have family and cultural responsibilities that may take them away from their workplace at times but do not necessarily translate into that person being lost to the industry altogether. Indigenous childcare workers tend to return to the industry once the issues that took them away are resolved. Importantly, those services which allow for and accommodate such changing circumstances have demonstrated their success at keeping their staff.

Third, Indigenous childcare workers have cited the need for culturally-appropriate training to take into account the legitimacy of the variations in the ways they engage with the demands of the workplace. The Secretariat of National Aboriginal and Islander Child Care (SNAICC) has advocated the need to develop Indigenous-specific training strategies that address, and are tailored to, the needs of the Indigenous child and family welfare and early learning and care services (2003). One of the difficulties of current mainstream approaches to providing childcare training is that the nationally endorsed training packages are built upon competencies designed for mainstream services which do not account for culturally valued and context relevant competencies for Indigenous children and families (Fasoli et al., 2004, p. 12). This is problematic for some communities on several levels: first, it has the effect of marginalising Indigenous knowledges and practices; second, such marginalising of Indigenous knowledge and practices results in a disempowering effect upon Indigenous workers and their children, families and communities; and, third, it takes no account of differing learning styles and contexts. As Campbell (2000, p. 10) points out:

Indigenous people often take longer to progress through their education and training for a variety of reasons and this poses problems when funding does not accommodate the need for extended education and training time frames.

There are several examples of culturally relevant training initiatives available throughout the country, but there is a real need for these to be expanded and the strategies used by such initiatives integrated into mainstream training initiatives. Models of best practice are being delivered through the Cape/Gulf Remote Area Aboriginal and Torres Strait Island Child Care Network (RAATSICC), the Bachelor Institute of Indigenous Tertiary Education in the Northern Territory, Yorganop in Western Australia, and some colleges of TAFE. For example, the training initiative delivered by Yorganop in Western Australia has modified the mainstream training resource package to provide flexibility in delivery, assessment and presentation, with the mode of both delivery and assessment determined after consultation with students. Consideration is also given to location and time frames available to each individual learner or group (Department of Family and Community Services, 2005; Department for Community Development, 2004).

In addition to the expansion of these initiatives, there is a need to modify the nationally endorsed training packages themselves, so that they legitimise Indigenous knowledge and practices, value current competencies, and acknowledge differences in learning styles, levels of literacy and contexts. Interlinked with these issues is the need for flexible on-site delivery of training, which was seen as an important way to remove some of the barriers preventing Indigenous students from gaining experience, qualifications and employment.

Finally, and related to the above, is the reality that, without Indigenous staff working in the mainstream childcare service system and a significant effort to improve non-Indigenous understanding of the needs and aspirations of

Indigenous families, Indigenous children will continue to be under-represented in formal childcare services. Throughout the consultations, Indigenous people expressed the importance of Indigenous staff caring for Indigenous children and have cited this preference for two important reasons: a lack of cultural sensitivity and understanding from non-Indigenous staff; and, above all else, the need for those working with Indigenous children to be someone they consider trustworthy:

There's huge trust issues if the mothers aren't there to see what happens at the centre; they'd feel safer if there was other members of the family there; the baby can't express what their needs are and this is highly important ... Family members should be present as this creates trust ... It needs to be holistic and have a whole family aspect ... the more the better to have family involved and working there and offer security to the children within the centre so the more the better ... if a family relation is there in particular we would like this, we would like to send our children there with them anyway.

Acknowledgements

The research for this paper was funded by the Australian Department of Families, Communities and Indigenous Affairs (now Families, Housing, Communities and Indigenous Affairs), and draws upon a draft report provided to the Department in 2006. The opinions expressed are those of the authors alone and do not necessarily represent the views of the Department. The research team comprised Sherry Siggers, Andrew Guilfoyle, Teresa Hutchins, Margaret Sims and Anna Targowska (Centre for Social Research, Edith Cowan University); Stephanie Jackiewicz, Colleen Hayward, Steve Zubrick and Ellen Seymour (Telethon Institute for Child Health Research); Terry Dunbar (Charles Darwin University); June McLoughlin and Frank Oberklaid (Royal Children's Hospital, Melbourne); and Collette Tayler (Queensland University of Technology). Susan Teather was employed as a Research Associate on the project and Katie Frances is currently employed to

work with the research team on publications arising from the research. We acknowledge also the important role of the Secretariat of National Aboriginal and Islander Child Care in assisting with the organisation of consultations and for comments on the initial research report.

References

Australian Bureau of Statistics (2003). *The health and welfare of Australia's Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples (cat. no. 4704.0)*. Canberra: Australian Bureau of Statistics.

Australian Government (2008). *Budget 2008–09*. Retrieved 17 July 2008, www.budget.gov.au/2008-09/content/bp2/html/index.htm

Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (2005). *The health and welfare of Australia's Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples 2005*. Canberra: Author.

Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (2008). *The health and welfare of Australia's Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples 2006*. Canberra: Author.

Bamblett, M., & Lewis, P. (2007). Detoxifying the child and family welfare system for Australian Indigenous peoples: Self-determination, rights and culture as the critical tools. *First Peoples Child & Family Review*, 3(3), 43-56.

Bellm, D., Burton, A., Whitebook, M., Broatch, L., & Young, M. P. (2002). *Inside the pre-K Classroom: A study of staffing and stability in state-funded prekindergarten programs*. Washington, DC: Centre for the Child Care Workforce. Retrieved 18 July 2008, www.ccw.org/pubs/ccw_pre-k_10.4.02.pdf

Bond, D. (2000). *Multifunctional Aboriginal children's services national report, December 2000*. Canberra: SNAICC and Department of Family and Community Services.

Campbell, S. (2000). *The reform agenda for vocational education and training: Implications for Indigenous Australians (No. 202/2000)*. Canberra: Centre for Aboriginal Economic Policy Research.

Community Services Ministers' Advisory Council (2006). *National children's services workforce study*. Melbourne: Department of Human Services on behalf of the Children's Services Sub Committee.

Department for Community Development (2004). *Early Years Strategic Framework, 2003 to 2006*. Perth: Author

Department of Family and Community Services (2003). *Australian Government report on the April 2003 child care workforce think tank*. Canberra: Author.

Department of Family and Community Services (2005). *Review of the Aboriginal and Islander Care Agency (AICCA) program, final report*. Retrieved 9 July 2008,

[www.facsia.gov.au/internet/facsinternet.nsf/vIA/indigenous/\\$File/AICCA_Report.pdf](http://www.facsia.gov.au/internet/facsinternet.nsf/vIA/indigenous/$File/AICCA_Report.pdf)

Department of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs (2007). *The Indigenous child care services plan*. Canberra: Author.

Department for Education and Skills (DfES). (2006). *Children's workforce strategy: Building a world class workforce for children, young people and families*. Nottingham, UK: Department for Education and Skills.

Fasoli, L., Benbow, R., Deveraux, K., Falk, I., Harris, R., Hazard, M., et al. (2004). *'Both ways' children's services project: A study of children's services development, change and sustainability in six remote Indigenous communities in the Northern Territory*. Batchelor, NT: Batchelor Institute Press.

Hutchins, T., Martin, K., Sagers, S., & Sims, M. (2008). *Indigenous early learning and care*. Canberra: Australian Research Alliance for Children and Youth.

National Association of Social Workers (2001). NASW standards for cultural competence in social work practice. Retrieved 23 April 2008, <http://socialworkers.org/practice/standards/naswc/culturalstandards.pdf>

Pocock, J. (2002). Improving access to childcare for Indigenous families. Retrieved 4 October 2005, www.snaicc.asn.au/news/pdfs/chdcare-2003.PDF

Priest, K. (2005). *Exploring quality assurance for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander child care: A literature review and background paper*. Canberra: Department of Family and Community Services.

Productivity Commission (2005). *Report on government services 2005*. Canberra: Author.

Secretariat of National Aboriginal and Islander Child Care (SNAICC) (2003, 22–24 July). *Summary recommendations*. Paper presented at the 'Our future generations: National Indigenous child welfare and development seminar', Melbourne.

Telethon Institute for Child Health Research (TICHR) (2005). *Workforce development for Indigenous maternal and child health: A working paper for 'Project 3: workforce development of the Rio Tinto Child Health Partnership'*. Unpublished paper, available from Telethon Institute for Child Health Research, Perth.

Trigwell, J. (2000). *Childcare models and options in rural and remote Indigenous communities*. Perth: Western Australian Council of Social Service.

Waltja Tjutangku Palyapayi Aboriginal Corporation (2001). *Pipirri Wiimaku 'for the little kids' innovative child care report*. Alice Springs, NT: Author.

Whitebrook, M., Sakai, L., Gerber, E., & Howes, C. (2001). *Then & now: Changes in child care staffing, 1994–2000*. Technical report. Berkley, CA: Centre for the Child Care Workforce, University of California.