

Table of Contents

Day 1 – Tuesday, September 18, 2018.....	1
Introductory Remarks/Opening Plenary	1
Context: Federal Child & Family Services Legislation	1
Inuit Child Welfare: The Needs, Gaps & Challenges for Inuit Women and Children	2
Presentations.....	2
Break-Out Groups.....	4
Urban Inuit and Child Welfare	9
Winnipeg.....	9
Ottawa	10
Montreal.....	11
Inuit Nunangat and Child Welfare	13
Nunatsiavut.....	13
Nunavik.....	14
Closing Plenary	16
Day 2 – Wednesday, September 19, 2018.....	18
From Gaps to Solutions: Promising Practices	18
From Gaps to Solutions: How to Practically Promote Inuit Child & Family Well-Being..	23
The Connection Between IQ Principles & Child Welfare: Determining Key Guiding Principles and Minimum Standards for Potential Legislation.....	24
Conclusion	27
References.....	28
Appendix I – Summary of Key Recommendations	29
Appendix II – Agenda	31
Appendix III – Federal Inuit Child Welfare Reform: A Response by Tungasuvvingat Inuit from an Ontario Inuit Perspective	35

Day 1 – Tuesday, September 18, 2018

Introductory Remarks/Opening Plenary

Rebecca Kudloo, President of Pauktuutit Inuit Women of Canada, and Natan Obed, President of Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami (ITK), opened the session with introductory remarks. They made note that it is fundamental for Inuit to have control over their children, families and communities to ensure Inuit children in care receive love, support and a constant connection to their culture. It was emphasized that children are important indicators of the overall health of Inuit society and that this engagement session is a good first step.

Context: Federal Child & Family Services Legislation

Isa Gros-Louis, Director General of Child and Family Services Reform at Indigenous Services Canada (ISC), provided background information on the federal government's process on co-developing potential child and family services legislation. She explained how the Government of Canada has committed to co-creating options for potential federal legislation following the January 2018 *Emergency Meeting on First Nations, Inuit and Métis Child and Family Services*.

Isa stated that ISC is completing these consultations in a staged approach. The first stage involves hosting distinction-based engagement sessions, such as the one Pauktuutit hosted. From these engagement sessions, ISC is going to recommend broad options for potential legislation with high-level principles to Cabinet in fall 2018. For stage two of the process (no specific timeline mentioned at the time of this report), ISC will look towards implementation, where they are planning to engage First Nations, Inuit and Métis leaders, experts and organizations to identify other matters affecting children, youth and families that could be addressed by the federal government.

Inuit Child Welfare: The Needs, Gaps & Challenges for Inuit Women and Children

Presentations

Tracy O’Hearn, Executive Director of Pauktuutit, and Jack Hicks, ITK consultant and Adjunct Professor in the College of Medicine at the University of Saskatchewan,¹ presented on the key needs, gaps and challenges for Inuit children in care.

Tracy explained how child welfare is a priority for Pauktuutit, so much so that a child welfare specific resolution was passed at Pauktuutit’s 2018 Annual General Assembly, which states that the organization will:

“...conduct research into the specific experiences of Inuit children, youth and families involved with the child welfare system across the country to determine what policies are needed to protect Inuit children from experiencing undue risk and harm to their health and well-being.”²

Tracy described how Pauktuutit has been at every Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls (MMIWG) Inquiry Hearing where an Inuk woman or Inuit family members provided testimony. She highlighted recurring points that women and family members raised in their testimonies, including that: many women do not report violence because they fear losing their children to child welfare authorities; children of murdered and missing women may be taken into care even if other family members could raise them; and, girls who are sent to foster and group homes in areas outside of their communities (e.g. to large metropolitan areas) are more vulnerable to being exploited and trafficked.

¹ Jack has also been a long-time social researcher in Nunavut.

² <https://www.pauktuutit.ca/about-us/resolutions/>

Tracy also discussed some of the key take-aways from the Inuit Session at the January 2018 *Emergency Meeting on First Nations, Inuit and Métis Child and Family Services*, including:

- the need for Inuit-specific data;
- more family resource workers, social workers, counsellors;
- parenting programs, addictions treatment and health services to prevent apprehensions;
- remove institutional socio-economic barriers to kinship care – e.g. lack of housing/overcrowded housing, financial assistance, education;
- focus on permanent placements, adoption within the family, or at the very least community;
- provide mandatory cultural training for service providers; and
- fund Inuit-led initiatives.

Jack Hicks then focused on the immense data gap that exists for Inuit children and youth in the child welfare system. He presented on the glaring lack of statistics and noted that we need a detailed picture of how many Inuit children and youth are in care and what type of care.³ He recommended that the agencies responsible for child welfare in the four Inuit regions, as well as provincial/territorial governments, should be engaged in a process to create reliable and comparable statistics on Inuit children and youth. It was also suggested that this could be done with the assistance of the federal government. Jack noted how well-thought-out investments and interventions that address the intergenerational effects of historical trauma and poor living conditions are required to reduce the numbers of Inuit children and youth in care.

³ For more information on the lack of Inuit statistics, please see Jack's PowerPoint presentation.

Break-Out Groups

After Tracy and Jack's presentations, participants divided into break-out groups to discuss the key gaps, needs and challenges they see as an obstacle to promoting the well-being of Inuit children and youth. The key themes and issues below were raised.

Lack of Funding

- Child and family services lack support, especially in Inuit Nunangat.
- There are not enough supports in the North – supports cannot roll down to the south because the social systems are lacking up North.
- Although there is funding for child welfare outside of Inuit Nunangat, that funding is rarely extended to community, nor is it invested in culturally appropriate or safe supports for Inuit living outside of Inuit Nunangat.
- Funding/services are in silos – there is a strong need for long-term, streamlined investments in Inuit-specific child and family services.
- Funding is currently based on per capita versus need, which is not equitable.
- There is not enough funding and there is a huge gap in positions needed in the child welfare sector which leads to many social workers being overworked, e.g. one person being hired for 62 children. This often leads to burnout and high turnover.
- There is a need for grassroots support that is funded on a multi-year basis, from remote communities to urban centres. The upstream investments should be defined by communities.

Need for Holistic Supports/Wrap-Around Services

- There is a strong need for a respected community member to serve as an advisor to provide guidance.
- Men also need healing and supports.
- Support groups for parents who lost parenting skills through Residential Schools and the Sixties Scoop is needed.⁴
- There should be life skills programs for all Inuit, including budgeting, cooking, etc.

Need for Preventative/Proactive vs. Intervention/Reactive Approach

- There is a need to take a proactive approach and eliminate the reactive approach to child apprehension.
- There should be more of a focus on prevention, including early identification and immediate support.
- There should be sufficient funding to help mothers keep their children.

Parental Supports/Rights

- Inuit do not always know what their rights are. There is a strong need for Inuit to be educated on their rights and how to enforce them when in contact with child and family services.
- Inuit need to better understand the provincial/territorial act which they are governed by. This understanding may require an advocate to help parents assert their rights and not be “bullied” into signing away their children.
- When children are taken out of the home, the foster parent gets financial support. Instead of paying the foster parent, child and family services should help the child’s family, especially when poverty is a factor in child apprehension.

⁴ The Sixties Scoop is a term that refers to the mass removal of Indigenous children and youth from their families into the child welfare system that began in the 1960s and continued into the 1980s. In most cases this took place without the consent of their families or communities. Many of these children were placed into non-Indigenous foster care homes, adopted by non-Indigenous parents and were geographically dislocated from their places of origin.

- The above is also true for kinship or customary care. Financial supports are not afforded to family members who may be willing and able to provide immediate and/or long term supports. Family are expected to act and take on the additional burden of costs of raising the child. For many, this is a deterrent as they are living day-to-day, with very little money (many with none) to spare.
- Foster parents are often given extra financial support for a special needs and/or medically fragile child, but not the birth parents/family.

Aging Out of Care

- Aging out of care is a fundamental issue. Some Inuit youth are too old for social services assistance and too young for income assistance. There is a need for increased services for youth.
- The services for youth also need to be broad in range to better meet their needs. Currently, many children are not moving out of home on their 18th birthday. This is unrealistic in today's socio-economic environment.
- Many programs that are available have restrictive criteria and eligibility requirements, which can prohibit the youth who need access from getting the services they need (i.e. must be a permanent ward/crown ward, must be 16 to 24, cannot be a care-by-agreement, cannot be temporary custody, cannot be kinship care, must be residing in "x area," etc.).

Child Sexual Abuse

- Potential issues with custom adoption include no required criminal record or vulnerable sector check for adoptive parents. This can increase the risk of child sexual abuse.
- Requiring background checks should be extended to all persons living in the home with the child. With housing being at a crisis, there may be individuals living in the home who should not be with children even though the adoptive parents may be ideal candidates.
- Some children in care are experiencing sexual abuse or sexual interference in the home that they have been placed in (e.g. by foster parents, by siblings, by other foster children, by peers – through coercion and bullying).

- Children in foster care are waiting long periods of time for an investigator to interview them when sexual abuse has been reported.

Need for an Inuit-Competent & Friendly Child and Family Services System

- There is a need for proper identification of Inuit in data collection. This includes ensuring any birth records are received in correct order and that the information contained is accurate.
- There is a need for Inuit service providers (social workers, support workers, interpreters, etc.).
- Inuit social workers often resign because they face many challenges such as being exhausted from training new *Qallunaat*⁵ social workers and being related to many in the community they serve.
- Inuit workers qualifications are often not recognized by the government – e.g. if they don't have the professional credentials that the government deems necessary.
- Inuit need to operate, or at the very least sit on, child and family services governance bodies.
- Inuit living outside of Inuit Nunangat need more culturally-appropriate support services and programs, e.g. meeting with elders, sewing, healing circles, etc.
- There needs to be mandatory cultural-competency training for **anyone** working with Inuit children, youth and families both inside and outside Inuit Nunangat (e.g. social workers, early childhood educators, healthcare professionals, etc.). This training must include:
 1. awareness and understanding of Inuit identity, Inuit history⁶, culture and traditions, including child rearing practices;
 2. culturally safe practices; and
 3. application of IQ principles for child welfare issues.

⁵ Inuktitut term that refers to non-Inuit, and in particular white people.

⁶ This includes learning about Inuit's experiences with forced relocation, Residential Schools, the Sixties Scoop, etc.

- There is a need for culturally-competent workers to help Inuit navigate the child and family services systems. There is an especially strong need for interpreters who are also trained in child welfare, including the respective provincial/territorial child and family services legislation.
- There is a need for self-care supports for all workers involved with child welfare.
- An accountability mechanism for people and communities (whether it be through representative organizations or whatever mechanism the community deems appropriate) to remedy the lack of knowledge about Inuit communities, particularly in urban areas, and decisions made without Inuit consultation is needed.
- There is a need to know where Inuit children in care go to help them maintain their Inuit identity and culture. Oftentimes children struggle with identity and are confused about finding their culture once in the child welfare system.
- Foster and adoptive parents of Inuit children and youth should undergo obligatory training on Inuit culture.
- The system is extremely unfriendly to children and youth when social workers come to the home, e.g. the lack of communication, children's belongings being shoved into garbage bags, children often do not understand why they are leaving. Minimizing the trauma associated with the process is necessary.

Address Systemic Barriers for Inuit

- Addressing underlying issues, such as lack of housing and severe food insecurity is needed.
- Housing is a massive challenge. Issues include: very little new housing for youth and families which leads to overcrowding; low quality of housing, especially in remote communities; expensive cost of living in remote communities; and a need for safe places for individuals fleeing violence as there is an extreme lack of shelters.⁷

⁷ Approximately 70% of the 52 communities in Inuit Nunangat do not have a safe shelter and there is no second stage/transitional housing.

Urban Inuit and Child Welfare

Participants from Winnipeg, Montreal and Ottawa spoke about the experiences of urban Inuit.

Winnipeg

Rachel Dutton, Executive Director of the Manitoba Inuit Association, and Gloria Penner, Inuit child welfare advocate and foster parent to medically fragile Inuit children from Nunavut, spoke about the urban Inuit experience in Winnipeg.

Rachel explained how there is a population of approximately 1,000 Inuit living in Manitoba and that the Inuit who come down are largely seeking access to healthcare and further education. She noted that in Manitoba the voices of Inuit are silenced. For example, when Manitoba started updating their *Child and Family Services Act* to look at including customary care in the provincial legislation, Inuit were not consulted. This lack of engagement with Inuit results in bureaucrats deciding the kinship agreements as they relate to customary care. Rachel also mentioned how child and family services in Manitoba often intervene due to systemic challenges that Inuit face such as a lack of healthcare. This is problematic as children and youth should not have to go into the care of the State to have access to health, education, and mental health and addiction services. She encourages the creation of a child and family services system that steps outside of the government box and silos to substantially address the needs of Inuit.

Gloria described how she is a foster parent to medically fragile children from Nunavut and how children come to her through a custody agreement with their families so they can have access to the medical treatment they need. She explained how the children who live with her go to school, know their culture well and have frequent video chats with their biological family so they can maintain a constant connection. Additionally, the children's parents are always welcome to visit and stay over the holidays. However, Gloria noted that huge challenges are parents only getting two visits a year to visit their children and getting children healthy enough to go home. Based on her years of experience, she has two key recommendations:

1. more visits to keep the families together; and
2. have service providers and/or community members who can speak the appropriate dialect of Inuktitut regularly visit the foster homes so children (and foster parents) can learn and maintain their language and communicate with their families.

Ottawa

Karen Baker-Anderson, Founding Executive Director of the Ottawa Inuit Children's Centre (OICC), and Janice Messam, Manager of the Family Well-Being Program at OICC, spoke to the urban Inuit experience in Ottawa.

Karen explained how Ottawa has an overrepresentation of Inuit children and youth in the child welfare system. In Ottawa, there are 34 children living in a home that is not their own, 30 additional children with an open file, and approximately 60 children from Nunavut receiving services such as mental health and medical services. She described how OICC has been actively involved in the changes being made to the Ontario *Child, Youth and Family Services Act* to help provide an Inuit lens and ensure there is a role for Inuit community in the Act. Yet, despite OICC's active engagement in the child and family services system, Karen stated that child welfare cannot be the solution. She recommends that we, as a community, need to find solutions that protect children and youth and keep them in their homes, or at the very least actively work towards getting them *back* in their homes. She emphasized the need for a continuum of services and described how OICC offers programs that start at pre-natal and continue throughout the child's life, involving the family every step of the way.

Janice noted that when parents do well, their children do well, which is why the Family Well-Being Program at OICC offers wrap-around services and supports families in whichever way they need. Through the program, OICC offers many supports including: court support and legal representation; access visits for families to interact with their children; and support for parents when their children are sick at the hospital. In addition to crisis response, OICC also provides prevention services, such as mental health services for trauma and addictions, a breakfast with dads' program, sewing circles, and

adoptive parent groups. Janice explained how the adoptive parent group allows Inuit children who are adopted into non-Inuit homes to continue to have a connection with the centre and their culture.

Further, now that OICC has a voice with the Children Aid's Society (CAS) of Ottawa, they can prescreen non-Inuit families if there is no other kinship option. In Ottawa, the CAS now directly comes to both OICC and Tungasuvvingat Inuit (TI) which came as a result of both organizations tirelessly advocating to the Ontario government that they should be a first resource for Inuit families. Janice concluded that the Family Well-Being Program has been very successful and it is fundamental that these sorts of programs be a lifetime commitment from the government and not solely a three-year project.

Montreal

Marti Miller, Clinical Coordinator at the Native Women's Shelter of Montreal (NWSM) explained how the NWSM was established in 1987 and it serves many homeless Inuit women and their children. The NWSM has two family care workers who help women navigate the youth protection system and get out of it as soon as possible. For example, the family care workers often work on convincing child and family services to allow new moms who need extra support to live at the shelter for the first three months of the baby's life and that has allowed many women to transition out of the shelter and youth protection with their babies. The NWSM also has an outreach worker who helps women once they leave the shelter through providing supports such as emergency grocery runs, going to medical appointments, and whatever else they may need.

Marti explained how the NWSM is working on fostering more positive relationships and implementing better approaches between child and family services, police and families. For example, the NWSM signed a collaboration agreement with the English Youth Protection Services in Quebec and they consistently work on making that a successful relationship. They also signed a collaboration agreement with the police in Montreal to try to address some of the systemic problems that exist within the police force, though she admitted this relationship has been more challenging.

Finally, Marti suggested that the government fund programs that offer a place to send families *as a whole* for rehabilitation/treatment services. This can help prevent situations where parents go to get much needed supports, but then their children are placed into care as they are getting helped. The current system breaks up families and looks at the situation individualistically when it is a relational problem that must be addressed holistically.

Inuit Nunangat and Child Welfare

Two representatives from Inuit land claim organizations spoke about the child welfare context in their respective regions.

Nunatsiavut

Darlene Jacque, Regional Social Worker Liaison, Nunatsiavut Government (NG), noted that there are currently 140 children in care in Nunatsiavut. There are 78 children placed within region and 62 are placed outside. The NG is noticing that many children are placed in care due to child neglect and domestic violence related to alcohol use.

Darlene mentioned several areas that the NG has taken on within child welfare to help support families. She explained how the NG created a Family Connections program, where staff have been hired to go into the community to work directly with families and help with issues that relate to child welfare. These staff attend court with the families, counselling sessions, offer supervision with their children, and are overall huge advocates for Inuit in the child welfare system in Nunatsiavut. Along with this, NG has created a housing initiative in Nain and Hopedale to help provide safe and affordable housing units for families who are involved with the child welfare system. All families involved with this program will receive in-home support from Family Connections workers on a regular, ongoing basis. These accommodations will solely be for families who are at-risk of losing of their children or who are preparing to have their children return home. She described that lack of safe and affordable housing can pose a huge barrier for many families involved with child welfare which is why more funding and support to expand this program would be very beneficial. It would help more at-risk families to find housing within Nunatsiavut. Darlene also reported that the NG is in the process of hiring a social worker whose sole duty will be to recruit and support foster homes within Nunatsiavut. Finding foster homes for children who need protection is a very challenging task, however, the NG recognizes the importance of keeping children as close to home as possible.

Darlene described how the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador will have a new *Children, Youth and Families Act* coming out in spring 2019 that the NG has been

closely involved with. Some notable aspects of the new Act include: a cultural continuity plan for children living in non-Indigenous homes; Indigenous representatives to be heard in court and made aware when there are court hearings around supervision and custody; and specific placement consideration for Indigenous children and Indigenous youth (order of priority: kin, close friends of family, home community, region). She noted that a devolution of services has been discussed within the NG but there is no firm timeline as to when this will actually happen because they want to ensure, prior to taking over, that it would be well-supported, well-funded and grounded in Inuit values. She emphasized how Inuit families need a more preventative and proactive approach that is based on relationship building and focused on strengthening families, rather than the heavily reactive and disciplinary system that is currently in place

Nunavik

Mina Beaulne, Integrated Youth and Family Services Advisor at the Nunavik Regional Board of Health and Social Services (NRBHSS), described how the NRBHSS is responsible for two health centres in Nunavik: the Inuulitsivik Health Centre (Hudson Coast); and Tulattavik Health Center (Ungava Coast). She highlighted that between July 22 and August 18, 2018 alone:

- Inuulitsivik reported 284 children being placed in foster care and 25 youth being placed in a rehabilitation centre; and
- Tulattavik reported 135 children and youth being placed in foster care and 19 youth in a rehabilitation centre.

Mina explained how all foster home placements go through the Director of Youth Protection and that each coast has a Director who are both non-Inuit. She also noted how most of the child and family service workers are non-Inuit, where in Hudson Coast only 19 out of 69 employees are Inuit. Another key challenge is the lack of foster homes in Nunavik resulting in a lot of Inuit children in care being placed in the South with non-Inuit families. To mitigate this challenge Mina's office made an agreement with the Government of Quebec to try to increase the foster home rate in Nunavik. One strategy

has been working on increasing the monetary compensation that foster homes can receive to better reflect the high cost of living in Nunavik.

She also explained how from 2009-2016 the NRBHSS created a strategic plan to better respond to the needs of Nunavik children and families. The outcome of this strategic plan was to implement a project that focuses on ensuring that youth protection services are thought of and created by Inuit, for Inuit.⁸ The Sukait Working Committee was established for this project and consists of representatives from the community, as well as other relevant/interested organizations in Nunavik. Currently, the project is in the phase of conducting community consultations with various stakeholders, including elders, families, service providers, etc.

⁸ For more detailed information on this project, please see Mina's PowerPoint presentation.

Closing Plenary

To conclude the first day, Yvonne Niego, Deputy Minister of Family Services, Government of Nunavut (GN), provided remarks on the child welfare situation in Nunavut. In Nunavut, there are currently 455 children and youth receiving services where approximately: 25% of those children are in their parental home on a plan of care with the family; 56% are in foster care; 3% are in territory in youth group homes; and, 15% are in care out of the territory.

Yvonne described how in Nunavut there are 25 communities that are 100% remote and fly-in, which means that the Department of Family Services remotely supervises 25 different locations across three time zones. To alleviate some of the challenges that come with this reality, the GN is working on creating an electronic database for child and family services. Prior to the implementation of this electronic filing system, social work case management was done solely by paper in Nunavut.

Yvonne stated that in the Northern context there must be an acknowledgment of colonization and its impact on entire systems (e.g. the healthcare, education, etc.). To remediate the effects of colonization and holistically promote Inuit well-being she emphasized the need for wrap-around services, such as addictions and mental health supports as this would have positive outcomes on entire families. She also suggested the need for stronger communication and information sharing across provinces and territories as well as a streamlined database system for child and family services. Key concerns she expressed are the extreme lack of infrastructure, financial capacity and human capacity in her territory. She therefore recommends an increase in:

- family services staff;
- cultural awareness and incorporation of Inuit values;
- Inuit-specific social work training;
- the number of Inuit foster parents; and
- long-term infrastructure investments such as daycare facilities, housing, etc.

Yvonne concluded her presentation by noting how important it is to invest in and support grassroots/non-profit organizations and front-line supports, such as the wellness centres in Nunavut.

Day 2 – Wednesday, September 19, 2018

From Gaps to Solutions: Promising Practices

Day two of the engagement session focused on moving from gaps to solutions. The morning commenced with a panel discussion on promising practices.

Kim Oliver, Team Leader for the Youth Centre in Nain, Nunatsiavut, talked about the youth centre and how it has been very helpful for Inuit youth in the region. Kim explained how the centre is open to those aged 13-30 and where they are welcome to hang out with friends and spend the night. She also described how the centre welcomes youth who are using substances so long as they do not disrupt and/or harm others. This is one way the centre strives to be non-judgmental and take a harm-reduction approach. The youths receive positive support from the staff and often go to them to discuss and seek advice on personal matters. Staff ensures they make themselves accessible in person and online as many youth prefer to reach out electronically. Additionally, staff and youth cook meals together each night at the youth centre and that helps promote food security for Inuit youth in Nunatsiavut. Many youths find the centre to be a safe and welcoming place.

Lizzie Aloupa, Prevention Officer at the Kativik Regional Police Force, discussed the *Good Touch/Bad Touch* program in Nunavik – a body-safety program that teaches children how to talk about experiencing abuse. Participants of the program are taught what abuse is, personal body safety rules, who can help them and what to do if they are threatened or harmed.⁹ The program is taught to children from kindergarten to grade five and the material is compatible with their age group. The programs are often done only in Inuktitut. Lizzie explained how she works with the school boards and the Nunavik Regional Board of Health and Social Services (NRBHSS) to run this program. She noted that prior to the *Good Touch/Bad Touch* program being taught in school she

⁹ For more information on the *Good Touch/Bad Touch* Program, please go to the Nunavik Regional Board of Health and Social Services' website: <https://nrbhss.ca/en/departments/public-health/prevention-and-health-promotion/good-touch-bad-touch-program>

spends two weeks in the community to train front line workers with “The Hidden Face”¹⁰ workshop. She also remarked that she only gives the workshop *if* the community is ready. If a community is unable to support children after with sustainable services and supports she will not conduct the workshop. Lizzie stated that she is happy to support anyone else who is interested in starting this program.

Mary Fredlund, Head Counsellor and Program Coordinator for the Rankin Inlet Spousal Abuse Counselling Program, then discussed the program that she runs at the Pulaarvik Kablu Friendship Centre – the only Friendship Centre in Nunavut. To her knowledge this program is the only one of its kind to take court-mandated offenders and run a 20-26 hour counselling program. The Spousal Abuse Counselling Program stemmed out of a review of criminal offences in Rankin Inlet, where it was noted that most crimes committed in the community were domestic violence. Communities were consulted and the majority of community members suggested that men should not go to jail, but rather get the supports they need. This resulted in the creation of the program.

Mary described how participants are usually in the program for 3-6-months and that group work is the most ideal way to run the program but that it is challenging to conduct group sessions with men working in the mines (e.g. being two weeks on, one week off). Consequently, a lot of the work is done one-on-one when the men are available. She also explained how another fundamental part of the program is supporting offenders’ partners – the program offers a group space with both women in healthy relationships and those who are victims/survivors of violence and abuse have discussions. The Pulaarvik Kablu Friendship Centre also offers a Handle with Care program¹¹ which is a

¹⁰ “The Hidden Face” Workshop was developed by Pauktuutit as part of their *Addressing the Needs of Child Sexual Abuse Project*. Pauktuutit created numerous tools for a four-day training workshop for frontline workers, educators, and others. The resources included: an adapted DVD public awareness tool called *The Hidden Face* from Greenlandic to Canadian Inuktitut dialect; facilitator and participant manuals; and workbooks. For more information see: <https://www.pauktuutit.ca/abuse-prevention/children-and-youth/workshop-hidden-face/>

¹¹ Prince Edward Island also uses this program with their Indigenous population. For more information see: <http://handlewithcarecanada.org/The-Program.aspx>

positive parenting program that reminds parents of what they are doing right and encourages them to do more of those things.

Mary concluded her presentation with four key take-aways based on her experience.

1. Violence begets violence, where 99.9% of men who have committed violence have been victims/survivors of violence themselves and are ashamed of their actions.
2. Children who witness abuse are in need of extra help.
3. Children being taken from one abusive situation and put into another makes no sense (try to help the biological/original family instead).
4. Hiring social workers from down south is a real barrier.

Overall, Mary emphasized how crucial it is to learn from those with lived experience and fully hear their voices, value what they are saying, believe in them, and ensure that potential legislation takes their stories into account.

Markus Wilcke, Council Member for Hamlet of Pangnirtung and Board Member of Pujualussait Healing Society, then presented on the situation of Inuit child welfare in Pangnirtung, Nunavut.¹² In January 2018, the community of Pangnirtung held a two-week workshop where they discussed pressing issues for community members, including high rates of teen suicide, increasing rates of family violence, inadequate law-enforcement and legal services, and no emergency shelters and treatment facilities. A key result of this workshop was the development a five-year community action plan. Markus explained how many of the issues mentioned above directly relate to child protection because children who witness violence are often traumatized by it and that can cause a cycle of violence. Also, when parents are experiencing their own trauma it makes it difficult to offer a consistently stable home environment causing many children to move away from the community. Markus recommends that a “Child Protection Act”

¹² For detailed information on Markus’ presentation, please see his written report and PowerPoint presentation.

must create opportunities for entire families to heal. Parents need holistic supports (e.g. mental health and addiction supports) to help them provide safe living environments for their children and youth.

On behalf of the Pujualussait Healing Society Board of Directors he expressed four key concerns.

1. Despite *Inuit Qaujimagatuqangit* (IQ) principles being considered in Nunavut's *Child and Family Services Act*, in reality they are not being translated into current practice.
2. Inuit custom adoptions are inadequately regulated and that can cause children to be placed into the care of adoptive parents who are unable to provide a safe environment.
3. Nunavut's *Child and Family Services Act* does not include provisions that mandate providing adequate support to primary caregivers to address the underlying issues that lead to child apprehension (e.g. addictions support, counselling, etc.).
4. Persons working with children in care and/or abusive homes (including foster/adoptive parents, daycare workers, teachers, community members, etc.) do not often have the knowledge, skills or resources to meet the needs of the children.

Due to these concerns, Markus made several important recommendations.

- Every effort must be made to ensure a child is placed with their family and culture.
- Include mandatory quality assurance legislation that ensures all potential caregivers are assessed for their ability to provide a safe and nurturing environment for a child and that they are monitored closely when a child is in their care.
- The placement of a child should be decided by a "Community Child Protection Committee" which could consist of a director of family services, social worker, parent, close relative, elder, etc.

- A holistic approach to child care and protection through considering factors such as language and culture, education, health and nutrition, social support and parental support should be adopted.
- Wrap-around services must be put into place and offered to primary care providers. This include treatment for addictions, counselling, cultural programs, etc.

From Gaps to Solutions: How to Practically Promote Inuit Child & Family Well-Being

Later in the morning participants broke into break-out groups to analyze two case studies. Participants reviewed the case studies in small groups and examined the root causes as to why Inuit children and youth may end up in care and how it could be better prevented. The smaller groups then reported back to the plenary. Key points raised in this session were:

- fiscal capacity is required for child and family services inside and outside of Inuit Nunangat;
- the need to address systemic issues derived from colonization such as Residential Schools;
- the need to change the system of apprehending children at birth and address stereotypical/automatic assumptions that a mom is unable to parent because she was in the system herself;
- providing supports and resources is fundamental – for instance, follow-up after a suicide attempt is critical and these follow-up services do not often exist in Inuit Nunangat;
- the need to promote education and address educational gaps in the North as the education quality is not the same as in the south; and
- the need for federal government's assistance with building safe shelters in communities.

The Connection Between IQ Principles & Child Welfare: Determining Key Guiding Principles and Minimum Standards for Potential Legislation

The latter part of the day focused on getting into the mindset of using an Inuit worldview to determine key principles that should be incorporated into potential federal legislation.

Laura Myers, Senior Policy Advisor, Pauktuutit, explained how Pauktuutit conducted an initial, high-level scan of provincial and territorial child and family services legislation in Nunavut, the Northwest Territories (NWT), Newfoundland and Labrador, Quebec, Ontario and Manitoba. Pauktuutit reviewed these pieces of legislation to get an idea of potential promising practices that could be applied to federal legislation, such as: the incorporation of IQ principles (Nunavut); extending support services until the age of 23 (NWT); and considering the proximity of the foster/adoptive home from the child or youth's home community (Quebec).

Rose Mary Cooper, Political Advisor to the Executive, Pauktuutit, then discussed *Inuit Qaujimaqatuqangit* (IQ) principles and demonstrated how using an Inuit worldview can help us determine guiding principles and minimum standards for federal legislation. She spoke specifically on how the last amendment of Nunavut's *Child and Family Services Act* (2014) included the incorporation of IQ, but that there needs to be practical application of these principles. For example, "may" language for support services means it is not binding and the Director of Family Services does not have to provide any services and this leaves a major gap for Inuit children and youth. Therefore, the language in legislation should be changed from "may" to "shall" to better reflect IQ principles (e.g. *Innuqatigiitsiarniq* focuses on caring for people and *Pijitsirniq* on serving and providing for family and community). Rose Mary remarked that we need to have in-depth discussions on how IQ principles should be incorporated to provide holistic supports for Inuit and demonstrate how Inuit children, youth and families have a right to these services.

Afterwards, participants convened into final breakout groups to respond to the following questions:

1. What would be key guiding principles and standards you would like to see in federal child & family services legislation? What are the musts?
2. How, as Inuit women, do we want to be engaged in the federal government's process of developing and implementing potential child welfare legislation?

The recommendations/responses below were raised.

Question 1: What would be key guiding principles and standards you would like to see in federal Child & Family Services legislation? What are the musts?

- certain words should be replaced that call to action (e.g., 'may' to 'shall');
- recognize Inuit identity federally and in all provincial and territorial acts;
- align wording federally and provincially/territorially and also align wording with instruments such as the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) and the Truth and Reconciliation Commission's (TRC) 94 Calls to Action;
- have an Inuit-specific Child and Youth Advocate in each province and territory;
- incorporation of IQ principles and Inuit traditional knowledge;
- the word "youth" should be included in the name of the Act;
- the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child should be a guiding principle;
- ensure legislation is available in all Inuit languages;
- every Director of Child and Family Services should meet regularly with Pauktuutit to make sure they are all working within the same Inuit values;
- ensure the Act applies to all Inuit, not just beneficiaries; and
- specifically mention the involvement of extended family (e.g. aunts, uncles, grandparents, family friends, etc.).

Question 2: How, as Inuit women, do we want to be engaged in the federal government's process of developing and implementing potential child welfare legislation?

- allocate adequate resources for community engagement;
- educate and train Inuit women so they can fully understand legislation and legislative process;
- the federal government should consult all of Inuit Nunangat before making any final decisions;
- meet with Inuit leadership regularly to monitor the Act and promote accountability;
- ensure voices of urban Inuit, Pauktuutit and all four land claim regions are heard;
- more time to work collaboratively with all land claim areas;
- Inuit women need a seat at the table and Pauktuutit should be co-authors of the legislation;
- listen to the voices of children and those with lived experience;
- have extensive consultations on policy and program development that comes out of this legislation; and
- allot more time for direct involvement at every step of the legislative process – not just a two-day engagement as it will take many months of collaborative engagement.

Conclusion

Based on these recommendations, common themes reveal themselves as potential guiding principles, including:

- **accessibility;**
- **cultural-competency;**
- **accountability;**
- **participatory, and**
- **equity/non-discrimination.**

Overall, having representatives from across Inuit Nunangat and urban centres in one room was an invaluable experience and allowed for many fruitful discussions. Though each region clearly has their own distinct needs, it is evident that there were many similar priorities for all participants. Pauktuutit sincerely thanks all representatives for taking the time to come out to this engagement session. The federal government has committed to staying engaged with Pauktuutit and participants on next steps in this important process.

References

Beaulne, Mina. (2018). *Nunavik Child and Youth Protection Services*. [PowerPoint Slides].

Hicks, Jack. (2018) *Inuit Child Welfare: The Data Gap*. [PowerPoint Slides].

Pauktuutit. (2018). Inuit Child Welfare Engagement Session: What We Have Heard. [PowerPoint Slides].

Pauktuutit. 2018 Resolutions. Retrieved from: <https://www.pauktuutit.ca/about-us/resolutions/>

Wilcke, Markus. (2018). Child Protection for Inuit: A Key Component in Addressing Pangnirtung's Urgency for Improved Personal and Family Support Services. [Report]

Appendix I - Summary of Key Recommendations

Key Recommendations from Federal Child & Family Services Legislation Engagement Session

September 18 – 19, 2018, Infinity Centre, Ottawa

- **Quality assurance is mandatory.** There should be **consistent report cards/evaluations** of this legislation to **ensure accountability.**
- **Child protection and support services must be mandatory** (e.g. healing supports for primary care providers, training for child protection workers, teachers, foster parents, etc.).
- Stronger wording is needed in legislation, e.g. changing “**may**” to “**shall.**”
- The **principles** in federal legislation **must be mandatory in all territorial and provincial child protection legislation.**
- Legislation should be **translated into Inuit languages.**
- **Jordan’s Principle** should be applied for Inuit children.
- The **UN Convention on the Rights of the Child** needs to be included as a guiding principle.
- **Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit (IQ)** principles need to be fully integrated into the Act.
- **Educate people at the grassroots level**, and in particular **women**, on how to understand and apply the legislation.
- Need to ensure the **voices of all Inuit are heard**, including **urban Inuit, Inuit women/Pauktuutit**, and **Inuit from all four land claim regions.**
- Every jurisdiction shall have an **Inuit Child and Youth Advocate.**

- Need for **reliable and comparable statistics on Inuit children in care**. It would be helpful for the federal government to put pressure on provincial/territorial governments to have this **done in collaboration with Inuit**.

Appendix II - Agenda

CHILD WELFARE ENGAGEMENT SESSION

September 18 – 19, 2018

Infinity Centre

Ottawa, Ontario

Agenda

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 18, 2018

8:00 – 9:00AM Registration

9:00 AM Plenary Session

Opening Prayer/Qulliq Lighting, Rebecca Anaviapik Soucie
Welcome and Opening Remarks, Rebecca Kudloo, President of
Pauktuutit Inuit Women of Canada
Natan Obed, President, Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami

9:25 AM Context- Federal Child and Family Services Legislation

Presentation by Isa Gros-Louis, Director General, Children and
Family Services Reform, Indigenous Services Canada

9:45 AM Health Break

**10:00 AM Inuit Child Welfare: The Needs, Gaps & Challenges for Inuit
Women and Children**

What We Have Heard, Presentation by Tracy O’Hearn, Pauktuutit
Inuit Child Welfare: The Data Gap, Presentation by Jack Hicks

10:40 AM Q&A

**11:00 AM Inuit Child Welfare: The Needs, Gaps & Challenges for Inuit
Women and Children**

Breakout Groups

11:45 PM	Check-in & Report Back
12:00 PM	Lunch (Provided)
1:00 PM	Urban Inuit & Child Welfare Presentation by: Rachel Dutton & Gloria Penner, Winnipeg; Karen Baker-Anderson, & Janice Messam Ottawa; Marti Miller, Montreal
1:30 PM	Breakout Groups
2:15 PM	Check in and Report Back
2:30 PM	Health Break
2:45 PM	Inuit Nunangat & Child Welfare Presentation by: Mina Beaulne, Nunavik; Darlene Jacque, Nunatsiavut
3:15 PM	Breakout Groups
4:00PM	Check in and Report Back
4:15 PM	Yvonne Niego, Deputy Minister of Family Services, GN Plenary discussion Write down the most important point/lesson you took-away from today
5:00PM	End of Day

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 19, 2018

- 8:00 – 9:00AM** **Registration**
- 9:00 AM** **Plenary Session**
Opening Prayer/Qulliq Lighting, Rebecca Anaviapik Soucie
Recap of Previous Day, Lauren Evans
- 9:20 AM** **From Gaps to Solutions: Promising Practices**
Presentation by: Kim Oliver, Nain Youth Centre; Lizzie Aloupa,
Kativik Regional Police Force; Mary Fredlund, Rankin Inlet Spousal
Abuse Counselling Program
- 9:50AM** Discussion Period
- 10:15 AM** **Health Break**
- 10:30AM** **From Gaps to Solutions: How to Practically Promote Inuit
Child & Family Well-Being**
Child Protection: A Key Component in Addressing Pangnirtung's
Urgency, Presentation by Markus Wilcke, Council Member, Hamlet
of Pangnirtung
- 10:45AM** Q&A
- 11:00AM** Breakout Sessions to Analyze Case Studies (Staircase Model)
- 12:00 PM** **Lunch (Provided)**
- 1:00 PM** **From Gaps to Solutions: How to Practically Promote Inuit
Child & Family Well-Being Continued...**
Check in & Report Back from Case Study Analysis

- 1:40 PM** **The Connection Between Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit (IQ) Principles & Child Welfare: Determining Key Guiding Principles & Minimum Standards for Potential Legislation**
Brief Presentation by Rose Mary Cooper & Laura Myers, Pauktuutit
- 2:00 PM** Breakout Groups
- 2:45 PM** **Health Break**
- 3:00 PM** **The Connection Between Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit (IQ) Principles & Child Welfare: Determining Key Guiding Principles & Minimum Standards for Potential Legislation Continued...**
Check in and Report Back
- 3:45 PM** **Closing Plenary**
Questions:
 - 1) What would be key guiding principles and standards you would like to see in federal Child & Family Services legislation? (What are the musts?)
 - 2) How, as Inuit women, do we want to be engaged in the federal government's process of developing and implementing potential child welfare legislation?
- 4:30 PM** **End of Session**

Federal Inuit Child Welfare Reform:
A Response by Tungasuvvingat Inuit from an Ontario Inuit
Perspective



Department of Child and Youth Policy
mgr-cyp@tungasuvvingatinuit.ca

SUMMARY

When developing a strategy to address Inuit child welfare in Canada, the majority of political representation focuses only on the well-being of children in the four land claim regions (Inuit Nunangat). However, due to migration and high population growth, over 30% of Inuit live outside traditional territories (Statistics Canada, 2016). An approach solely focused on Inuit Nunangat disregards a significant portion of the Inuit population living outside Land Claim Regions, including children sent to Ontario specifically for child welfare or protection services. Therefore, the non-Nunangat perspective must be considered to achieve an equitable federal response.

In addition to lacking representation, Inuit living outside of traditional territories face many unique challenges and lack sufficient cultural and community support. Because Inuit have no historical presence or traditional lands in Ontario, there are very few family and children's services that are culturally appropriate or safe. The consequence is a disproportionately high acuity of need for non-Nunangat Inuit, negatively impacting the community's social determinants of health, and resulting in poor socio-economic and health outcomes. This is reflected in the high percentage of Inuit who have contact with child protection services.

To address the issue of insufficient culturally safe child welfare models and supports for Inuit in Ontario, it is imperative to have cultural continuity for Inuit child welfare across Canada. This requires a non-Nunangat Inuit policy framework for Inuit living outside of Land Claim Regions.

Tungasuvvingat Inuit is in a unique position as the designate to ITK, the Listed Community for Inuit in Ontario, to facilitate the design and implementation of an Inuit-specific child welfare model in Ontario that can serve as an example for other provinces, but currently lacks support from provincial and federal government to carry out this responsibility.

ISSUE

According to a disaggregated study of census data, Tungasuvvingat Inuit's client data, and community events, we estimate the Inuit population in Ontario is presently close to 10 000. Inuit have a disproportionately high acuity of need compared to other indigenous groups in the province and have insufficient cultural supports. As a result, Inuit children are grossly overrepresented in the provincial child welfare system, while being disconnected from culture and community.

A federal strategy on Inuit child welfare must ensure it supports Inuit equitably, regardless of where they live in the country. This demands special consideration and measures for cultural continuity for Inuit living outside Inuit Nunangat.

Currently, Tungasuvvingat Inuit is the only agency working to implement an Inuit-specific child welfare model in Ontario based on culturally appropriate preventative support for families, but does not have provincial or federal support. With the proper investment, this model could be replicated across other provinces and better serve the needs of Inuit outside Inuit Nunangat.

Frequently, a pan-aboriginal approach is adopted, which reflects the cultural and historical needs of First Nations communities. This approach excludes unique needs of Inuit.

An increasing amount of Inuit live outside traditional homelands; the population in Ontario is estimated at 10,000. Population growth rates in Ontario continue to rise because of migration and high fertility rates and are distributed across the province, with the largest population in Ottawa. See Figure 4.



Figure 4. Distribution of Inuit across Ontario

Inuit have a very high acuity of need across many social determinants of health, which accounts for the disproportionate percentage of Inuit children in the child welfare system in ON. The following are a few examples:

- a. Inuit constitute a youthful population, with 58% of Inuit under the age of 25. The median age of the Inuit population is 23 years, compared with 41 years for non-Aboriginal people (Statistics Canada, 2011).
- b. Between 2010 and 2015, a total of 262 Inuit children and youth were involved with the Children’s Aid Society of Ottawa, representing almost 23% of the city’s total Inuit child and youth population. According to the society’s 2015 numbers, 38 Inuit children and youth received in-care support, representing 11.5% of the total number of Inuit children and youth in the city. In comparison, in-care rates for First Nations and Métis children and youth were 0.8% and 0.2%, respectively. (Tungasuvvingat Inuit, 2016).

From the information released by CASO October 2015:

- Aboriginal population make up in Ottawa: First Nations (53%), Métis (37%), Inuit (5%)

Total aboriginal children and youth population	First Nations	Metis	Inuit
10164	7917	2570	323
In-care	65	7	38
In-care % of Population count	0.8%	0.2%	11.5%*

*This indicates that although Inuit make up only 5% of indigenous children in Ontario, they make up 11.5% of indigenous children in care.

- c. The Inuit language still remains one of the most resilient Aboriginal languages in the country. In 2011, 63% of the Inuit population could converse in Inuktitut (Statistics Canada, 2011).
- d. Highschool completion rate 59%, with only 7% with post-secondary education.
- e. 58.3% of Inuit between the ages of 20 and 40 reported that their family could not afford to buy all the food they needed (Lambden et al.,2006).
- f. Youth suicide is of high concern for Inuit since suicide rates for Inuit youth are among the highest in the world, at 11 times the Canadian national average (Statistics Canada, 2008).
- g. In Ottawa, 15.6% are homeless/at risk compared to 0.6% of total population (Ref: Homeless Hub and Point in time count in Ottawa, ON June 2014). Data from the 2007-2008 Inuit Health Survey also indicates that 1 in 5 homes provided temporary shelter to Inuit homeless visitors. Housing problems have been associated with low achievement levels in schools, spousal abuse, respiratory tract infections among infants, depression, and substance abuse (ITK, 2004; NTI, 2005).

CURRENT MODEL OF INUIT CHILD WELFARE IN ONTARIO

In April 2018, a new *Child, Youth and Family Services Act* (CYFSA) was proclaimed in Ontario. For the first time, Inuit are recognized as distinct peoples in Ontario. As the representational organization for Inuit in Canada, ITK will become a “Listed Community” under the Ontario CYFSA, with Tungasuvvingat Inuit (TI) serving as the provincial designate (on behalf of ITK). The listing will take effect July 2019.

Tungasuvvingat Inuit is in a unique position to carry out the work of the Listed Community in Ontario as a wrap-around service delivery organization that has provided culturally appropriate services for over 30 years. The model developed through TI and ITK’s collaboration will be able to act as a model for Inuit specific child welfare not only in Ontario, but across Southern Canada and will be the first of its kind.

The challenges of developing this model are significant. TI will provide service to Inuit across the province, regardless of what regional CAS they come in contact with since there is no traditional territory that defines jurisdictional boundaries. Services delivered to children and youth must also be in accordance with the direction of the Land Claim Organization the child or youth originates from. There is no comparable model for this type of service delivery in the country.

The Act and the responsibilities named in the Act take effect July 1, 2019. As of yet, ITK and TI have received no support or funding or capacity support to be able to realize these responsibilities.

TI envisions working with Land Claim Organizations, ITK, and CAS’s to create a preventative model based on culturally appropriate supports and advocacy for each child. TI would also provide capacity development for local CAS agencies to ensure children, youth, and their families are receiving culturally appropriate services uninhibited by language barriers, with a strong connection to community to foster cultural continuity throughout the plan of care. Elements of this model include:

- Cultural safety training for service providers working with Inuit
- Accurate and protected data collection system to monitor Inuit clients
- A case worker from TI that plays an active role in developing culturally appropriate plan of care, with recommendations for activities that maintain cultural continuity
- Strengths-based resilience packages for youth that introduce them to the provincial community, services available in their area and according to their Land Claim Region of origin, and cultural activities

- Offer additional supports to the child, youth, or family through Jordan's Principle funding and advocacy.

CONSIDERATIONS

1. Inuit do not have a historical presence in Ontario. As a modern diaspora, there are very few or no culturally appropriate services and programs available outside of Ottawa. For many Inuit, the transition to the South results in significant culture shock, isolation, and distress, compounding existing socio-economic challenges.
2. As a separate and unique indigenous group, Inuit require different supports, grounded in and accountable to their own culture, practices, and community. Cultural continuity is vital to developing self-efficacy in youth, promoting positive self-identity, fostering community support, and providing resources to build resilience. It is absolutely necessary that Inuit children in care receive culturally appropriate services and support, regardless of where they are in the province. Such services must be accountable to the Inuit community of Ontario.
3. In 2018, a new Child Youth and Family Services Act named Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami (ITK) as the Listed Community for Inuit in Ontario. ITK designated TI to carry out the work of the Listed Community in Ontario. However, no level of government has invested in the capacity of TI to carry out this work, which will commence on July 1, 2019.
4. The model for Inuit child welfare in ON can act as an example to be replicated in other provinces.
5. TI engaged 117 Ontario service providers in 17 communities and identified a number of themes that speak to the need for additional programming support for Inuit:
 - a. Service providers are ready to work with TI.
 - b. There is a desire for Inuit cultural awareness training.
 - c. Additional communication and information sharing is desired.
 - d. There are gaps in the knowledge held by service providers about TI and Inuit culture.
6. The following calls to action from the Canadian Truth and Reconciliation Commission:
 - a. 1. Reducing the number of Aboriginal children in care by:
 - ... ii. Providing adequate resources to enable Aboriginal communities and child-welfare organizations to keep Aboriginal families together where it is safe to do so, and to keep children in culturally appropriate environments, regardless of where they reside.
 - ... iv. Ensuring that social workers and others who conduct child-welfare investigations are properly educated and trained about the potential for Aboriginal communities and families to provide more appropriate solutions to family healing.
 - b. 5. We call upon the federal, provincial, territorial, and Aboriginal governments to develop culturally appropriate parenting programs for Aboriginal families.
7. The Government of Canada is committed to the following specific actions to address the over-representation of Indigenous children and youth in care in Canada.
 - a. Continue to fully implement the orders from the Canadian Human Rights Tribunal including Jordan's Principle, and reform First Nations child and family services including moving to a flexible funding model.
 - b. Work with partners to shift the focus of programming to culturally-appropriate prevention, early intervention, and family reunification.
 - c. Work with our partners to support communities to draw down jurisdiction in the area of child and family services, including exploring co-developed federal legislation.

- d. Participate and accelerate the work at tripartite and technical tables that are in place across the country in supporting reform.
 - e. Support Inuit and Métis Nation leadership in their work to advance meaningful, culturally-appropriate reform of child and family services.
8. Through the OICYS, the provincial Government of Ontario has committed to:
- a. transforming Ontario's relationship with Indigenous children and youth, and their families
 - b. prioritizing preventative services for Indigenous children and youth that are culturally appropriate
 - c. building a high-quality integrated services network that supports Indigenous children and youth
 - d. enabling government and Indigenous service providers to track and evaluate their work in implementing the strategy

With these factors in mind, there is a need for provincial and federal government to provide equitable support for Inuit children and youth in the province of Ontario.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The federal government's response to indigenous child welfare reform recognizes and addresses Inuit outside Inuit Nunangat and produces a clear response to their unique needs.
2. The federal government invests in an Inuit-specific child welfare models for Inuit outside traditional territories.
3. The federal government aligns with the government of Ontario and Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami, which has named Tungasuvvingat Inuit as the designate for the Listed Community in Ontario under the 2018 Child Youth and Family Services Act, by investing in TI to form an Inuit-specific child welfare model in Ontario, which can serve as a model for other provinces. in the South.
4. The federal government's response focuses on prevention, using a strength-based approach that transforms the system from reactionary to proactive. Requirements and prohibitions related to prevention and early intervention need to be clearly spelled out. Without clear written expectations, an intervention-focused system will continue to react to family crises and prioritize post-crisis intervention rather than the real priority, which is preventative measures that keep children and youth within their families.
5. The new strategy should reflect Inuit values, traditions, and beliefs to empower communities to address and overcome historic trauma-induced barriers and negative social determinants of health with respect and acknowledgment of guiding principles.
6. The reform should transform current systems away from within historic delivery, policy and procedures to promote respectful and effective relationships with Inuit, flexible approaches, and emphasis on keeping families together.
7. Evaluation and measurement processes should be culturally appropriate and reflective of community priorities. This involves eliminating power inequities with Inuit knowledge and adopting an alternative method of evaluation where measures of success are determined by the community.