



Report to the National Native Title Tribunal

Pilot Mentoring Project for Junior NTRB Anthropologists

**David F Martin
Anthropos Consulting Services, Canberra
June, 2004**

Acknowledgments

I wish to acknowledge the input and assistance of many individuals in the conduct of this project and the preparation of this report.

The pilot program owes much to the financial support of the NNTT and ATSI through its NTRB Capacity Building Program. During the inception of the pilot the Central Land Council (through CEO David Ross) generously covered certain of the costs of the first workshop in Alice Springs. Subsequently, the NNTT assisted in providing a meeting venue for the final workshop. Such sponsorship has been appreciated.

I owe a particular debt to Dr Julie Finlayson, who was involved as the Facilitator of this project as a staff member of Anthropos Consulting until she took up a position with ATSI in early December 2003. Under agreement with ATSI as one of the two sponsors of the pilot, she has subsequently continued to provide advice and counsel as an ATSI officer.

Dr Nicolas Peterson of the ANU deserves particular mention as a constant supporter of the project in his capacity as the AAS representative on the pilot's Steering Committee. He provided for the printing and collation of the resource kits from University funds, offering advice and practical help whenever he could in spite of his own significant career demands. We are very grateful for his involvement and keen interest in the program.

Wayne Denning, Director of the Native Title Services Program within ATSI, has continued to offer interest in and support to the project throughout its duration.

Dr Klim Gollan (NNTT) also deserves sincere thanks for his professional advice at various developmental stages of the project as well as his positive and encouraging contribution during his oversight of the project as the designated Project Officer.

David Martin
Anthropos Consulting

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
Background to the project	5
Terms of Reference for the pilot	5
Mentoring pilot principles.....	7
Agreed delivery protocol.....	8
Project participants	9
Conduct of the pilot.....	10
Joint meetings.....	11
Other developments.....	11
Lessons from the mentoring pilot	12
General observations	12
Mentoring at a distance	12
Engagement of Mentees with the project.....	13
The mentoring pilot and the host NTRBs.....	13
Mentoring outcomes in the context of wider NTRB issues.....	14
Marginalisation of anthropologists' roles.....	15
Anthropologists and wider staff management issues.....	16
Personal, career and professional development issues.....	17
Recommendations and future directions	18
General findings and recommendations arising from the pilot	19
Potential future directions.....	22

Abbreviations used

AAS	Australian Anthropological Society Inc
AIATSIS	Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies
ATSIC	Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission
ATSIS	Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Services
NNTT	National Native Title Tribunal
NTRB	Native Title Representative Body
OIPC	Office of Indigenous Policy Coordination of the Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs
PJC	Parliamentary Joint Committee on Native Title and the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Land Fund

Executive Summary

Assessment of the pilot mentoring program

Outcomes from this small-scale mentoring pilot were mixed, and while there were beneficial results for participants, there were also valuable lessons in terms of what worked, and what did not. Nonetheless, the mentoring pilot, together with the findings of the project into anthropological capacity in native title practice, have clearly identified the need for mentoring and professional development of NTRB anthropologists, to overcome major issues including relative lack of experience and skills, professional isolation, and lack of meaningful career paths.

A key goal of the mentoring pilot was to contribute to the capacity of NTRBs to perform their functions, through improving the anthropological expertise in their service provision. However, in a context where there are widespread and systemic deficiencies in NTRB capacity, mentoring cannot operate effectively on a stand-alone basis. It must complement staff professional development programs and wider programs of NTRB capacity development and institutional reform more generally.

A significant deficit in the pilot mentoring project was that in most cases, mentoring of the junior staff anthropologists was not integrated into NTRB management and professional development structures and processes, and there was a fragmented approach in its delivery across different NTRBs. Any future project must address this deficiency. Also, future mentoring needs full commitment and support from senior NTRB management.

The mentoring project and the anthropological capacity project both highlighted the relatively lower qualifications of NTRB anthropologists in comparison with their consultant and academic colleagues. However, a mentoring and professional development program for NTRB anthropologists and other NTRB social-scientific staff should complement rather than substitute for general capacity building programs for NTRBs and training and skills development initiatives for staff such as those being offered from February 2005 by the University of Western Australia.

The twelve-month pilot was too long. The 'mentoring cycle' of energetic and sustained communication lasted four–six months after which contact waned. The first signs of the fall off were reversion to 'as-needs' communication followed by a fairly rapid tailing off. The mentoring component of any future professional development program should involve shorter modules, perhaps 4 months, allowing for short, intensive and thus more effective mentoring relationships with set objectives.

In the pilot project, Mentees were directly approached to participate on the basis of being relatively new graduates working with little or no assistance from senior anthropological colleagues. This did not necessarily result in individual's participation being based on demonstrated need or on their commitment to benefit from the process. In future, Mentee participation should be based on a competitive selection process based on published criteria, and

on embedded incentives to participate in the program. Programs need status and external recognition.

There are similar arguments for selection of Mentors. Given the typically heavy workloads of the senior practitioners who would make appropriate Mentors, it may be necessary for any future mentoring program to professionalise participation by Mentors, including through provision of training modules and through payment of reasonable fees rather than just an honorarium as with the pilot project.

While a Resource Kit for NTRB anthropologists was produced as part of the pilot, it was under-utilised. Nonetheless, it provides an invaluable resource and it is recommended that it be revised and published in an accessible format (possibly electronically) for distribution to and application in NTRBs.

Whatever new initiatives develop they must engage with the now dominant propensity of contemporary NTRB practice; working in disciplinary silos in isolation from one another and without due regard for the interdisciplinary nature of native title research and claim preparation

Need for an ongoing mentoring and professional development program

The lessons learned from the mentoring pilot, together with the findings in the recent report on anthropological capacity in native title practice (Martin 2004), make it clear that NTRB anthropologists in particular are likely to be relatively junior and inexperienced, female, professionally quite isolated, feeling that their work is not contributing to a career path in anthropology, and working in environments which are not necessarily supportive of specific anthropological practice in NTRB work and where there are seldom adequate resources to implement staff professional development more generally.

Most of these factors lie well outside the capacity of a program focused on mentoring to deal with. While there were benefits to most of the Mentees from their regular contact with senior practitioners in the pilot, including addressing some of the professional isolation issues, few of the underlying anthropological practice issues could be addressed.

Thus, while the pilot project indicated that mentoring as such can provide benefits to participants, taking into account some of the lessons learned such as the limitations of conducting it without face-to-face contact, the project has highlighted the necessity to embed mentoring within a wider program of professional development.

At the same time, feedback during the pilot project made it clear that a crucial component of addressing anthropological professional practice issues within NTRBs—and indeed within native title practice more broadly—must lie in overcoming the professional ‘silos’ within which the various disciplines involved typically operate.

Proposed mentoring and professional development program

In light of the experience from the mentoring pilot, a broad outline of a proposed mentoring and professional development program to address the issues for NTRB anthropologists is as follows:

-
- (a) Mentoring of junior NTRB anthropologists cannot operate as a standalone program, but must be embedded within a wider system of professional development;
 - (b) This mentoring / professional development must serve to break down disciplinary silos in NTRB native title practice rather than reinforce them;
 - (c) Equally, while mentoring needs to be focused on junior NTRB anthropologists, it needs to be linked to wider professional development which meets the needs of NTRB staff across their various roles and disciplines, and this in turn must be one component of further building the capacity of NTRBs to meet their statutory functions;
 - (d) The mentoring component itself should broadly follow the methodology of the pilot project, which involved a structured program and was based on widely accepted mentoring principles;
 - (e) However, for the mentoring to be effective, it must include opportunities for face-to-face contact between Mentees and Mentors. It is suggested that this be undertaken through at least one visit by each Mentor to the Mentee in their NTRB workplace, as well as participation in a national professional development workshop (as discussed below).
 - (f) An alternative to solely utilising Mentors based in the major cities, as was the case with the pilot, regionally based mentoring networks could be established within a state (for example, across the Pilbara in Western Australia) or within part of a state (for example, between NTRBs in central and northern Queensland). This would use peer mentoring with contributions from a designated senior anthropologist (either a consultant or from another NTRB).
 - (g) Any mentoring and professional development program must be flexible enough to allow for adaptation in the light of changes in the native title policy and service delivery environments, including in the NTRB organisational landscape;
 - (h) Such a program must be based on a detailed needs analysis which involves more than just self-reporting by NTRB staff;
 - (i) Mentoring and professional development must have the full commitment and support of the CEOs and senior management of the relevant NTRBs, and must be integrated into NTRB management and professional development structures and processes;
 - (j) The mentoring component of any future professional development program should involve short modules, perhaps 4 months, allowing for short, intensive and thus more effective mentoring relationships with set objectives;
 - (k) Mentee participation should be based on a competitive selection process based on published criteria, and on embedded incentives to participate in the program;
 - (l) Since there is only a limited pool of suitably qualified and available senior and experienced anthropologists able and willing to act as Mentors, it may be necessary for any future mentoring program to

-
- professionalise participation by Mentors, including through provision of training modules and through payment of reasonable fees;
- (m) A process of formal accountability between Mentor and Mentee based on specific goals and benchmarks is needed to drive personal commitment;
 - (n) The resource kit for Mentees prepared for the pilot project should be revised and published in an accessible format (possibly electronically) for distribution to and application in NTRBs;
 - (o) Resources directly provided by agencies such as the NNTT and OIPC for any mentoring and professional development project arising from this pilot should be directed to the identified needs of junior NTRB anthropologists. However, mechanisms will be needed to address the 'silo mentality' operating between professionals in many NTRBs, and also to link NTRB anthropologists with anthropologists and other professionals working in native title outside NTRBs.
 - (p) Additionally, a mentoring and professional development project should be linked into the wider NTRB capacity development program, and funding provided by agencies for this mentoring project should be structured so as to leverage funding and resources from other sources.
 - (q) It is suggested that an appropriate mechanism to achieve these objectives would be through holding an intensive professional development workshop in native title practice, focused primarily on the needs of anthropologists but also addressing the needs of other social-scientific disciplines. It would necessarily include lawyers to facilitate cross-disciplinary dialogue. Such a workshop could be held over a period of 3-5 days at a time when the workload for most NTRBs is lower, to maximise participation, and following completion of the first mentoring module of 4-6 months.
 - (r) Such a course would most appropriately be structured and delivered so that for those who wished to take this path, successful completion could be credited towards relevant professional development courses, such as the Graduate Diploma or Graduate Certificate in Native Title and Cultural Heritage Management being offered from February 2005 by the Department of Anthropology at the University of Western Australia. This would provide an added attraction for non-Mentees to participate.
 - (s) Costs, or a proportion of the costs, for the junior NTRB anthropologists participating in the mentoring program could be met by the agencies funding that program. Other participants should be sought from government agencies, consultants, private industry and possibly the academy, and would either meet their own costs (as would most likely be the case for consultants), or have them met by their employer.
 - (t) Such a mentoring and professional development program should operate for at least two years, since the issues being addressed are long-term and systemic, and not amenable to short term interventions.
-

Background to the project

1. The idea for a mentoring scheme for junior anthropologists working in Native Title Representative Bodies (NTRBs) arose from discussions amongst some anthropologists concerned by the retreat from native title work of many junior anthropologists and the consequent difficulties faced by many NTRBs in recruiting suitably qualified anthropological staff and accessing expertise in the area. It was realised too that many new graduates taking up positions in NTRBs were professionally isolated and not necessarily in contact with more experienced peers. From such concerns, the Australia Anthropological Society (AAS) developed an initial proposal for offering those in the early stages of a career in the field of native title an opportunity for focused professional support.
2. From this proposal, a pilot mentoring project was negotiated between the Land Rights and Native Title Branch of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission (ATSIC), later part of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Services (ATSIS), the National Native Title Tribunal (NNTT), and Anthropos Consulting, involving pairing five senior and experienced anthropologists as Mentors with five NTRB junior anthropologists as Mentees. Under a Memorandum of Understanding between ATSIC, the NNTT and Anthropos Consulting, funding for the project was provided jointly by ATSIC and the NNTT, with ATSIC resourcing the Mentors and costs of the two workshops held during the project, and the NNTT resourcing the project development and facilitation work to be undertaken by Anthropos, in accordance with a contract between these two parties.
3. The pilot project has targeted situations where professional support for the junior anthropologist was limited. A university degree in anthropology provides no technical or managerial preparation for most of the tasks NTRB anthropologists perform. New graduates have to learn such skills 'on the job'. This pilot mentoring project was therefore directly related to the perceived need for better professional practice and expertise.
4. As discussed later in this report, such perceptions were borne out by the findings of a separate project conducted by Anthropos Consulting for the NNTT relating to the capacity of anthropologists to provide services in the native title area. That project's report (Martin 2004) highlighted a range of issues confronting NTRB anthropologists including their relative inexperience, professional isolation, and lack of career path.

Terms of Reference for the pilot

5. The objectives of the mentoring project were:
 - To explore the potential to Mentor inexperienced junior staff anthropologists in NTRBs Australia-wide;
 - To boost the immediate performance of NTRB employees and to assist ATSIC/ATSIS to direct funds to obtain long-lasting future benefit in this area;

-
- To develop and pilot a generic mentoring practice across all native title expert practitioners, and to promote the efficacy of this approach to the professional associations that service these disciplines, thereby assisting the NNTT strategic objectives of increased throughput in mediated native title determinations.

The structure of the pilot

6. A number of stages, milestones and outputs were established under the contractual arrangements between the NNTT and Anthropos. Those of direct relevance to this report required Anthropos to:

Stage One

- (a) Identify Mentors on the basis of specified criteria, confirm their agreement to participate and enter into contractual arrangements with them;
- (b) Identify NTRBs who have junior anthropologists where both are willing to participate in the project, and obtain written confirmation from each participating NTRB.

Stage Two

- (c) Conduct a two day workshop with the Mentors to scope an agreed delivery methodology;
- (d) Draft a mentoring protocol;
- (e) Draft a statement of mentoring principles, and prepare the final agreed delivery methodology based on the workshop discussions;
- (f) Provide the draft protocol, mentoring principles and delivery methodology to the Steering Committee for approval, and amend as requested by them;
- (g) Distribute these to the Mentors, Mentees, and Steering Committee.

Stage Three

- (h) Co-ordinate and record the mentoring process through regular consultations with Mentors, Mentees, and NTRBs;
- (i) Prepare an interim report.

Stage Four

- (j) Prepare and circulate a questionnaire and analyse the responses, following up by feedback as necessary;
 - (k) Prepare a final report including the feedback from Mentors, Mentees and NTRBs on the effectiveness of the mentoring project as a capacity building and support initiative for NTRBs.
7. A Steering Committee was formed comprising a representative from each of the sponsoring organisations, the NNTT and the Native Title and Land Rights Branch of ATSIC (later ATSIS), together with a representative from AAS as the anthropological profession's peak national organisation.

-
8. Julie Finlayson of Anthropos Consulting acted as the project developer, co-ordinator and facilitator until she took up a position with AT SIS in December 2003, when David Martin took on her role.
 9. Carefully defined mentoring principles outlining the mentoring relationship and communication protocols, the importance of confidentiality and processes to deal with disputes between individuals were established at the outset. Mentors also discussed the need for sensitivity to issues of gender and age, not least because all Mentees were young women on the cusp of careers in applied anthropology with Mentors were who predominantly males with established careers in the field.
 10. One role of the facilitator was to regularly contact Mentees to monitor the process and if necessary to offer independent advice if difficulties arose. Fortunately, all parties enjoyed amicable relations throughout the pilot.

Mentoring pilot principles

11. At the commencement of the mentoring project, both parties agreed to the following principles, later set out in an agreement between each of the Mentors and Mentees. These principles were developed with reference to a body of literature on mentoring methodologies and best-practice consulted by the Facilitator and approved by the Steering Committee:
 - (a) **A structured process:** the mentoring process would operate through established goals and timeframes in developing each Mentee's professional capacities. Therefore, a common process of setting goals, maintaining documents and records linked to actions and outcomes would be implemented. To this end, each Mentee would be requested to keep a diary to maintain written records of the mentoring process, identify specific issues in the mentoring process and serve as a device for reflexive thinking about the nature of their professional work and conduct. The diary would enable Mentees to track their own progress and provide a basis for identifying changes in their professional capabilities, knowledge and applied skills.
 - (b) **Professional relationship:** Since the aim of the project was professional development, the appropriate way in which Mentors and Mentees were to understand their relationship was one between professional adviser and junior partner, not one involving personal counselling.
 - (c) **Matters for discussion between Mentor/Mentee:** Matters would be confined to structural and procedural issues. Mentors did not need to know details of the matters in which the Mentees were involved, and should resist, becoming a party to any discussions that centred on identification of named individuals, groups and claimant parties, or focused on personal, as opposed to professional, matters. Mentors would not provide professional advice on particular native title claims.
 - (d) **Code of conduct:** The general conduct of the parties involved in the mentoring process would be guided by reference to the principles of professional and ethical conduct outlined in the Australian Anthropological Society's Code of Ethics.
-

-
- (e) **Conflict of interest:** Mentors were required to consider, declare and attempt to avoid any conflicts of interest in the context of their mentoring. Should such a situation arise Mentors were obliged to contact the Facilitator immediately.
 - (f) **Dispute resolution:** Both Mentors and Mentees understood that in the event of any issues of concern or dispute that might arise they had to immediately inform the Facilitator. The Facilitator would then confer with Dr Peterson as the AAS representative on the Steering Committee as to a suitable course of action.
 - (g) **Confidentiality:** matters discussed between Mentor and Mentee had to remain confidential and this principle was to be observed by both parties.
 - (h) **Relationship with NTRB:** While the Mentees' employing NTRBs all had provided written support of the mentoring process, other NTRB staff would not be privy to the subjects of communications between a particular Mentor and Mentee. However, the host NTRBs were provided with a copy of the mentoring principles, protocol for delivery and other relevant documents generated from the pilot project.
 - (i) **Gender issues:** Mentors were to be aware of issues or sensitivities associated with the gender differences between Mentors and Mentees that might impact on the professional relationship. The Facilitator was to be alerted to any concerns in this regard.

Agreed delivery protocol

12. **Mentor / Mentee Agreement:** A generic Agreement template was developed for the partnerships between Mentors and Mentees. This included;
 - (a) An agreed process for regular contact, communication and reporting;
 - (b) the specific nature of the mentoring activities and the principles under which this engagement could proceed;
 - (c) the milestones for achieving specific outcomes in the process; and
 - (d) the development of documentation throughout the process to facilitate review of the process and track achievements. The precise details of each Mentor/Mentee agreement were tailored to, and driven by, the articulated needs of the Mentee.
13. **A structured process:** This has been raised above in relation to the mentoring principles under which the process was conducted. However it is important to emphasise that it was envisaged that the mentoring delivery process would operate, at least ideally, according to an articulated structure involving defined goals, and timeframes in relation to achievable tasks (for example completion of a tailored reading course based on the resource kit).
14. There was to be a consistent process of setting goals, and the development of documents recording actions linked to outcomes. While Mentees were expected to maintain a diary for such purposes, the Mentors were similarly expected to keep detailed records of their communication. The Mentors especially felt that these practices were important aspects of professional skill development for work in organisations. Unfortunately, in the event it seems

that none of the Mentees kept a diary of their own learning journey, and documentation kept by Mentors was also limited.

15. **Ensuring the Facilitator was informed:** The Facilitator expected to be informed of any dispute, breach of contract, or developing conflict of interest.
16. **Reporting deadlines** for Mentors to communicate with the Facilitator were established.
17. Both Mentors/Mentee were provided with copies of the protocol for delivery of the service.

Project participants

18. In the event, there were six Mentees, with one of the five Mentors working with two junior anthropologists. All Mentees were young women with honours degrees in anthropology. Only one had more than one year's experience in native title work, and held a managerial position within an NTRB. While this might seem at first instance to comprise a non-representative sample of NTRB anthropologists, in fact this is not the case.
19. A recent survey conducted by Anthropos Consulting for the NNTT in 2003-04 as part of a report on the capacity of anthropologists to provide native title services,¹ demonstrated that NTRB anthropologists are predominantly young women with lower qualifications and less experience than their consultant and academic colleagues working in the same field. The report summarised the characteristics of NTRB anthropologists as follows:

All respondents [to the survey] aged under 30, and a substantial proportion (45 percent) of those aged between 30 and 39, worked for NTRBs. The majority (58 percent) of respondent NTRB anthropologists were under 40 years old, and the younger (under 30) NTRB anthropologists were overwhelmingly female. Relatively few (less than 30 percent) of NTRB anthropologists had higher degrees, or had more than 5 years experience in native title work, and a quarter of them had less than one year's experience. NTRB anthropologists were significantly less likely to have had experience working in land rights than their colleagues in the academy or working as consultants; only 25 percent of them had experience in this related arena, compared with between 60 and 70 percent of their colleagues. This of course is not unexpected, given that they were a much younger and less experienced group in general, but does reinforce the general relative inexperience of NTRB anthropologists (Martin 2004, ¶82).
20. The survey also found that while NTRB anthropologists were heavily involved in research for claims and connection documentation, they were much more likely than either their consultant or academic colleagues to be working in non-anthropological aspects of native title work (such as field research logistics and claim management), and were less likely to be working on litigation or mediation of claims or the preparation of connection reports than consultants.

¹ Martin, D.F. 2004. *Capacity of Anthropologists in Native Title Practice*, Report to the National Native Title Tribunal, Anthropos Consulting Services, Canberra. Available at <http://www.anthropos.com.au>

While they otherwise had role profiles that were not dissimilar to consultants, some NTRB anthropologists felt that they were merely adjunct workers to the more pivotal roles accorded consultant anthropologists. Only a relatively small proportion of NTRB anthropologists (some 30 percent) saw native title work as enhancing their careers in anthropology (Martin *op.cit.* ¶¶87, 88, 99).

21. Conversely, the project's Mentors also confirmed the survey's profile of consultants as relatively older, highly qualified, and experienced anthropologists (Martin 2004, e.g. ¶83). The Mentors comprised four older male and one female anthropologist, all of whom were highly qualified academically and had extensive experience in native title and land claim work.

Conduct of the pilot

22. Every attempt was made to provide structure and direction to the pilot project. An initial workshop for Mentors was held in Alice Springs in early June 2003. The workshop enabled the Mentors and project facilitator to:
 - Develop agreed mentoring principles and a delivery methodology for the conduct of the program;
 - Draft a protocol for the mentoring process with identified milestones (a copy of which is attached at Appendix A); and
 - Match Mentors with Mentees and develop an agreement to regulate the relationship between Mentor and Mentee.
23. Subsequently, these documents were distributed to all those involved. However, the individual agreements between each Mentor/Mentee took longer to develop, partly because participants had busy professional lives. The issue of work pressure was to arise frequently throughout the pilot, emerging as a key driver in structuring relationships and contact. Ultimately, most agreements were not finalised until as late as October 2003.
24. A resource kit to assist Mentors was produced by Dr Nicolas Peterson of the Australian National University (who was also on the project Steering Committee). The kit comprised selected anthropological readings in native title claim research. All Mentors received a copy of the kit for themselves and their Mentees, to use as a basis for discussions with and support for them. However, feedback on its use has been limited, which is disappointing. However, inquiry revealed that lack of time for additional reading was an issue for Mentees, who also preferred immediate discussion and direct contact with Mentors to study.
25. A second, unanticipated by-product of the pilot was the development of a Newsletter to communicate with both Mentors and Mentees and link them into a more project-wide perspective. Mentors and Mentees wanted feedback on the process, including information about commonly experienced issues. Most importantly, the Newsletter provided all parties with an additional avenue for communication in a process characterised by lack of face-to-face contact. The Newsletters supplemented the monthly telephone contacts between facilitator and Mentees, and the reporting required of Mentors to the facilitator.

-
26. Mentors were asked to provide the facilitator with staged reports throughout the pilot reflecting on the mentoring process and their experiences. A final workshop involving Mentors, the NNTT project manager, ATSYS, and Anthropos was held in Adelaide over a weekend in mid-April 2004. At this workshop, Mentors made short presentations of their experiences in and views of the project. There was considerable discussion of the outcomes of the pilot, both positive and negative, and broad agreement was reached regarding the outline of a proposal to conduct an expanded mentoring project which would be linked to other capacity building and training initiatives, would be integrated with professional development needs of NTRB staff, and would address the problematic disciplinary 'silos' which have developed in many cases. This proposal is further discussed later in this report.
 27. A short questionnaire was developed and sent out to each Mentee, and four of the six responded. Interestingly, comments from Mentors were often reinforced or substantiated by the Mentees' views and vice versa. A copy of the questionnaire is attached at Appendix B. Additionally, each Mentor was asked to provide a short and focused report providing a summary of their experiences of the project, issues that had arisen, and views as to future directions for mentoring. These reports supplemented the presentations given at the Adelaide workshop.

Joint meetings

28. Originally, the pilot made no provision for joint meetings between the Mentors and Mentees. However, it proved possible to arrange informal contact between some participants around key conferences during the year beginning with the national Native Title conference in Alice Springs and subsequently, the annual AAS conference in Sydney.
29. These opportunities enabled people to meet and discuss the project. The importance of such contact was emphasised by the fact that few Mentors/Mentees knew one another. Additional efforts to improve direct contact involved a dinner and guest speaker on mentoring held during the annual AAS conference.
30. The facilitator also sought professional development to ensure the conduct of the pilot was supported by best practice mentoring methodologies. Contact was made with a mentoring network with opportunities for exchanges of information, discussion, and developing contacts with other participants in professional mentoring.

Other developments

31. Publicity about the mentoring scheme was widely distributed at the national Native Title conference in Alice Springs in June 2003, through the Newsletter of the Native Title Research Unit at the Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies (AIATSIS), and through a presentation on the project to a national workshop for NTRB Chief Executive Officers conducted in March 2004 by ATSYS under the auspices of its capacity building program.
32. Over the life of the pilot four Mentees presented papers arising from their experiences to the annual conference of the Australian Anthropological

Society in 2003 and in a session of the National Native Title Conference in Adelaide in 2004.

Lessons from the mentoring pilot

33. The following sections are based on feedback from both Mentors and Mentees; from Mentors at the two workshops, together with mid-project and final Mentor reports, and from Mentees through telephone discussions, and responses to the questionnaire sent out at the conclusion of the pilot. As well, these observations draw on input from personnel from the sponsoring agencies (the NNTT and ATSI), from Anthropos' earlier report to the NNTT on anthropological capacity in the native title area (Martin 2004), and on the Facilitators' own observations of the project.

General observations

34. Most participants felt the project was worthwhile and value-added to their work experiences in native title—in spite of emerging difficulties in the process. However, outcomes from this small-scale mentoring pilot were mixed, and while there were beneficial results for the participants, there were also valuable lessons in terms of what worked, and what did not. Nonetheless, the mentoring pilot, together with the findings of the project into anthropological capacity in native title practice, have clearly identified the need for mentoring and professional development of NTRB anthropologists, to overcome major issues including relative lack of experience and skills, professional isolation, and lack of meaningful career paths.
35. A key goal of the mentoring pilot was to contribute to the capacity of NTRBs to perform their functions, through improving the anthropological expertise in their service provision. However, the pilot program demonstrated that in a context where there are widespread and systemic deficiencies in NTRB capacity, mentoring cannot operate effectively on a stand-alone basis. It must complement staff professional development programs and wider programs of NTRB capacity development and institutional reform more generally.

Mentoring at a distance

36. A major concern of participants, both Mentors and Mentees, was that the lack of direct contact limited the effectiveness of the mentoring process. Contacts were mostly by email and telephone. Lack of physical contact made role modelling impossible. Direct contact would have facilitated informal mentoring through osmosis, observation and emulation. In the five mentoring relationships, only one Mentor was able, through particular circumstances, to have regular direct contact with his Mentee. There was unanimous agreement that face-to-face time would be essential in any future mentoring project.
37. Regular communication was an issue for most participants, and pragmatism ultimately shaped contact. Work demands were a constant interruption to planned contacts. Prolonged sickness of one of the participants also seriously interrupted one Mentor/Mentee relationship. Ultimately, most people made contact on an as-needs basis to accommodate contingencies, rather than on a specific schedule.

Engagement of Mentees with the project

38. A number of Mentees felt that there was inadequate structure to their involvement in the project, and that this had limited their capacity to benefit from it.
39. Nonetheless, as has been previously discussed the project methodology established a structured approach with defined stages, milestones, and outputs. Regular consultation schedules were recommended. As one example, documentation of the process was seen as important, not just for the project facilitator but also for participants. Thus, each Mentee was requested to keep a diary to maintain written records of the mentoring process, to identify specific issues and serve as a device for reflexive thinking about the nature of their professional work and conduct. Systematic note-taking is also a core component of anthropological practice, including in undertaking ethnographic inquiry. As far as could be ascertained however, only one Mentee kept such a diary.
40. Mentees engaged with the process differentially in terms of their self-discipline. Some were more motivated and proactive than others, and accordingly appeared to benefit more from the mentoring process. On the other hand, some Mentors felt that their Mentees needed to assume more responsibility for their own learning if they were to realise the potential of mentoring. It should also be noted that, partly because this was a pilot and there was generally little formal recognition of it by NTRB management, it was difficult for most Mentees to establish their mentoring commitments as an intrinsic component of their work practices. It therefore became an 'add-on' to already demanding (if typically professionally unsatisfying) work schedules.
41. In light of the concerns expressed about a lack of structure in the project therefore, it would appear useful to distinguish between the overall structure of the pilot on the one hand, and on the other the structure given by individuals to their involvement in the project arising from a disciplined approach to their participation in it.
42. Mentoring of necessity is a bilateral relationship that requires commitment and proactive engagement from both parties for its success. To maximise the possibilities for success, attention would need to be given in any future mentoring program to attracting participants with a commitment to proactive involvement in it. Mechanisms to achieve this could include places in the program determined through competitive application, providing a higher public profile for the program, and embedding the mentoring itself in a wider program of professional development.
43. Furthermore, in most cases, the substance of the mentoring relationship seemed to attenuate in the second half of the pilot. In one case, this arose partly because of prolonged illness of the Mentor. More generally, it appeared to be difficult to sustain a mentoring relationship over more than about six months through phone calls and emails. This has implications for any future mentoring project.

The mentoring pilot and the host NTRBs

44. At the conclusion of the pilot, it is clear that the successes and failures of the mentoring pilot have to be understood in the broader context of NTRB

performance and governance including staff management issues. ATSI has identified widespread capacity deficits in NTRBs, particularly in the smaller and more poorly resourced organisations, which it is attempting to address through its Capacity Building Program. Issues raised by project participants regarding the success or otherwise of mentoring process have to be evaluated in this wider context.

Mentoring outcomes in the context of wider NTRB issues

45. Concerns raised by Mentees such as the common marginalisation of their specifically anthropological skills in native title practice, their relegation to general administrative and facilitation duties, the lack of professional development and the frequently stressful and confronting organisational politics inevitably impacted on the mentoring project, and on the concerns that the Mentees wanted the project to address.
46. For the mentoring to be successful, it required both the agreement and the active support of the host NTRB. The CEO of each host NTRB provided formal agreement to the involvement of an employee as a Mentee under the terms of the mentoring pilot, and as discussed above each NTRB was provided with project documentation including the mentoring principles and CEOs were given a presentation on the project at a national workshop. However, few NTRBs appeared to actively support their staff anthropologist's involvement in the program, for example by enabling the Mentee to build it into their professional duties rather than being forced to treat it as an 'add on'. There was negligible feedback from senior NTRB staff and management concerning the pilot. In at least one case, the CEO of the organisation had no idea that a staff member was also a Mentee.
47. It should be noted here however that during the inception of the pilot the Central Land Council (through CEO David Ross) generously covered certain of the costs of the first workshop in Alice Springs. Greater commitment and supportive involvement from the host organisations is essential for any future staff mentoring program.
48. Conversely, few Mentors familiarised themselves with the key public documents of the relevant NTRB (for example the strategic plan, the annual report and the Mentee's duty statement) to better understand the Mentee's role and the organisation's *modus operandi*.
49. The pilot mentoring project aimed to address professional practice issues for junior anthropologists as one component of broader NTRB capacity building. The principles established for the pilot made it clear that the NTRB was the host organisation, and that the mentoring relationship was to be focused on issues of professional anthropological practice, not on problems within the particular NTRB or on personal difficulties (see especially ¶11((c)) above).
50. A fine—but important—line exists between mentoring and providing professional and personal advice. Often Mentees wanted answers to immediate issues while Mentors were conscious of the difficulties which would be occasioned by providing advice on specific matters.
51. The pilot project thus identified another important matter: In trying to deal with the necessity of avoiding becoming involved in providing advice on particular

NTRB-related concerns of the Mentees while still meeting their needs, discussion arose regarding the value of professional development for the Mentors themselves. Mentors recognised that specific skills were needed in their role, and that it was not sufficient for them to merely provide anecdotal advice.

Marginalisation of anthropologists' roles

52. An on-going challenge for anthropologists working in native title is maintaining and enhancing their professional identity. As staff anthropologists, they face limitations on the application and extension of their skills and increasingly the pressure to service legal processes. Anthropologists can find themselves marginalised or excluded from core discussions of claim research within their own workplaces.
53. Simultaneously, the position of applied anthropologists within the discipline more broadly is fraught. Indeed the AASNET debates raging between October and December 2003 indicated as did respondents to the Anthropos survey, that applied anthropology is viewed by many as a problematic career option.
54. Some Mentees complained that they were treated as quasi-clerical or administrative support staff with little recognition of their professional qualifications or the need for professional development. This situation was exacerbated where consultant anthropologists regularly conducted claims research. Confusion about their duties and roles was frequently expressed by Mentees. Few NTRBs would appear to provide adequate induction programs to new staff.
55. These views are consistent with data in the previously mentioned survey conducted as part of the report into anthropologists' capacity to provide native title services (Martin 2004), which indicated that staff anthropologists are routinely engaged in tasks outside their professional role. These tasks were generally service-orientated and might ordinarily be seen as the duties of field staff.
56. Reasons why NTRBs find access to anthropologists difficult are complex. Some organisations experience chronic difficulty in recruiting and retaining appropriate staff. In other cases, recruitment to particular positions has proved difficult even when overall NTRB staffing appears to be relatively stable. Employment and retention patterns are frequently linked to internal factors such as staff relations, management, size, and organisational capacity. In a small industry the external perception of organisational dysfunction or governance problems can exert a powerful influence on recruitment. Politicking combined with organisational dysfunction in NTRBs also underlies the appeal of operating as a consultant. Out-sourced work requires less involvement with the internal organisational processes.
57. In the 15 NTRBs and two non-NTRB service providers nationally there are approximately 45 possible positions for staff anthropologists. In practice, not all positions are currently filled, with at least two organisations operating without staff anthropologists. Another observable trend is for a Principal Legal Officer (PLO) to manage all native title research. An important research question is whether such management practices in NTRBs are responses to an under-supply of anthropologists, or to perceived inadequacies in

anthropological research and advice. In this context, it is worth noting a presentation at the recent (June 2004) National Native Title Conference in Adelaide by a senior native title legal practitioner who has also worked as the PLO of an NTRB, in which he argued that the law does not require anthropology to ascertain the facts on which a determination of native title is based.

Anthropologists and wider staff management issues

58. Not unexpectedly, some NTRBs argue that their location (especially in remote areas) disadvantages them. This may be a factor, but the difficulty of filling positions in Cairns and other major regional centres suggests that location of itself may not be a dominant factor. NTRBs in general have not addressed recent research in management studies, which indicates that there are a diverse range of factors which influence people's decisions about work. These are not just the location of the job but include the attitudes of different generations to work, performance, management structures and styles, expectations of rewards and so on.
59. In March 2004, CEOs and Chairpersons of NTRBs met in Canberra. In the preliminary reporting of key NTRB workplace and workload issues, the difficulty of recruiting and retaining key professional staff was raised with specific reference to engaging and retaining anthropologists. NTRBs also report to the Federal Court that delays in progressing some claims are a result of difficulties in sourcing suitable anthropologists.
60. Further discussion revealed that NTRB management had little insight into specific reasons for the high staff turnover and limited availability of experienced anthropologists. Few NTRBs routinely conduct exit interviews. If a process was conducted it most likely occurred at middle management level leaving the CEO uninformed.
61. Workplaces are also changing through such factors as deregulation, outsourcing, casual employment, multi-sited workplaces and the impact of technology. As one example of the impacts of wider workplace changes, one of the Mentees requested information and resources regarding the negotiation of workplace agreements. NTRBs attempt to attract new staff with tempting employment packages, including salary sacrificing. Individual workplace agreements are further opportunities for developing tailored employment options for professionals. However, these arrangements are negotiated individually and not across NTRB workplaces. For young recruits, the challenge is to negotiate an appropriate salary package when different awards offer different pay scales and duties across the native title system without necessarily having any experience to draw on or comparative models to operate with.
62. Many in senior NTRB management positions would appear to be aware of the need for major workplace changes. However, an all too common justification for a lack of remedial action is that the NTRB is an Aboriginal organisation, and therefore need not engage with wider organisational and managerial best practice. However, ATSI's applied capacity building program emphasises that the development of professional service delivery to clients will require significant organisational reform.

Personal, career and professional development issues

63. While the mentoring pilot sought to ensure that it was focused on issues of professional practice and not personal counselling, feedback during the project from both Mentees and Mentors emphasised the difficulties of young anthropologists establishing a socially and personally viable life style in often remote locations and achieving a balance between professional and personal needs.
64. There has been little detailed investigation into what professional development or accredited training is offered to NTRB staff, including anthropologists. However, anecdotally few NTRB managers would appear to give it priority. Staff development in most NTRBs is rarely planned and available only where it occurs at little or no cost to the organisation (although there are some notable exceptions to this). For example, staff participation in the national native title conference is possible because attendance costs are subsidised by ATSI. For many NTRB staff, particularly those in small or remote organisations, this seems to be one of the few opportunities available for professional development. Some Mentees were unable to attend either the 2003 National Native Title Conference or the 2003 AAS Annual Conference, although a significant number of NTRB anthropologists attended the 2004 National Native Title Conference.
65. Career options for NTRB anthropologists are limited, and the mentoring pilot identified a particular need for career development advice. This is consistent with the report to the NNTT into anthropological capacity (Martin 2004), which found that only a relatively small proportion of NTRB anthropologists (some 30 percent) saw native title work as enhancing their careers in anthropology (Martin *op.cit.* ¶¶87, 88, 99).
66. Mentees sought employment in the applied work because alternative career options in anthropology (such as academic or non-native title applied work) are very limited. But within NTRBs options for professional development in anthropological practice or in management and policy work appear few.
67. This limitation undoubtedly arises in no small part because of the resource limitations under which NTRBs operate. It is exacerbated however by the fact that most NTRBs are relatively small, dispersed and largely autonomous organisations operating in enclaves in terms of staff recruitment, management and development practices. Consequently, the specialisation of native title research seems to limit anthropologists to moving between NTRBs to further their professional experience. It is interesting to note in this regard that there have been some initiatives to overcome the professional isolation of staff; for example, by sharing PLO positions between two NTRBs, and by offers for exchanges of anthropologists between organisations. These initiatives however, while laudable, do appear to be primarily addressing shortfalls in the availability of professionals rather than professional development *per se*.
68. Some Mentees were also working with Indigenous Australians for the first time and were unfamiliar with the ethnographic literature. A resource kit of relevant literature to address such gaps was provided to each of the Mentors in the early stages of the project to use with their Mentees. Unfortunately, despite attempts to seek feedback regarding the kit at a number of stages in the

project, few of the Mentors would seem to have worked systematically through it with their Mentees. Where this was undertaken, the Mentee felt that the materials illuminated their field experience, and found that re-reading papers with the benefit of field experience provided new meaning and insight for them.

69. The project into anthropological practice argued that any problems with the supply of anthropologists for native title work lay not with inadequate numbers of anthropological graduates and postgraduates, but with other factors including the marginalisation of applied practice within the discipline including within many Australian universities.
70. It however argued that it was not the function of undergraduate courses to provide training in native title practice, and that this would be more appropriately delivered through special purpose post-graduate courses. The Graduate Certificate and Graduate Diploma courses in native title and cultural heritage management to be offered by the University of Western Australia from February 2005 would appear to fill a very important gap.
71. However, any effort to address the issues confronting anthropologists (and other professionals) working in native title must ultimately also address the issue of limited employment options and career paths within the NTRB system. At present the relationship between training and career opportunities is unexplored, with training and capacity building initiatives provided to NTRBs on a stand-alone basis. Outside of being embedded in a broader context, one-off training and development strategies will be of limited assistance.

Recommendations and future directions

72. The lessons learned from the mentoring pilot, together with the findings in the report on anthropological capacity in native title practice also discussed previously (Martin 2004), make it clear that NTRB anthropologists in particular are likely to be relatively junior and inexperienced, female, professionally quite isolated, feeling that their work is not contributing to a career path in anthropology, and working in environments which are not necessarily supportive of specific anthropological practice in NTRB work and where there are seldom adequate resources to implement staff professional development more generally.
73. Most of these factors lie well outside the capacity of a program focused on mentoring to deal with. While there were benefits to most of the Mentees from their regular contact with senior practitioners in the pilot, including addressing some of the professional isolation issues, few of the underlying anthropological practice issues could be addressed. Thus, while the pilot project indicated that mentoring as such can provide benefits to participants, taking into account some of the lessons learned such as the limitations of conducting it without face-to-face contact, the project has highlighted the necessity to embed mentoring within a wider program of professional development.
74. At the same time, feedback during the pilot project has made it clear that a crucial component of addressing anthropological professional practice issues

within NTRBs—and indeed within native title practice more broadly—must lie in overcoming the professional ‘silos’ within which the various disciplines involved typically operate. That involving anthropology and legal practice, commented on in the anthropological practice report (Martin 2004), provides only one instance.

75. This final section provides a number of recommendations against this background, and suggests future directions for a flexible mentoring and professional development program for NTRB staff focused primarily on the social science professions but which is linked to other capacity and professional development initiatives.

General findings and recommendations arising from the pilot

76. Outcomes from this small-scale mentoring pilot were mixed, and while there were beneficial results for a number of the participants, there were also valuable lessons in terms of what worked, and what did not. However, the mentoring pilot, together with the findings of the project into anthropological capacity in native title practice, have clearly identified the need for mentoring and professional development of NTRB anthropologists, to overcome major issues including relative lack of experience and skills, professional isolation, and lack of meaningful career paths.
77. A key goal of the mentoring pilot was to contribute to the capacity of NTRBs to perform their functions, through improving the anthropological expertise in their service provision. However, in a context where there are widespread and systemic deficiencies in NTRB capacity, mentoring cannot operate effectively on a stand-alone basis. It must complement staff professional development programs and wider programs of NTRB capacity development and institutional reform more generally.
78. Given the uncertainties in the current policy environment, including new institutional arrangements under which the functions and staff of the ATSI Native Title and Land Rights Branch will be transferred from July 1 2004 to the Office of Indigenous Policy Coordination within the Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs (OIPC), and possible outcomes from the current Parliamentary Joint Committee on Native Title and the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Land Fund (PJC) inquiry into NTRBs, any future mentoring and professional development program must be flexible enough to adapt to any resultant changes in native title service delivery, including in the NTRB organisational landscape.
79. Given also the uncertainties in the NTRB institutional landscape, and the diverse models that NTRBs have adopted for delivering native title services including in terms of the balance between their in-house expertise and that of external consultants, any future mentoring and professional development program must be based on a detailed needs analysis which involves more than just self-reporting by NTRB staff.
80. Also, the native title legal and policy environment itself is undergoing significant changes, and is likely to do so for the foreseeable future. The kinds of support and development provided to NTRB staff must be flexible enough to equip anthropologists and other professionals to meet changing demands.

-
81. One of the most significant problems for most participants with the mentoring pilot was the lack of face-to-face contact. Any future mentoring program must build in mechanisms to overcome this deficiency.
 82. A significant deficit in the pilot mentoring project was that in most cases, mentoring of the junior staff anthropologists was not integrated into NTRB management and professional development structures and processes, and there was a fragmented approach in its delivery across different NTRBs. Any future project must address this deficiency. Also, future mentoring needs full commitment and support from senior NTRB management.
 83. An application to be mentored should have supporting documentation from senior management in the relevant NTRB outlining the level of specific commitment the NTRB would provide to the Mentee. For example an NTRB could offer a Mentee annual membership in the AAS, airfare and accommodation to the disciplinary conference or national native title conference, allocated time for regularly contact with the Mentor.
 84. While there are specific needs of NTRB anthropologists in this regard, it is essential that these are addressed in the wider context of professional development of NTRB staff generally, and that mentoring and professional development serves to break down current disciplinary silos rather than reinforcing them. Mentoring should usefully form part of a wider scheme for integrated staff professional development in NTRBs. At present a legal mentoring pilot is under way. As far as Anthropolos is aware no cross-referencing to the lessons of the anthropological mentoring pilot has occurred.
 85. The mentoring project and the anthropological capacity project both highlighted the relatively lower qualifications of NTRB anthropologists in comparison with their consultant and academic colleagues. However, a mentoring and professional development program for NTRB anthropologists and other NTRB social-scientific staff should complement rather than substitute for general capacity building programs for NTRBs and training and skills development initiatives for staff such as those being offered from February 2005 by the University of Western Australia.
 86. Mentoring and professional development must assist NTRB anthropologists to strategically address their long-term career planning issues.
 87. The twelve-month pilot was too long. The 'mentoring cycle' of energetic and sustained communication lasted four–six months after which contact waned. The first signs of the fall off were reversion to 'as-needs' communication followed by a fairly rapid tailing off. The mentoring component of any future professional development program should involve shorter modules, perhaps 4 months, allowing for short, intensive and thus more effective mentoring relationships with set objectives.
 88. Mentees working for the first time in NTRBs felt in retrospect that they had little idea of their needs when they first began work in their positions. This points to the importance of timing; Mentees are more likely to benefit from the program in the year after they first commence work, rather than as new recruits.

-
89. In the pilot project, Mentees were directly approached to participate on the basis of being relatively new graduates working with little or no assistance from senior anthropological colleagues. This did not necessarily result in individual's participation being based on demonstrated need or on their commitment to benefit from the process. In future, Mentee participation should be based on a competitive selection process based on published criteria, and on embedded incentives to participate in the program. Programs need status and external recognition.
 90. There are similar arguments for selection of Mentors. The calibre of the Mentors contributed significantly to the successes the pilot did achieve, in spite of the structural limitations in the current mentoring process. However, feedback from Mentees suggested that there were variable levels of engagement with the program by Mentors. One factor here though is that the Mentors were senior practitioners who had heavy workload commitments to balance, and were unwilling to devote time to Mentees who appeared unwilling to take a degree of initiative in the learning process.
 91. Moreover, there is only a limited pool of suitably qualified and available senior and experienced anthropologists able and willing to act as Mentors. Additionally, Mentors commented that they would have gained from a course on mentoring techniques and strategies for consistency of purpose. It might also have helped people move between counselling and advising. It may be necessary for any future mentoring program to professionalise participation by Mentors, including through provision of training modules and through payment of reasonable fees rather than just an honorarium as with the pilot project.
 92. In the pilot, a mentoring protocol was developed in the first workshop by the Mentors and facilitator and approved by the Steering Committee. In future a protocol might usefully have two components; one developed by the Mentors to establish their code of conduct and ethics and the other component developed in mutual discussion between individual Mentors and the host NTRB. This would help to formalise the NTRB commitment.
 93. The pilot mentoring project was, appropriately, modestly resourced. With hindsight however, the lack of funds to facilitate direct contact between Mentors and Mentees proved a significant limitation. Resources for such contact, whether in the NTRB location, at workshops, or both, should be an intrinsic component of any future mentoring project.
 94. While a corpus of anthropological literature is available, it is not necessarily easily accessible to those working in NTRBs. Consequently, the kit potentially provides an important resource for anthropologists in NTRBs. While the resource kit was under-utilised, it is recommended that it be revised and published in an accessible format (possibly electronically) for distribution to and application in NTRBs.
 95. A process of formal accountability between Mentor and Mentee based on specific goals and benchmarks is needed to drive commitment. Left to an as-needed intention the relationship in most cases faltered. Both parties must set higher expectations of themselves in terms of a return on the project.

-
96. Mentoring might supplement a national review of the service models in NTRBs for anthropological expertise now proliferating in the native title environment.
 97. Similarly, integrated professional development in NTRBs ought to document induction courses where these are undertaken by NTRBs for new staff.
 98. Whatever new initiatives develop they must engage with the now dominant propensity of contemporary NTRB practice; working in disciplinary silos in isolation from one another and without due regard for the interdisciplinary nature of native title research and claim preparation.

Potential future directions

99. In light of the experience from the mentoring pilot, a broad outline of a proposed mentoring and professional development program is as follows:
 - (a) Mentoring of junior NTRB anthropologists cannot operate as a standalone program, but must be embedded within a wider system of professional development;
 - (b) This mentoring / professional development must serve to break down disciplinary silos in NTRB native title practice rather than reinforce them;
 - (c) Equally, while mentoring needs to be focused on junior NTRB anthropologists, it needs to be linked to wider professional development which meets the needs of NTRB staff across their various roles and disciplines, and this in turn must be one component of further building the capacity of NTRBs to meet their statutory functions;
 - (d) The mentoring component itself should broadly follow the methodology of the pilot project, which involved a structured program and was based on widely accepted mentoring principles;
 - (e) However, for the mentoring to be effective, it must include opportunities for face-to-face contact between Mentees and Mentors. It is suggested that this be undertaken through at least one visit by each Mentor to the Mentee in their NTRB workplace, as well as participation in a national professional development workshop (as discussed below).
 - (f) An alternative to solely utilising Mentors based in the major cities, as was the case with the pilot, regionally based mentoring networks could be established within a state (for example, across the Pilbara in Western Australia) or within part of a state (for example, between NTRBs in central and northern Queensland). This would use peer mentoring with contributions from a designated senior anthropologist (either a consultant or from another NTRB).
 - (g) Any mentoring and professional development program must be flexible enough to allow for adaptation in the light of changes in the native title policy and service delivery environments, including in the NTRB organisational landscape;
 - (h) Such a program must be based on a detailed needs analysis which involves more than just self-reporting by NTRB staff;

-
- (i) Mentoring and professional development must have the full commitment and support of the CEOs and senior management of the relevant NTRBs, and must be integrated into NTRB management and professional development structures and processes;
 - (j) The mentoring component of any future professional development program should involve short modules, perhaps 4 months, allowing for short, intensive and thus more effective mentoring relationships with set objectives;
 - (k) Mentee participation should be based on a competitive selection process based on published criteria, and on embedded incentives to participate in the program;
 - (l) Since there is only a limited pool of suitably qualified and available senior and experienced anthropologists able and willing to act as Mentors, it may be necessary for any future mentoring program to professionalise participation by Mentors, including through provision of training modules and through payment of reasonable fees;
 - (m) A process of formal accountability between Mentor and Mentee based on specific goals and benchmarks is needed to drive personal commitment;
 - (n) The resource kit for Mentees prepared for the pilot project should be revised and published in an accessible format (possibly electronically) for distribution to and application in NTRBs;
 - (o) Resources directly provided by agencies such as the NNTT and OIPC for any mentoring and professional development project arising from this pilot should be directed to the identified needs of junior NTRB anthropologists. However, mechanisms will be needed to address the 'silo mentality' operating between professionals in many NTRBs, and also to link NTRB anthropologists with anthropologists and other professionals working in native title outside NTRBs.
 - (p) Additionally, a mentoring and professional development project should be linked into the wider NTRB capacity development program, and funding provided by agencies for this mentoring project should be structured so as to leverage funding and resources from other sources.
 - (q) It is suggested that an appropriate mechanism to achieve these objectives would be through holding an intensive professional development workshop in native title practice, focused primarily on the needs of anthropologists but also addressing the needs of other social-scientific disciplines. It would necessarily include lawyers to facilitate cross-disciplinary dialogue. Such a workshop could be held over a period of 3-5 days at a time when the workload for most NTRBs is lower, to maximise participation, and following completion of the first mentoring module of 4-6 months.
 - (r) Such a course would most appropriately be structured and delivered so that for those who wished to take this path, successful completion could be credited towards relevant professional development courses, such as the Graduate Diploma or Graduate Certificate in Native Title and Cultural

Heritage Management being offered from February 2005 by the Department of Anthropology at the University of Western Australia. This would provide an added attraction for non-Mentees to participate.

- (s) Costs, or a proportion of the costs, for the junior NTRB anthropologists participating in the mentoring program could be met by the agencies funding that program. Other participants should be sought from government agencies, consultants, private industry and possibly the academy, and would either meet their own costs (as would most likely be the case for consultants), or have them met by their employer.
- (t) Such a mentoring and professional development program should operate for at least two years, since the issues being addressed are long-term and systemic, and not amenable to short term interventions.