

BUILDING INDIGENOUS-LED ENGAGEMENT FRAMEWORKS

Report on the Dialogue on Indigenous Data,
Information and Records
University of British Columbia,
January 21, 2019

Mary Ellen Turpel-Lafond (Aki-kwe)

UBC RESIDENTIAL SCHOOL HISTORY AND DIALOGUE CENTRE

Lerato Chondoma

UBC INDIGENOUS RESEARCH SUPPORT INITIATIVE

This project is supported by an Indigenous Research Capacity and Reconciliation Connection Grant from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) from the Government of Canada.

We respectfully acknowledge that the University of British Columbia (UBC) is located on the traditional, ancestral, and unceded territory of the hən̓q̓əmin̓əm̓-speaking xʷməθkʷəy̓əm (Musqueam) people.



THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

About the Residential School History & Dialogue Centre

The Residential School History & Dialogue Centre (RSHDC) is located on the traditional, ancestral, and unceded territory of the *hən̓q̓əmin̓əm̓*-speaking *xʷməθkʷəy̓əm* (Musqueam) people. With a mandate to support access to Residential School records for Survivors, their families, and communities, the RSHDC works to generate inclusive dialogue that is transparent and trauma-informed. This approach to dialogue is essential to the Centre's work building on information practices, research, and education around Residential Schools and related systems. With a framework that privileges respectful, equitable, and Indigenous-informed access to records and information, the RSHDC is developing digital systems and spaces of inquiry to model a new platform for information stewardship.

About the Indigenous Research Support Initiative

The Indigenous Research Support Initiative (IRSI) at UBC is based on the premise that more effective research and greater mutual understanding can be developed from identifying, developing, and supporting research practices that proceed from respectful relations between researchers and Indigenous communities. IRSI provides professional support and services to Indigenous communities and university researchers to undertake collaborative projects based on community-led interests, reciprocal relationships and principles of mutual accountability.

About Gwen Phillips and the BC First Nations Data Governance Initiative (BCFNDGI)

Gwen Phillips is currently championing the BCFNDGI, a tripartite government initiative (federal, provincial and First Nations governments) with a key objective being timely access to quality data to plan, manage and account for investments and outcomes associated with First Nations well-being. A collaborative partnership is being developed between the BCFNDGI and IRSI, the purpose of which is to implement a collaborative provincial strategy to increase First Nations' capacity in data governance, surveillance and research to support First Nations in their Community Development and Nation Rebuilding activities.

Thank you to the collaborators on this SSHRC grant: David Alexander, Steve Cundy, Roshan Danesh, Sarah Dupont, Charles Grant, Erica Hernandez-Read, Kim Lawson, Sheryl Lightfoot, Tricia Logan, Lisa Nathan, Gitta Oldendorff, Amy Perreault, Gwen Phillips, Elizabeth Shaffer, Ann Stevenson, Emma Wright

In addition to the collaborators mentioned, the following people have also contributed to the development of this paper: Helen Burt, Leslie Bonshor, Fran Hunt-Jinnouchi and Leona Sparrow.

Executive Summary

Increasingly, Indigenous communities around the world are reclaiming the Indigenous data, information and records that have been constructed about them (e.g. Anderson 2005). Indigenous data sovereignty, information governance and records repatriation are directly associated with increased self-determination and assertion of rights and freedoms for many Indigenous Nations. Historically, Indigenous communities have been separated and displaced from archival documentation and materials relating to history, culture, language, songs, lands, resources, heritage and communities (e.g. Fourmile 1989; Anderson 2005; Gardiner and Thorpe 2014). These practices have resulted in governments, academic researchers and churches creating, collecting and governing the large amounts of information about Indigenous people and their cultures that are held in archives and libraries (e.g. Anderson 2005; Nakata and Langton 2005, 13; Callison, Roy, LeCheminant 2016).

The Residential School History and Dialogue Centre (RSHDC), the Indigenous Research Support Initiative (IRSI) at UBC, and Gwen Phillips as regional champion of the BC First Nations Data Governance Initiative, are collaborating to address and prevent some of these issues in university research and in the use of Residential School materials. Part of this collaboration is a dialogue series focused on engaging academic and community collaborators around issues of data, information and records to ensure that policies, practices, systems and protocols are collaboratively developed with Indigenous community partners. At the heart of this dialogue series is a call to change the culture around Indigenous data, information and records. The goal is for these dialogues to develop a model of engagement that is collaboratively and iteratively developed and tested for Indigenous data, information and records housed at UBC, the RSHDC, and beyond.

The first dialogue was held January 21 at UBC and brought together nearly 70 Indigenous and non-Indigenous experts, researchers, community members and practitioners working directly on matters related to Indigenous information, records management and collection, as well as Indigenous research.

Throughout the dialogue, participants provided guidance about what is required at this moment for institutions to relearn how to engage with Survivors, Indigenous Peoples and Nations regarding Indigenous data, information and records. Institutions must be willing to demonstrate that they are serious, and are doing the internal work necessary to transition out of past and colonial patterns. In addition to identifying key principles and practices for engagement, this guidance has provided a foundation for re-conceptualizing the design of the future steps and phases for RSHDC and IRSI. Seven foundational themes emerged from discussions at the dialogue, these serve as the basis for future engagement and dialogues. These themes are integral in the development of SSHRC's Strategic Plan on engagement and partnership, particularly in fostering mutually respectful relationships. These themes should form the basis for organizations like RSHDC, IRSI and SSHRC to partner with Indigenous Peoples.

Future reports, developed in co-operation and collaboration with additional partners, will identify approaches to engagement as they evolve through an Indigenous-led process.

Background and Context

Key definitions

The phrase “Indigenous data, information, and records” appears throughout this document. These terms are not neutrally defined and can be interpreted in a variety of ways. In order to provide context, we have provided definitions of each of these components from library, archival and information studies literature.

- “Data” refers to a tangible or electronic record of raw information (measurements, statistics or information in numerical form that can be digitally transmitted or processed) used as a basis for reasoning, discussion, or calculation and must be processed or analyzed to be meaningful.
- “Research data” refers to data that are used as primary sources to support technical or scientific enquiry, research, scholarship, or artistic activity, and that are used as evidence in the research process and/or are commonly accepted in the research community as necessary to validate research findings and results. Research data may include experimental data, observational data, operational data, third-party data, public sector data, monitoring data, processed data or re-purposed data.
- “Information” refers to the analysis, collection, classification, manipulation, storage, retrieval, movement and dissemination of information.
- “Records” refers to any recorded information made or received by an organization.
- Indigenous data, information and records can include all of the above, and be both by, and about, Indigenous Peoples.

The control, management, collection, and use of information has been and continues to be a central force in structuring relations between peoples. Historically, Indigenous communities have been separated and displaced from information, documentation and materials relating to their own history, culture, language, songs, lands, resources, heritage and communities (e.g. Fourmile 1989; Anderson 2005; Gardiner and Thorpe 2014). Colonial governments attempted to sever long-standing Indigenous systems of knowledge-generation, transmission and governance, while imposing Eurocentric norms and values regarding information. The impact of this reality remains tangible in Canada, and Indigenous Peoples are still dealing with the effects of this today.

Governments, organizations and experts have used, and continue to use, information as a weapon by taking, acquiring, distorting, withholding and mis-using Indigenous knowledge (collective knowledge, cultural, artistic, spiritual resources). Modes of research with and about Indigenous Peoples have often been laden with biased goals and assumptions, including being produced and used to support systems of oppression, and creating destructive laws, policies and practices.

Indigenous advocacy and action has brought us to a moment of significant transition and possibility for change. The long-standing and highly problematic norms, structures and processes controlling Indigenous data, information and records are being rejected more often. Increasingly, Indigenous communities around the world are reclaiming their Indigenous data and records that have been constructed about them (e.g. Anderson 2005). Indigenous data sovereignty, information governance and records repatriation are directly associated with increased self-determination and assertion of rights and freedoms for many Indigenous Nations. Developments such as the adoption of the *United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples* (UNDRIP), which expresses and confirms fundamental Indigenous human rights standards, and the work of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC), which highlighted the critical need for Survivor-centred approaches as part of achieving justice for Indigenous Peoples, are leading to transitional shifts and inspiring change.

Institutions of learning have an important role to play in this moment of transition. Foundational understandings and practices regarding Indigenous data, information and records must be transformed, by building methods and modalities grounded in recognition and respect of the inherent rights of Indigenous Peoples, and their distinct worldviews, cultures, societies, laws and governments. This work presents both an opportunity and imperative for institutions to build a proper framework for the management, collection, use and governance of Indigenous

data, information and records. This framework must be Indigenous-led, grounded in respectful Nation-to-Nation relationships, and respect collective sovereignty and individual autonomy.

The RSHDC and IRSI are collaborating on a process to change the cultures of Indigenous data, information and records management practices connected to their work at UBC, to support the necessary foundational shifts in attitude and approach within and amongst institutions of learning. IRSI is also collaborating with the BC First Nations Data Governance Initiative and other UBC partners to develop a path forward for developing institutional policy, standards and protocols for Indigenous research data management. For the RSHDC, these practices affect records and information from and about Residential Schools—from whether they are collected to how they are accessed or used in educational materials. For IRSI, these practices affect data collected in research, records created by researchers, and information disseminated through research and research results. Given the extent of extractive research and the challenges around Residential School records, ensuring that Indigenous knowledge and cultural protocols are privileged in this process is key. Indigenous participation must be the foundation for the design and practice of Indigenous data, information and records governance and systems.

The process is designed to occur in two phases, both of which are grounded in co-operation and collaboration to ensure that policies, practices, systems, and protocols are collaboratively developed with Indigenous community partners:

Phase 1, supported by an Indigenous Research Capacity and Reconciliation Connection Grant from SSHRC, is about the process itself: the identification of the principles, practices, and standards that should guide development of an Indigenous led engagement framework for Indigenous data, information and records housed at UBC and the RSHDC.

Phase 2 involves the development of the renewed and transformed approach to the control, management, collection, and use of information – including the partnership and relationship models that may be put into place.

Phase 1 is structured around a series of dialogues with collaborators that a) privilege Indigenous voices and knowledge as it relates to Indigenous data, information and records; and b) facilitate knowledge mobilization and partnership building.

The first dialogue was held on January 21 at UBC and brought together nearly 70 Indigenous and non-Indigenous experts, researchers, and technicians working directly on matters related to Indigenous information and records management and collection, as well as Indigenous research. The goal was to share experiences and insights about engagement practices and principles that are being utilized, and explore critical issues and challenges. Upcoming dialogues are designed for Indigenous and non-Indigenous practitioners to share their guidance about protocols for co-operation and collaboration regarding Indigenous data, information, and records, as well as models of partnership between institutions of learning and Survivors, Knowledge-holders, Indigenous Peoples and Nations.

Dialogue Overview

The dialogue was designed to share knowledge and insights regarding engagement with Indigenous Peoples about data, information and records from three vantage points:

The experience of Survivors, Knowledge-holders and Indigenous Peoples, as well as the Indigenous organizations that support them, in exercising sovereignty over their own data, information and records;

The experience of institutions of learning in trying to create partnerships and relationships regarding Indigenous data, information and records; and

Insights from scholarship and research.

The dialogue adopted two main formats: panel presentations and world-café discussions. Panel presenters shared perspectives on a series of foundational issues including: privacy, access, and security; ethics and reciprocity; infrastructure, resourcing, and capacity; ownership and control; data governance and sovereignty; and rights and repatriation.

The presentations, and the questions and answers which followed, were particularly insightful in connecting real world

case studies and examples of principles and models of engagement with historical and contextual realities. Panelists touched on a wide range of issues, challenges and tensions that need to be addressed in any policies or framework developed, whether by SSHRC, institutions of higher learning or other organizational bodies:

- Indigenous voices are a crucial, and sometimes missing, part of the process: Elders, Matriarchs, Knowledge-holders, Survivors, leaders, youth, and practitioners;
- Indigenous organizations, such as the Union of BC Indian Chiefs, First Nations Information Governance Centre (FNIGC) and First Nations Technology Council can support Indigenous Peoples in the work of information management, collection, governance;
- Indigenous laws and protocols play a vital role in relation to Indigenous data, information and records;
- Engagement and research must be built around the needs, interests, and guidance of Indigenous Peoples and Nations;
- Long-term relationships are the basis for co-operative approaches;
- Indigenous community/organizational capacity, and providing adequate capacity supports and knowledge transfer is important;
- Shifting out of the status quo is a disruptive process – this is a good and necessary thing;
- Imbalances of power exist, including between institutions of learning, individuals and communities, and these must be addressed explicitly;
- Free, prior, and informed consent is an essential standard for agreements and relations between Indigenous Peoples and institutions of learning;
- Agreements and arrangements must be flexible and adaptable to changing circumstances and contexts;
- Unique approaches and relationships must be developed in recognition of the differences amongst and between First Nations, Métis, and Inuit;
- Metadata and its use, can reflect the broader challenge of perpetuation of past wrongs;
- Language and terminology is important and use of terms such as stakeholders, consultation, engagement, and co-development can bring tension;
- Data sovereignty provides a basis for institutions to understand their relationships with Indigenous data, information and records;
- Individual and collective rights in how information is treated, including issues of individual privacy and collective processes for the collection and management of information are essential to distinguish.

The presentations laid the foundation for a ‘world café’ style exercise in which all participants could share their insights on key topics and questions, while also responding to and building upon the insights of others. Collectively, these topics were intended to cover the values, principles, procedures, structures, and agreements that may form part of a process of engagement regarding Indigenous data, information and records. The four topics were:

Engagement | What is authentic collaboration and engagement? How might today’s conversations inform the Principles of Indigenous Research Engagement framework currently under development? What does a successful consultation/collaboration look like? Do you have examples from your institution? How do we model safe and respectful engagement with Survivors around RSHDC records?

Tools and frameworks | How can existing tools and frameworks like UNDRIP, the TRC Calls to Action, OCAP™, etc. be mobilized in the context of BC research institutions and repositories? What are the challenges and lessons learned from past and present community-led or collaborative models (e.g. Indigitization, etc.)? How can the RSHDC support Survivor-informed access and privacy models?

Decision-making protocols | What are the roles and responsibilities in making these changes? What is the work that universities, researchers, organizations, Nations, etc. must do? What does a fair table look like? Who is missing from the/this room? What protocols and/or engagement practices can aid in finding solutions and resolving tensions, as opposed to intensifying them? How could/should decisions be made?

Moving toward a governance/management framework for research data, information and records | Who are the stakeholders? What do we mean by governance and/or management? What should governance and/or management accomplish? What are our values/principles? What is the importance of pursuing new approaches to stewardship?

Core Themes

Seven foundational themes emerged at the dialogue through the presentations and collaborative knowledge generation. These themes provide guidance for developing an approach to engagement regarding Indigenous data, information and records. These themes, as well as specific insights from the dialogue, will inform the remainder of Phase 1 and Phase 2, and should inform SSHRC's approach to fostering mutually respectful relationships in its new Strategic Plan.

1 Developing Indigenous-led frameworks requires Indigenous-led processes and engagement

The goal of a proper framework for Indigenous data, information, and records can only be achieved through an appropriate process of engagement. Such a process must be grounded in recognition of Indigenous peoples and protocols, be reflective and respectful of Indigenous laws, jurisdictions, and governments, and be designed and implemented in full co-operation and collaboration with Indigenous peoples. As one participant commented "the 'how' is critical." The group collectively emphasized all of the essential yet often "missing Indigenous voices" that have been ignored or ostracized throughout colonial history — Elders, Knowledge-holders, Survivors, youth — must not only be included, but also in lead.

Participants touched on many dimensions of demonstrating proper recognition and respect. These included: careful consideration of language and how terms are used and deployed, including language such as "stakeholders," "consultation," "co-development," and "engagement;" properly considering and following protocols about who one should be engaging with; approaching Survivors, Knowledge-holders, and Indigenous Peoples at the earliest stages, and with the right intentions; and ensuring the structure and aspects of the process are defined and determined with Indigenous partners, around their vision, goals, and priorities, consistent with the standard of self-determination, respectful and safe.

This theme also manifested itself in observations and commentary about the dialogue itself. It was noted that a number of essential voices were not in the room and part of the process yet, and that it is critical that these voices are helping shape the path forward from the beginning. It is in understanding of this necessity that the upcoming steps in Phase 1 will entirely focus on working directly with Survivors, Indigenous Peoples and Nations, and receiving their guidance about principles and practices for engagement.

2 Engagement approaches and methodologies must be 'inside-out' rather than 'outside-in,' rooted in Indigenous worldviews, cultures, and norms

Many participants shared the common experience of being approached by individuals and organizations that have preset agendas and expectations, often making improper assumptions, and reflecting self-motivated intentions. One participant described a typical way Nations and Indigenous Peoples are approached to share information or be a part of research processes as "How will this benefit me or my organization?" Other participants shared examples of how individuals sometimes just show up, with little or no knowledge of, or relationship with, the community (from the outside, looking in). Sometimes these individuals have strong conceptions of their own value and importance, and are looking to share information or to conduct research. Such examples illustrate deeply entrenched processes and ideas, where Indigenous information is taken, used and controlled by others.

These experiences can be characterized as an 'outside-in' understanding and approach to Indigenous data, information, and records, where the intentions, methodologies and objectives are driven and set externally from Survivors, individuals, peoples and Nations. Institutional partners need to develop their work using an 'inside-out' process, based on the visions, priorities, protocols and goals of Indigenous Peoples. An 'inside-out' transformation is vital for work regarding Indigenous data, information and records.

Participants provided examples of how this shift from 'outside-in' to 'inside-out' was beginning to accelerate. Many personal stories were shared of how researchers would arrive in an 'outside-in' approach, and through education and guidance, they would transform into a more appropriate 'inside-out' approach. As well, institutions shared some of their own struggles and efforts to move from one approach to the other - recognizing that making the shift is still a work in progress. As one example, University of Northern British Columbia shared how they have built formal

agreements grounded in standards that Nations have developed. Since then, the institution has been able to advance the internal work of shifting its own systems and practices to be more 'inside-out' in nature.

Participants also noted how in certain ways the dialogue itself may reflect more 'outside-in' than 'inside-out' approaches, which emphasized the centrality of the institution and its interests in relation to data, information, and records it holds.

3 Indigenous laws, protocols, and standards of data sovereignty must be met in development of any frameworks for Indigenous data, information and records

Engagement and any frameworks regarding Indigenous data, information, and records, must acknowledge as a starting point that there are existing Indigenous laws and protocols that govern these matters. These existing laws and protocols must be the foundation for moving forward based on co-operation and collaboration. Of course, systems of Indigenous laws and protocols are plural, reflecting the distinctiveness that exists amongst and between First Nations, Métis, and Inuit. As such, a learning approach is always required both to ensure that the distinct Indigenous legal orders and protocols of Nations are being respected, and that these are appropriately shaping the approaches taken.

UNDRIP reinforces the centrality of Indigenous laws and protocols, as well as the meaning of proper Nation-to-Nation relationships. Throughout the dialogue the standard of free, prior, and informed consent was emphasized as essential, and examples were given of how institutions have begun incorporating it as the basis for how Indigenous data, information, and records are treated. Directly related to this was examination of the need to seek understanding and demonstrate respect for the internal decision-making processes Nations use, including the varying ways consensus operates and will play a role, and how to confirm when authorization and consent from a Nation may be achieved.

Indigenous organizations are doing important work to support Nations in implementing their laws and protocols in relation to Indigenous data, information, and records. This has included the development of core standards such as OCAP™ which delineate basic premises around which frameworks should be built. It is also captured in the concept of 'data sovereignty' as a rubric through which partnerships between institutions of learning and Indigenous Peoples and Nations are to be built. In its most foundational sense, the work of reconciliation is that of structuring proper relations between Indigenous sovereignty and the assumed sovereignty of the Crown, or other governing bodies. This includes Indigenous sovereignty over their knowledge and information resources, which are expressions of their distinct peoples, cultures and societies.

4 Authentic relationships and human approaches must be at the core when working with Indigenous Peoples - they need to be Survivor-centred, support capacity development, and demonstrate care for others and oneself

"Authentic long-term relationships are the essential foundation," commented one participant, an insight that was reinforced throughout the day. However, just as crucial is deep exploration about what 'authentic' means. Relations concerning Indigenous data, information, and records have always been characterized by unequal power dynamics. These dynamics have been embedded within, and are reflective of, broader colonial dynamics that have created significant impacts and trauma, and perpetuated deep conditions of mistrust. Establishing that trust requires long-term relationship building to transform those dynamics and to ensure processes are safe and respectful.

An understanding emerged of a substantive and deeply human-centred vision of authentic relations, characterized by the values of equality and fairness, care for self and others, substantive capacity and other support, and always adopting a learning stance. It is necessary to start engagement in the right way, taking steps to address these imbalances of power from the outset —including through critical capacity supports — and to always be ready to shift and make adjustments that continue to address these challenges.

Innovative efforts regarding capacity support were also highlighted. For example, Indigitization grants (Indigitization 2018) provide a capacity building approach that has been successful and generated support because it was built out of and in response to proper dialogue with Indigenous Peoples. This work is not administratively cumbersome or burdensome, and can advance Nation-driven initiatives and approaches. Critically, it avoids the challenge of many capacity support models that typically require public disclosure of information.

The vital contexts in which this work arises was also emphasized - in particular those where significant trauma and

harm has occurred. Survivor-centred approaches that are comprehensively guided and shaped through work with Survivors is critical, ensuring that matters related to privacy, and the care and well-being of all involved is paramount.

5 There is no 'one size fits all' model and engagement must be designed to ensure past and existing wrongs are not perpetuated or reproduced

Many institutions privilege the transferability of models and frameworks from one project or illustration to another, including systems of information management and collection. Such an approach is not appropriate or viable in relation to Indigenous data, information, and records. There is no "one size fits all" approach or methodology – rather plural approaches and methodologies must be built with Indigenous Peoples, Nations and Survivors, guided by the context and realities of the situation, distinct Indigenous laws and protocols, the particular types of information in question, and the patterns of relations that may exist.

Another critical reason for rejecting 'one size fits all' models is ensuring that one is not perpetuating and reinforcing misrepresentations and misinformation from the past. An example was shared to illustrate how the use of metadata can reinforce colonial attitudes and assumptions, and as such the practice of relying on approaches and models already in place can reinforce past wrongs. A transformative approach is to begin work together based on guiding principles and values that help start an ethical engagement, but without preconditions or preset agendas, and without reliance on what might have been done elsewhere or in the past. Some institutions are learning to use these approaches in partnership but more can be done.

There are also many tensions and challenges that speak to the necessity to carefully consider the particular contexts and realities in which engagement occurs. For example, the tensions between individual and collective rights, roles and responsibilities was recurrently noted, such as individual privacy, autonomy, and well-being on the one hand, and the collective role and interest in stewarding and sharing certain information on the other. Such tensions are typically not treated through generalizations and meta-approaches, and require careful attention and to the specific contexts in which they arise.

6 Engagement and frameworks must be driven by needs set by individuals and Nations, and should be responsive to changing contexts and realities

"All documents and agreements must be living" one participant shared. This captures the insight expressed throughout the dialogue that the work of engaging and partnering with respect to Indigenous data, records, and information is always dynamic, and never static. Stories were shared of individuals who at a certain time and context authorized a particular use of their records, but as their life circumstances and perspectives changed, their views regarding those records also shifted. Similarly, many shared examples of how communities and Nations over time may shift the direction in which work and partnerships move as a result of many factors including the further implementation and development of their own laws, protocols, and systems regarding data, information, and records, or changes in leadership and priorities.

As such, engagement must be flexible and adaptable, and it never should be considered to be done, even where a so-called 'outcome' (such as an agreement) has been achieved. Processes must be open, built with partners and updated on an on-going basis. A 'framework' in the form of a guideline or checklist will never be appropriate or respectful. One also needs to be prepared to take substantive steps that are available when shifts do occur. For example, participants provided examples of actions they had taken to remove records from public view, change access protocols, or other steps when consents and authorizations had changed when it was identified by Indigenous partners that additional factors or context needed to be considered.

7 Institutions of learning must get their own house in order in significant ways to engage with individuals and Nations appropriately

Institutions of learning must change the patterns they have with regards to Indigenous data, information, and records, and get their own house in order to approach Indigenous Peoples, Nations and Survivors, in new and proper ways that can build trust. It is necessary that these institutions demonstrate they are serious about doing the internal work needed to shift out of past and colonial patterns. In this regard, as a number of participants echoed in various ways,

“Indigenous-led” does not mean the burdens and responsibilities for change lies disproportionately or primarily on the shoulders of Indigenous Peoples. ‘Engagement fatigue’ is a reality. To start, the foundations on which institutions, researchers, and non-Indigenous experts approach work and engagement must change.

Many examples were shared of how institutions can and should be striving to change. These included:

- the need for more Indigenous peoples within the institution, and reconsideration of the processes and approaches for identifying and recruiting Indigenous staff;
- doing the groundwork of properly identifying what Indigenous data, collections and records within the institution, and tracing back Indigenous ownership and authorization as best possible;
- learning the proper ways to begin engagement and with whom, including through guidance from Elders and Knowledge-holders;
- recognizing how the time for engagement and partnering with Indigenous individuals and Nations must be determined by them, and not the institution; and
- establishing one’s own internal mechanisms and processes to support and facilitate appropriate engagement and constantly recognizing the contexts of trauma and harm in which many issues related to Indigenous data, information and records arise.

Institutions must also reconsider their mindset and orientation towards their very role in this work. A number of examples were given of how institutions need to reconceptualize their work in terms of a service ethic, particularly those institutions that support the work and direction of Indigenous Peoples such as Survivors and Elders. Such an ethic supports the application of key standards discussed earlier relating to consent and authorization and makes clear how matters of access should be dealt with. This also helps focus the longer-term work that might be done in partnership such as where the priorities lie.

The term “disruption” arose throughout the dialogue, in reference to different contexts. There is a need to ‘disrupt’ the status quo patterns within institutions regarding Indigenous data, information, records – with such disruption, the necessary internal changes can accelerate and advance in a timely way.

Conclusion

Throughout the dialogue, important guidance was generated about what is required at this moment for institutions to relearn how to engage with Survivors, Elders, Indigenous Peoples and Nations regarding Indigenous data, information and records. These institutions must be willing to demonstrate that they are serious, and are doing the internal work necessary to transition out of past and colonial patterns. In addition to identifying key principles and practices for engagement, this guidance has provided a foundation for re-conceptualizing the design of the future steps and phases to for RSHDC and IRSI. In particular, future dialogues will be community and Nation-based to reflect the need for co-design. Future reports, developed in co-operation and collaboration, will identify approaches to engagement as they evolve through an Indigenous-led process. These themes are integral in the development of SSHRC’s Strategic Plan on engagement and partnership, and should form the basis for organizations such as SSHRC to engage and partner with Indigenous Peoples.

There is a need to ‘disrupt’ the status quo patterns within institutions regarding Indigenous data, information, records. Given the ownership and control rights that Indigenous communities and Nations have over their research data and information, it is clear that existing institutional strategies, policies, practices and protocols with respect to Indigenous data and information will need to undergo dramatic changes. Planning and initiating this work will begin in the next phase of the dialogues.

References

- Anderson, Jane. 2005. *Access and Control of Indigenous Knowledge in Libraries and Archives: Ownership and Future Use*. New York: American Library Association, The MacArthur Foundation, and Columbia University.
http://ccnmtl.columbia.edu/projects/alaconf2005/paper_anderson.pdf.
- Brown, Pam, Jennifer Carpenter, Gerry Lawson, Kim Lawson, Lisa P. Nathan, and Mark Turin. 2017. *Uplifting Voices. In Reflections of Canada: illuminating our opportunities and challenges at 150+ years*. Peter Wall Institute for Advanced Studies, 264-269.
- Callison, Camille, Loriene Roy, and Gretchen Alice LeCheminant, eds. 2016. *Indigenous Notions of Ownership and Libraries, Archives and Museums*. Berlin/Munich: De Gruyter Saur.
- Fourmile, Henrietta. 1989. "Who Owns the Past? Aborigines as Captives of the Archives." *Aboriginal History* 13: 1-8.
- Gardiner, Gabrielle, and Kirsten Thorpe. 2014. "The Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Data Archive: Connecting Communities and Research Data." *Language Documentation and Description* 12: 103-19.
<http://www.e-publishing.org/PID/140>.
- Indigitization. 2018. *Grant program*. <http://www.indigitization.ca/grant-program/program-background/>
- Lawson, Kimberley L. 2004. "Precious Fragments: First Nations Materials in Archives, Libraries, and Museums." Master's thesis, University of British Columbia.
- Nakata, Martin and Marcia Langton. 2009. *Australian Indigenous Knowledge and Libraries*. Sydney: UTS ePress.
<https://doi.org/10.5130/978-0-9802840-1-0>.
- Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada. *Calls to Action*. Winnipeg: 2015.
https://nctr.ca/assets/reports/Calls_to_Action_English2.pdf.
- UN General Assembly. *United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples*. Resolution. A/RES/61/295.
http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/documents/DRIPS_en.pdf.

Appendix A: Dialogue Program

Dialogue on Indigenous Data, Information and Records

January 21, 2019

UBC Robson Square, 800 Robson Street, Room C150

UBC Vancouver Dialogue

Time	Activity
8:00 AM	Registration & Breakfast
9:00 AM	<p>Opening</p> <p>Territory Welcome - Elder Larry Grant</p> <p>Setting up the Day - Dr. Mary Ellen Turpel-Lafond (Aki-kwe)</p>
9:30 AM	<p>Panels</p> <p>Panelists will share their perspectives on the suggested themes. These conversations will inform our afternoon discussions on the development of an Indigenous-led engagement framework around Indigenous data, information, and records housed at UBC and the RSHDC.</p> <p>Panel 1 Privacy, Access & Security; Ethics & Reciprocity; and Infrastructure, Resourcing & Capacity</p> <p>Melissa Adams, Librarian & Archivist - Union of BC Indian Chiefs; Erica Hernandez-Read, Archivist - University of Northern BC; Sarah Dupont, Engagement Librarian - UBC <u>X</u>wi7<u>x</u>wa Library and First Nations Curriculum Concentration Coordinator, UBC iSchool; (Chair: Ann Stevenson - UBC)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Perspectives on Privacy, Access and Security; Ethics and Reciprocity; and Infrastructure, Resourcing and Capacity - with particular attention to the Dialogue theme of developing principles for engagement for Indigenous data, information, and records housed at UBC and the RSHDC in the development of an Indigenous-led engagement framework.
10:30 AM	Break
10:45 AM	<p>Panel 2 Ownership & Control; Data Governance & Sovereignty; Rights & Repatriation</p> <p>Jonathan Dewar, Executive Director - First Nations Information Governance Centre; Tricia Logan, Assistant Director, Research & Engagement - UBC, RSHDC; Leslie Bonshor, Executive Director, Aboriginal Health - Vancouver Coastal Health; (Chair: Lerato Chondoma, IRSI)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Perspectives on Ownership and Control; Data Governance and Sovereignty; and Rights and Repatriation - with particular attention to the Dialogue theme of developing principles for engagement for Indigenous data, information, and records housed at UBC and the RSHDC in the development of an Indigenous-led engagement framework.
11:45 PM	Lunch



Residential School History & Dialogue Centre

Indigenous Research Support Initiative

Dialogue on Indigenous Data, Information and Records

12:45 PM	Discussion Introduction
1:00 PM	World Café Dialogue The afternoon dialogues are world café style, with topic-based table discussions; each topic has two tables. Each table has a moderator to take notes and facilitate discussions. Every 20 minutes participants can choose to rotate to a different topic/table, or stay where they are. Participants can self-direct where they want to engage based on their interests, facilitating a dynamic and fluid process - people get to move around and work with more colleagues. There is no afternoon break, but coffee/snacks will be on hand throughout the afternoon. After an hour and half, each topic/table will report back to the group on major themes and topics from the discussions.
2:30 PM	World Café Share-Back Moderators will share major themes from the discussions with the entire group.
3:30 PM	Wrap-Up & Closing Remarks
4:00 PM	End



Appendix B: Original SSHRC Proposal (pgs 1-4)

1. Summary

Increasingly, Indigenous communities around the world are reclaiming their Indigenous data and records that have been constructed about them (e.g. Anderson 2005). Indigenous data sovereignty, information governance and records repatriation are directly associated with increased self-determination and assertion of rights and freedoms for many Indigenous Nations. Historically, Indigenous communities have been separated and displaced from archival documentation and materials relating to history, culture, language, songs, lands, resources, heritage and communities (e.g. Fourmile 1989; Anderson 2005; Gardiner and Thorpe 2014). Grounded in colonialism, scientific approaches to information inquiry and data management often recognize the individual, the investigator, or the agency/department as the creator (and often de facto owner) of the information. Traditionally, in archival theory, discourse and management, the rules governing decisions about whose voices are included or excluded, what evidence is privileged, whose voices and what records are deemed worthy of preservation, who has access to archives and how archives are arranged and described privilege a Eurocentric positionality (e.g. Lawson 2004; Stoler 2009; Cook 2013). These practices have resulted in governments, academic researchers and churches creating, collecting and governing the large amounts of information about Indigenous people and their cultures that are held in archives and libraries (e.g. Anderson 2005; Nakata and Langton 2005, 13; Callison, Roy, LeCheminant 2016).

The Indian Residential School History and Dialogue Centre (IRSHDC), the Indigenous Research Support Initiative (IRSI) at the University of British Columbia and Gwen Phillips (as a champion for the BC First Nations' Data Governance Initiative) are collaborating on a dialogue series focused on engaging academic and community collaborators around issues of data, information and records to ensure that policies, practices, systems and protocols are collaboratively developed with Indigenous community partners. At the heart of this dialogue series is a call to change the culture of Indigenous data, information and records management and archival practices. This is a call to act, engage and ensure that Indigenous knowledge and cultural protocols are privileged in this conversation and that Indigenous participation is surfaced in the design and practice of Indigenous data, information and records governance and systems. This project is structured around three proposed dialogue sessions in British Columbia with 40 community and academic collaborators, to work towards a model of engagement that is collaboratively and iteratively developed and tested for Indigenous data, information and records housed at the UBC, the IRSHDC, and beyond.

2. Engagement Dialogues for Indigenous Data, Information and Records

Keywords: Indigenous data sovereignty, Indigenous data repatriation, digital repatriation, data and information governance, agency, OCAP™, reconciliation, digital technologies and infrastructure, Indigenous knowledge, engagement model, intellectual property, pluralism, TRC Calls to Action

Themes: The dialogue series addresses each theme and a) privileges Indigenous voices and knowledge as it relates to Indigenous data, information and records; and b) facilitates knowledge mobilization and partnership building to aid in reconciliation. The work of the Indian Residential School History and Dialogue Centre and the Indigenous Research Support Initiative relies on Indigenous research networks and partnerships and will always rely on maintaining and building upon relationships with valued community partners.

Indigenous communities around the world are reclaiming their Indigenous data and records that have been constructed about them (e.g. Anderson 2005). Indigenous data sovereignty, information governance and records repatriation are directly associated with increased self-determination and the assertion of rights and freedoms for many Indigenous Nations. Historically, Indigenous communities have been separated and displaced from archival documentation and materials relating to history, culture, language, songs, lands, resources, heritage, and communities (e.g. Fourmile 1989; Anderson 2005; Gardiner and Thorpe 2014). Grounded in colonialism, scientific approaches to information inquiry and data management often recognize the individual, the investigator, or the agency/department as the creator (and often de facto owner) of the information. Traditionally, in archival theory, discourse and management, the rules governing decisions about whose voices are included or excluded, what evidence is privileged, whose voices and what records are deemed worthy of preservation, who has access to archives and how archives are arranged and described privilege a Eurocentric positionality (e.g. Lawson 2004; Stoler 2009; Cook 2013). These practices resulted in governments, academic researchers, anthropologists and ethnographers, linguists, and churches creating, collecting and governing the large amounts of information about Indigenous people and their cultures that are currently held in archives and libraries (e.g. Anderson 2005; Nakata and Langton 2005, 13; Callison, Roy, and LeCheminant 2016).

By way of example this proposal focuses on two specific datasets and records collections; Indigenous research data and Indian Residential School records and information. The extremely sensitive considerations highlighted through these two examples are analogous to most data, information and records about Indigenous people and communities. Western-centric academic research has followed an extractive model and has operated in circumstances of unequal power and without regard for community concerns, needs or interests. For decades, research data has remained within academic institutions without consideration for future use by communities with relationships to their data. It is often the case that Indigenous individuals and communities who are subjects of the research and share traditional knowledge to inform the research, have no control over ownership and access to the products of the research. Equally, the network of archives, museums and libraries around the world that hold Indigenous data, information and records are often disconnected and records are dispersed and difficult to identify and access (Byrne 2009; Gardiner and Thorpe 2014).

Records related to the Indian Residential School System (IRSS) and the Survivors who attended the schools are held in government, church and community archives as well as individual private collections. Many records related to the IRSS were gathered by the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC), however, many exist outside of the TRC's mandate of collection. Additionally, survivors (including activist agencies such as the Indian Residential School Survivors Society) have collectively and individually amassed records of their advocacy, activism support, healing and research for several decades. Efforts to digitize these records in aid of accessibility are only one step in generating meaningful and fulsome access for the individuals and communities who these records are about. Community driven practices such as those enacted by Survivors and the IRSS need to continue to inform the dialogue as efforts are made to preserve these records and make them accessible into the future. Discourse and action

on developing descriptive models, privacy and access policies and protocols, and digital information systems that are informed by Indigenous communities is urgently required.

While advancements have been made to address these issues, the framing of the discourse of trauma within the context of traditional archival structures demands examination. The construction of platforms that support alternative narratives and facilitate agency and pluralism to voices that are often left outside of the official archival collections is necessary. As Indigenous communities reestablish their Indigenous governance structures and institutions impacted by colonization, new understandings about data, information and records collection, preservation, access and repatriation are critical to rebuilding cultural capital, increasing agency and advancing self-determination.

Examples of increased support for Indigenous data sovereignty in international policy include:

- The *UNESCO 2003 Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage*, aimed at empowering Indigenous knowledge holders to determine access to cultural materials by researchers
- *2007 UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples*- Article 15 states that “Indigenous peoples have the right to dignity and diversity of their cultures, traditions and histories and aspirations which shall be appropriately reflected in education and public information.” In the sixteenth session, 2017, the UNDESA Division for Inclusive Social Development Indigenous People outlines recommendations for data and indicators that call for disaggregated, meaningful data for Indigenous people
- 2008 World Health Organization’s Commission on the social determinants of health a “Minimum Health Equity Surveillance System” – as part of the system, “good-quality data on the health of Indigenous Peoples should be available where applicable” (Kunst and Mackenbach 2008)

Some examples of notable international Indigenous data sovereignty initiatives:

- Te Mana Raruanga Moari Data Sovereignty Network (Advocating for the development of capacity and capability across Māori data ecosystem including: data rights and interests, data governance, data access and control, data storage and security)
- Ownership, Control, Access and, Possession™ in Canada, governing First Nations research and data
- Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami (Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami’s National Inuit Strategy on Research seeks to address issues that marginalize and neglect Inuit in a research capacity. Issues include researchers and research institutions being the main beneficiaries of research in Inuit Nunangat, and research being governed, resourced and carried out with little Inuit participation. The strategy enhances Inuit self-determination)
- BC First Nations Data Governance Initiative (Nation-based, community-driven data governance)
- International Indigenous Data Sovereignty Network linking efforts across the globe, including Australia, Canada, New Zealand, Peru, Sweden and others

The University of British Columbia is uniquely positioned to facilitate this dialogue series because of its new and existing institutional resources committed to working in good and ethical ways with Indigenous people and communities Given the long-lasting legacy of colonization of Indigenous peoples, UBC continues to prioritize its partnerships with Indigenous peoples and communities.

The new UBC 2018-2028 Strategic Plan describes how the “Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada and the publication of its *Final Report and Calls to Action*, and the development of the [UNDRIP], have brought attention to the ways in which Canadian educational and other institutions have failed and oppressed Indigenous people. At this historic juncture, UBC renews its commitments, articulated in the *2009 Aboriginal Strategic Plan*, to addressing this history and charting a way forward that provides a basis for productive co-existence and a more equitable future. (Shaping UBC’s next century, Strategic Plan 2018-2028, University of British Columbia)

The Indian Residential School History and Dialogue Centre (IRSHDC) and the Indigenous Research Support Initiative (IRSI) are two examples of initiatives at UBC that respond to the TRC Calls to Action, notably calls 65, 69 and 70, and are central to the [2018 Indigenous Strategic Plan](#).

Drawing on community engagement, emergent technologies and creative and collaborative approaches, the **Indian Residential School History and Dialogue Centre** aims to facilitate a variety of engagements and support informed dialogue and more transparent information practices. As a framework that seeks to privilege respectful, equitable and innovative access to records and information, the IRSHDC's developing systems and space of inquiry can model a new platform for information stewardship, particularly relating to collections that hold records of traumatic events – one that is pluralistic and seeks to support agency. The IRSHDC utilizes digital technologies in service to challenge the hierarchies within the structures of bureaucracy and challenge the authenticity of state narratives, educate about this chapter in Canada's national narrative, facilitate critical engagement and entertain a place where "distrust" (of records, systems, narratives, etc.) can be surfaced and discussed.

The **Indigenous Research Support Initiative** is based on the premise that more effective research and greater mutual understanding can be developed from identifying, developing, and supporting research practices that proceed from respectful relations between researchers and Indigenous communities. While IRSI is not restrictive of the practices of university researchers in working with Indigenous communities, it is designed to bring attention to newer approaches to research that are more likely to address community needs and priorities in ways that respect community interests and autonomy. Its description is included in Appendix II to the Indigenous Strategic Plan not only to identify it as a major Indigenous initiative, but to suggest as well a major trajectory in the future of Indigenous research methodologies and relations that it will reflect and help to define. The intent of the initiative is to provide professional research support and services to Indigenous communities and university researchers to undertake collaborative projects based on community-led interests, reciprocal relationships, and principles of mutual accountability.

Gwen Phillips, is currently championing the **BCFNDCI** a tripartite government initiative (federal, provincial and First Nations governments) with a key objective being timely access to quality data to plan, manage and account for investments and outcomes associated with First Nations well-being. A collaborative partnership is being developed between the BCFNDCI and the IRSI, the purpose of which is to implement a collaborative provincial strategy to increase First Nations' capacity in data governance, surveillance and research to support First Nations in their Community Development and Nation Rebuilding activities.

It is through this new research partnership with IRSI that Gwen Phillips is collaborating with the IRSHDC and IRSI on a dialogue series focused on engaging academic and community collaborators around issues of data, information and records to ensure that policies, practices, systems and protocols are collaboratively developed with Indigenous community partners. At the heart of this dialogue series is a call to change the culture of Indigenous data, information and records management and archival practices. This is a call to act, engage and ensure that Indigenous knowledge and cultural protocols be privileged in this conversation and that Indigenous participation is surfaced in the design and practice of Indigenous data, information and records governance and systems.

This project is structured around three proposed dialogues in British Columbia with 40 community and academic collaborators, to work towards a model of engagement that is collaboratively and iteratively developed and tested, for Indigenous data, information and records housed at UBC, the IRSHDC, and beyond. The content of the dialogues will include discussions about, but not limited to: policies, practices, technologies, training and capacity, legal issues and legislative environments, Indigenous-led models as well as digital technologies and infrastructure. We anticipate holding one workshop in Vancouver (at the IRSHDC), one in Prince George (at UNBC), one in Kamloops (at Thompson Rivers University). The first dialogue will focus on developing engagement protocol, rules of operation, as well as decision-making protocols and desired outcomes. The second dialogue will focus on identifying gaps in the current infrastructure, resources, practices and models for Indigenous data, information and records. The third dialogue will focus on tools and resources to action solutions.