NORQUEST COLLEGE

Guidelines for Research Involving Indigenous Peoples in Canada

2022

Authors & Working Group Members:

Karrie Auger (former NorQuest employee - Manager, Indigenous Peoples Education & Strategic Initiatives)

Dr. Cindy Boucher, Senior Policy Advisor

Louella Chonkolay, Senior Career Advisor

Dr. Norma Dunning (former NorQuest employee - Curriculum Developer)

Dr. Erika Goble, Associate Dean Research

Dr. Tibetha Kemble (former NorQuest employee - Dean, Arts & Sciences)

Lorisia McLeod (former NQ employee - Instruction Librarian)

Elliott Young (former NorQuest employee - Indigenous Community Engagement Advisor)

Contents

Purpose

In response to the experiences of NorQuest College researchers working in Indigenous Peoples contexts and in light of the Tri-Council Policy Statement, 2nd Edition, the Research Office and the Division of Indigenous Relations & Supports took up the task of articulating and defining research guidelines for the implementation of Chapter 9 of the policy. A group of Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples met over a period of two years to discuss in-depth issues related to research involving Indigenous peoples and to draft this set of guidelines. These guidelines are intended to inform NorQuest College faculty, staff and students and Research Office staff supporting researchers, as well as external researchers wishing to conduct projects with NorQuest students and staff. These guidelines will assist the college's research administrators with internal reviews of projects. In this way, these guidelines are intended to guide all aspects of all research with Indigenous Peoples.

The impetus in the creation of these guidelines is both complex and multifaceted; however, and as will be explored below, it is abundantly clear that Indigenous people, cultures, knowledges, and languages have been "studied to death" with little to no reciprocal benefit. In that regard, we can no longer ignore the understanding that research relationships have often been extractive, damaging, and/or without consideration for the Indigenous peoples and their needs. Through that lens, the imperative is upon us to actively chart a new path for research that aligns with the values of community collaboration, long-term relationship building, and mutually respectful reciprocity.

NorQuest College requires all researchers to familiarize themselves with the existing protocols and expectations surrounding research in First Nation, Metis and Inuit communities that are explored throughout this Guideline. It is essential for researchers to understand and refer to this Guideline before they approach communities and/or Indigenous peoples with their research proposals. The principles and practices explained throughout this Guideline should be applied and adapted to the unique circumstances of the research study and the community.

Outline

This document is organized in three sections. Section 1 explores and articulates the historical contexts that provide the impetus for the development of NorQuest College specific guidelines pertaining to research involving Indigenous peoples in what is now known as Canada. This section also provides a historical overview of the transformations within, and the various phases and related impacts of, research involving Indigenous peoples to demonstrate the harms inflicted on Indigenous peoples and communities as a result of extractive research processes and practices, followed by the resurgence and reclamation of Indigenist research that is controlled, owned, and directed by Indigenous peoples themselves.

Section 2 articulates the scope, principles, and processes of Research Involving Indigenous Peoples that are outlined by the Tri Council Policy Statement, yet are undefined. The intent of this section is to make clear the principles and concepts of Indigenous research that seek to build an understanding of how non-Indigenous researchers must approach and design research for and with Indigenous peoples and communities in ways that cause no more harm. Moreover, Section 2 also sets forth an understanding that research involving Indigenous peoples must principally benefit not the sole researcher or the research team, but rather Indigenous peoples and communities themselves. This rights-based framework serves as an active catalyst in changing the trajectory of research involving Indigenous peoples by redressing the painful colonial legacy of research, and advancing the process of reconciliation that has as its core the principle aim of rebuilding and strengthening Indigenous communities, practices, traditions, and language, for current and future generations.

Section 3 provides a robust overview of the elements to consider when applying this Guideline. Specifically, attention is called to 8 key elements including:

1. Relationships and relationship building
2. Research questions
3. Ethics approval
4. Methods and methodology
5. Analysis and reporting
6. Documentation
7. Data Management and control
8. Decolonizing research.

While these the above noted elements are presented as considerations to NorQuest researchers, we strongly encourage you to move beyond the normative relationship between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples that has historically been framed by our individual and collective dehumanization, towards a more meaningful realization and recognition of our rights as humans and as the First Peoples, and our persistent calls to be respected. We consider this document to be more than a simple guideline, but rather as a purposeful step towards right- relations between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples at NorQuest College in the area of research and beyond.

Key Concepts & Definitions

We recognize that the ways in which terms and concepts are defined can help shape and direct activity related to research with Indigenous peoples and communities. In that regard, we rely on, and refer to, the [Tri Council Policy Statement on Key Concepts and Definitions.](#)

Section 1: Background / Introduction

Overview of the Tri Council Policy Statement

The Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR), the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC), and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) developed the Tri Council Policy Statement (TCPS) as a joint policy that "expresses the continuing commitment by the three Councils to the people of Canada, to promote the ethical conduct of research involving human subjects" (Government of Canada, 2017).

This commitment was first expressed in the publication of guidelines in the late 1970s and work on the joint policy was started by the formation of the Tri-Council Working Group in 1994 and was formally adopted in 1998. Since then, the Tri Council Policy Statement has undergone substantive changes in response to emerging ethical issues within the sphere of research involving human subjects, and within the scope of this work, specific considerations for research with Indigenous peoples and communities.

Overview of the History of the TCPS and Research Involving Indigenous Peoples

The first TCPS released in 1998 contained a brief section entitled *Research Involving Aboriginal Peoples* (Section 6) and was drafted with the rudimentary understanding that "aboriginal (sic) peoples have rights and interests which deserve respect and recognition by the research community." (BC Mental Health & Substance Use Services (BCMHSUS), 1998). However, "sufficient discussions with representatives of the affected groups, or with various organizations or researchers" had not yet occurred and the first TCPS was drafted with the intent of serving as a discussion point on three key areas: (1) assisting researchers and Research Ethics Boards in determining which projects might involve research on such groups; (2) to illustrate ethical issues and conduct for such research; and (3) to indicate good practices that researchers should consider. (BCMHSUS, 1998).

The first draft of Section 6 in the 1998 TCPS articulated to the research community across Canada, perhaps for the first time, that there "are historical reasons why indigenous (sic) or aboriginal (sic) peoples may legitimately feel apprehensive about the activities of researchers" (BCMHSUS, n.p.). Specifically, the TCPS states,

> In many cases, research has been conducted in respectful ways and has contributed to the well-being of aboriginal communities. In others, aboriginal peoples have not been treated with a high degree of respect by researchers. Inaccurate or insensitive research has caused stigmatization. On occasion, the cultural property and human remains of indigenous peoples have been expropriated by researchers for permanent exhibition or storage in institutes, or offered for sale. Researchers have sometimes

treated groups merely as sources of data, and have occasionally endangered dissident indigenous peoples by unwittingly acting as information-gatherers for repressive regimes. Such conduct has harmed the participant communities and spoiled future research opportunities.

Although considered advanced for its time, Section 6 of the 1998 TCPS was only beginning to understand the importance of setting standards in respect of research with Indigenous peoples and communities, but also to articulating and respecting the impacts of: (1) the long and painful history of unethical, harmful, and disrespectful research by non-Indigenous researchers; (2) the national and international rights-frameworks of Indigenous peoples vis-a-vis research; and (3) the significance of, and benefits to, Indigenous led, designed, and controlled/owned research.

Phases and Impacts of Research Involving Indigenous Peoples

National and international research involving Indigenous peoples and communities is not new. As will be explored in the sections to follow, research involving Indigenous peoples has spanned more than 2 centuries and has undergone significant transformation over time in response to major social, cultural, and political events. As Wilson (2003) describes, "academic research and researchers reflect the sociocultural and political context in which their research is framed." (p. 162). Through that lens, exploring the various phases of research involving Indigenous peoples is important to help "reconceptualize and reframe from an Aboriginal position, the structural relations towards Aboriginal people and Aboriginal lands and the role research has played in these relations." (Martin, 2003, in Wilson, 2003, p. 162). Martin (in Wilson, 2003) goes on to describe the six major phases of research involving Indigenous peoples which are: (1) terra nullius, (2) traditionalizing, (3) assimilationist, (4) early Aboriginal research, (5) recent Aboriginal research, and (6) Indigenist research. In describing these phases, Martin contextualizes the mindset "that carries forward and is compounded in the next and either nourished or placed into a state of remission by the political climate of the time." (Wilson, p. 162).

While each of the phases described by Martin are important in their own right and support and deepen our understanding of the shifts in mindset and the socio-political landscape that surrounds Indigenous and non-Indigenous relations, the scope of this work will describe, in part, the socio-political underpinnings over the last 60 years that have informed and ultimately shaped our present understanding of research involving Indigenous peoples and communities – and ultimately, the impetus for the Tri-Council Policy Statement that directs researchers' compliance with a policy framework for research activities and the ethical conduct of research involving humans.

In the sections to follow, we will explore some of the major socio-political events that have shifted the structural relationship between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples and that describe, in a general way, the effects these events have had on research involving Indigenous peoples.

Hawthorne Report (1966)

Following nearly 100 years of attempts by the federal government to absorb Indigenous peoples into the body politic and to "get rid of the Indian problem" (First Nation Caring Society, 2016), by 1963 it was clear that despite every attempt Indigenous peoples would remain distinct and that
the impacts of failed social policy and their aggressive assimilation regimes (i.e., Indian Residential Schools, Enfranchisement Act, the Pass System, forced sterilization, the 60s Scoop, forced relocations, etc.) had left Indigenous peoples and communities severely socially and economically marginalized.

To better understand these and other issues, the federal government enlisted Harry B. Hawthorne, a non-Indigenous anthropologist from the University of British Columbia, to undertake what was at the time, the most comprehensive survey of the social conditions of Indigenous communities in Canada. In his report, "*A Survey of the Contemporary Indians of Canada*" (Hawthorne, 1967), Hawthorne concluded that Indigenous peoples and communities were the most marginalized and disadvantaged population in Canada, and were thus "citizens minus" (Hawthorne, 1967, V.1, Part 1). An important consideration in this regard, is that in asserting Indigenous peoples as such, Hawthorne was among a small few who dared to challenge the federal government for its failures in respect of Indigenous peoples. His critique of the federal government would thus form his rationale as to why Indigenous peoples should be viewed as "citizens plus."

> *A further part of the basic and general goal of the Report is to review the arguments establishing the right of Indians to be citizens plus, and to spell out some of the ways in which this status can be given practical meaning. The argument presents facts and legal and political decisions leading to the conclusion that the right derives from promises made to them, from expectations they were encouraged to hold, and from the simple fact that they once occupied and used a country to which others came to gain enormous wealth in which the Indians have shared little. (1967, V.1, Part 1, p. 6, emphasis added)*

> > *We discuss the possible conflict between the status of citizens plus and the egalitarian attitudes both Whites and Indians hold. On the other hand, the reverse status Indians have held, as citizens minus, which is equally repugnant to a strongly egalitarian society has been tolerated for a long time, perhaps because it was out of sight, and so out of mind of most people. (1967, V.1, Part 1, p. 6, emphasis added)*

> > > *(7) Indians should be regarded as 'citizens plus"; in addition to the normal rights and duties of citizenship, Indians possess certain additional rights as charter members of the Canadian community.*

> > > *(8) The Indian Affairs Branch has a special responsibility to see that the 'plus' aspects of Indian citizenship are respected, and that governments*

> *and the Canadian people are educated in the acceptance of their*
> *existence. (1967, V.1, Part 1, Recommendations, p. 13, emphasis added*

Although the assessments and conclusions made by Hawthorne and his team of non-Indigenous researchers were, for the most part, accurate in representing the impacts of woefully inadequate social policy regimes, they were, however, conclusions made *about* Indigenous peoples, *without* Indigenous peoples input, engagement, or consultation. Further, in advancing the Hawthorne report to the federal government at the time, Indigenous peoples and communities had little input or influence over the uptake and/or outcomes of this work and communities were evaluated by Hawthorne and his team using Western methods.

Unfortunately, despite clearly articulating the need for Indigenous peoples to hold distinct and additional status ("plus"), the then Trudeau government interpreted Hawthorne's findings as an indication that Indian status was the source of inequality which they used as the principle measure for the development of the 1969 White Paper that sought to amend the Indian Act, dismantle the Department of Indian Affairs, transfer responsibility of Indigenous peoples to the provincial governments, and to remove any distinct status held by Indigenous peoples.

> Widespread disapproval by Indigenous leaders, peoples and communities followed the 1969 White Paper[1] and in 1969 and 1970 Harold Cardinal and the Indian Association of Alberta produced their respective rebukes to the assertion of a Just Society[2], with the now seminal works entitled *The Unjust Society* and the *Red Paper,* or *Citizens Plus*[3]. By 1971, the White Paper was considered moot given the widespread disapproval it received; however, the process served as a powerful tool for the emerging rights-movement among Indigenous peoples to protect their distinct status, uphold treaty rights, advance the obligations of the crown and to heed and respect Indigenous voices. As Turner (2006) describes,

> Throughout the fall of 1968 and the winter and spring of 1969, he [Trudeau] carried out a consultative process with Indians, with the goal of reviving the Indian Act. This raised hopes among many Indians that perhaps the Canadian government was finally going to do something about improving their deplorable standard of living. The consultations were extensive and represented a shift in the government's view of the place of Indians in Canadian society. But then the federal government surprised every by releasing the White Paper in June 199; and to make matters worse, this paper seemed not to incorporate any of the voices from Indian Country. The Trudeau government never explained why the paper was released with complete disregard for Indian participation – and many Indians felt they were owed an explanation. (p. 16)

By the mid-1980, alongside national discussions about the repatriation of the Constitution, Indigenous peoples and communities fought and won for the entrenchment of Aboriginal and treaty rights into the Supreme Law of Canada under Section 35 which recognizes and affirms the distinct rights of Indians, Inuit and Metis peoples.

An important consideration about Hawthorne's work and the struggles that followed, is that his work is perhaps the most salient example of the deleterious impacts of research conducted *on* Indigenous peoples without their direct involvement in the design or implementation, but also with regards to the lack of input on the identification of need, direction, desired outcomes/impacts of the research findings for the population it intends to serve. Indeed, while Hawthorne was not the first non-Indigenous researcher to conduct research on Indigenous peoples, his work and the resultant conflict that arose from the maladapted conclusions made by his research serve as a powerful framework for research involving Indigenous peoples and communities to follow.

Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples (1996)

In the nearly 30 years that followed Hawthorne's research, little to no improvements had been made to the poor social and economic outcomes disproportionately experienced by Indigenous peoples in Canada, nor had improvements been made to the Indigenous-Crown relationship. Indeed, between 1963 and 1991 outcomes observed among Indigenous populations in the areas of health, education, child welfare, incarceration, and language and culture had actually gotten worse over time and events such as the Oka Crisis and the Meech Lake Accord, among others, fueled the need for a deeper examination of both the relationship and the root causes of the deep and persistent inequalities.

In 1991, the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples[4] (RCAP) was established with the

> broad mandate...[of undertaking] a large and complex research agenda. Consultations were held with Aboriginal groups on the development of the research plan. The integrated research plan, which was published in 1993, had four theme areas: governance; land and economy; social and cultural issues; and the North**.** (Canadian Encyclopedia, 2019, n.p.).

The federal government, now working in partnership with Indigenous peoples and communities, spend the next 5 years working on the largest and most comprehensive Indigenous-led research project that would set the foundation for a 20-year agenda for implementing lasting and meaningful change.

The RCAP covered a vast range of issues, was more than 4,000 pages long, contained more than 400 recommendations, and called for sweeping changes to the relationship between Aboriginal, non-Aboriginal people and the governments in Canada. Perhaps most importantly, the RCAP was among the first to articulate the need and the rights-based framework for research involving Indigenous peoples.

> The gathering of information and its subsequent use are inherently political. In the past, Aboriginal people have not been consulted about what information should be collected, who should gather that information, who should maintain it, and who should have access to it. The information gathered may or may not have been relevant to the questions, priorities and concerns of Aboriginal peoples. Because

data gathering has frequently been imposed by outside authorities, it has met with resistance in many quarters. (Government of Canada, 1996, V.3. p. 498)

Ownership, Control, Access & Possession Principles (OCAP ®) (1998)

Shortly after the release of the RCAP, the First Nations Governance Committee began discussions in 1998 about setting standards that establish how "First Nations data should be collected, protected, used, or shared." (First Nations Information Governance Centre (FNIGC), 2019). As expressed by the FNIGC and others, Indigenous peoples have often described their dissatisfaction with being "the focus of too much research (i.e. "Researched to Death"), that research projects are too often conducted by non-First Nations people, that research results are not returned to communities, and that research does not benefit First Nations people or communities." (FNIGC, 2019). The FNIGC goes on to describe some of the motivating examples of past research that have harmed Indigenous peoples (e.g. the Barrow Alcohol Study of alcoholism in Alaska in the 1970s, the Nuu-chah-nulth First Nation "Bad Blood" research of the 1980s, and the diabetes study of the Havasupai Tribe in Arizona during the 1990s.) As such, the FNIGC believed it was important to develop principles for research with Indigenous communities to eliminate the harm and invasiveness of non-Indigenous research processes and to help articulate Indigenous sovereignty and jurisdiction over information about their communities and their own data.

According to the First Nations Information Governance Centre (FNIGC), OCAP principles are responsive to the understanding that,

> There is no law or concept in Western society that recognizes community rights and interests in their information, which is in large part why OCAP® was created. OCAP® ensures that First Nations own their information and respects the fact that they are stewards of their information, much in the same way that they are stewards over their own lands. It also reflects First Nation commitments to use and share information in a way that maximizes the benefit to a community, while minimizing harm. (FNIGC, 2019)

The scope of OCAP Principles will be explored in greater detail later in this document. However, it is important to note the timeline of the FNIGC's work in respect of larger national movements among Indigenous peoples vis-a-vis research, and to the contribution OCAP to emerging understandings within the national consciousness to the rights of Indigenous peoples.

Indigenous Scholars and Indigenous Research (1990s)

By the mid-1990s, Indigenous scholars throughout Canada and New Zealand were starting to assert their power and authority over research paradigms, processes, protocols, methods, and methodologies. As Wilson (2003) describes, "They began to articulate their own Indigenist perspective and demanded to be heard doing so" (p. 168). Over the course of two decades (from 1970s to 1990s), Indigenous researchers such as Dr. Linda Tuhiwai-Smith, Dr. Shawn Wilson, Dr. Cora Weber-Pillwax, Dr. Patsy Steinhauer, Dr. Marie Battiste, Dr. Youngblood

Henderson (among others) initiated the process of moving Indigenous perspectives and research processes/protocols from the Eurocentric "add and stir" (Battiste, 1998) model that produced and reproduced Indigenous peoples as the "other" to be studied and examined, towards decolonial and decolonized possibilities. As Dr. Evelyn Steinhauer expresses,

> It is exciting to know that finally our voices are being heard and that Indigenous scholars are now talking about and using Indigenous knowledge in their research. I think it is through such dialogue and discussion that Indigenous research methodologies will one day become common practice, for it is time to give voice and legitimize the knowledge of our people. (2002, p. 70, in Wilson, 2003, p. 171).

In the present context, Indigenous research methodologies have become an established and valid frame of research that asserts Indigenous sovereignty and control over the research process, but also sets out the principles of Indigenous research that stand in stark contrast to Eurocentric understandings of validity, objectivity, and apoliticality. More specifically, Wilson explains that "with the notion of objectivity in "valid" research comes the idea of separating before one can unite, or of looking for the smallest individual component before seeing the big picture." (2003, p. 171). Wilson goes on to explain,

> Western research has a history of people being told to amputate a part of themselves to be able to fit something that's rigid, and not built for them in the first place…..practices in the Western paradigm can amputate your sexuality, you gender, your language, and your spirituality by looking at individual components rather than by looking at the total person and the complexity of the connections and relationships that allow individual(s) to function. (p. 171-172)

An important consideration about the contribution of Indigenous scholars throughout this formative period is that their work set the foundation for Indigenous research methods, methodologies, and principles to follow that not only asserted legitimacy and validity, but reaffirmed the expression of Indigenous rights as expressed under Section 35 and of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous peoples.

United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (2007) (UNDRIP)

The United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) took more than 25 years to develop and originated in 1982 when the UN Economic and Social Council set up its Working Group on Indigenous Populations whose mandate was to respond to a study by Special Rapporteur José Ricardo Martínez Cobo[5] on the problem of discrimination faced by Indigenous peoples throughout the world.

In 1985, the Working Group was tasked with developing human rights standards that would protect Indigenous peoples and assert their rights as sovereign and self-determining peoples. The first draft was completed in 1993 and was approved by the Sub Commission on the Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities the following year. Over the next 14 years, the draft Declaration was discussed and amended to account for concerns by member states about certain provisions, most notably the assertion that Indigenous peoples are self-determining and have control over their lands and natural resources. In 2007, the UNDRIP

was sent to the United Nations General Assembly for a vote, where it received initial approval by 143 member states. Four member states voted against the UNDRIP including Canada Australia, New Zealand and the United States.

Despite previous concerns about the UNDRIP being "unbalanced" and "inconsistent with the charter" (CBC, 2007), Canada removed it's objector status in 2016 and became a full supporter "of the declaration without qualification" (CBC, 2016). Furthermore, Canada asserted " Through Section 35 of its Constitution, Canada has a robust framework for the protection of Indigenous rights, [and] by adopting and implementing the declaration, we are excited that we are breathing life into Section 35 and recognizing it as a full box of rights for Indigenous Peoples in Canada" (CBC, 2016).

While the UNDRIP does not specifically address the rights of Indigenous peoples in respect of research, and/or research processes, it does however, speak broadly to the rights of Indigenous peoples to be self-determining in respect of protecting their traditional knowledge, heritage, and expressions. More specifically, Articles 3, 4, and 31 state:

> Article 3
>
> Indigenous peoples have the right to self-determination. By virtue of that right they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social and cultural development. (United Nations, 2008, p. 4)
>
> Article 4
>
> Indigenous peoples, in exercising their right to self-determination, have the right to autonomy or self-government in matters relating to their internal and local affairs, as well as ways and means for financing their autonomous functions. (United Nations, 2008, p. 4/5)
>
> Article 31
>
> Indigenous peoples have the right to maintain, control, protect and develop their cultural heritage, traditional knowledge and traditional cultural expressions, as well as the manifestations of their sciences, technologies and cultures, including human and genetic resources, seeds, medicines, knowledge of the properties of fauna and flora, oral traditions, literatures, designs, sports and traditional games and visual and performing arts. They also have the right to maintain, control, protect and develop their intellectual property over such cultural heritage, traditional knowledge, and traditional cultural expressions. (United Nations, 2008, p. 11).

Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada (2015)

Arising from the Indian Residential School Agreement, the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) of Canada was established in 2008 with the purpose of documenting the history and impacts of the Indian Residential School system. Following six years of testimony and fact- gathering, the TRC released its final report and 94 Calls to Action in 2015 that called on all levels of government, and the Canadian public, to make substantive structural

changes that would redress the legacies of colonialism and advance the process of reconciliation.

On the subject of consent, the TRC "has found evidence of a number of studies that were carried out on residential school students during this period" (between 1940-2000). Most significantly, the TRC then goes on to describe the malnutrition studies carried our between 1948 and 1953 as well as seven other studies that were deemed acceptable by Indian Residential School administrators and Department of Indian Affairs officials, despite not having any authority to do so.

Despite the fact that very few rules governed medical research during this period, including the need for subjects to be given the opportunity to provide informed consent, Mosby (2013) found little evidence that the experimentation and medical research performed on children attending Indian Residential schools actually addressed the underlying issue of malnutrition. Instead, Mosby argues that Indigenous children were more likely fearful, confused, and in some cases, used/coerced into providing evidence and support for the colonial drive to transition Indigenous peoples and communities from traditional to "modern" food consumption.

Without question, medical and other experimentation in Residential schools has far reaching impacts, the most significant of which, according to Mosby, is

> that they provide us with a unique and disturbing window into the ways in which – under the guise of benevolent administration and even charity – bureaucrats, scientists, and a whole range of experts exploited their "discovery" of malnutrition in Aboriginal communities and residential schools to further their own professional and political interests rather than to address the root causes of these problems or, for that matter, the Canadian government's complicity in them. (p. 171)

Within the contexts of the status of Indigenous health in Canada, it could also be argued that the legacy of nutritional and medical experimentation throughout this period has manufactured the current "crisis" that is observable in the disproportionate disease burden experienced by Indigenous peoples and communities. As Galloway and Mosby (2017) make clear, the current status of Indigenous peoples health has been "programmed by hunger to continue the cycle of worsening effects." (p. E1044) and that

> In light of recent evidence showing the connections between childhood hunger and chronic disease risk both in adult-hood and in succeeding generations, we can now be fairly certain that the elevated risk of obesity, early-onset insulin resistance and diabetes observed among Indigenous peoples in Canada arises, in part at least, from the prolonged malnutrition experienced by many residential school survivors. This assessment, moreover, is further reinforced by a recent landmark study showing that Indigenous children were no more nutritionally stressed than other Canadian children at school entry.

Setting New Directions To Support Indigenous Research and Research in Training in Canada, 2019-2022 Strategic Plan

Following the 2015 TRC report, the federal government formed the Canada Research Coordinating Committee that recommitted the federal tri-agency research funding bodies (SSHRC, CIHR, & NSERC) to enact the Calls for Action and undertake a dialogue with Indigenous communities across Canada about research by, for, and with Indigenous peoples. The goal was to set a new direction for Canadian research that approached research and research training as a means to advance reconciliation and redress the harms of colonialism. Over the following two years, the government undertook a series regional engagement events and research activities which culminated in the release of a 3-year strategic plan and dedicated funding to support its implementation in 2019. Guided by the principles of Indigenous self - determination, decolonization of research, accountability, and equitable access, the Strategy outlined the following priorities for research in Canada: the necessity of decolonizing of research in Canada; recognizing Indigenous data governance and intellectual property rights; creating better mechanisms to ensure the ethical conduct of research involving Indigenous peoples and communities for both researchers based in Canada and international researchers conducting research in Canada; expanding funding opportunities and eligibility for Indigenous researchers and organizations; fostering meaningful long-term research partnerships and community-led research; improving support to Indigenous students; and ensuring Indigenous leadership and representation in federal research decision-making. Over its 3-years, the Strategic Plan began the process of structurally reconfiguring the research landscape in Canada and has resulted in changes to federal requirements that direct researchers and research organizations, increased funding and training opportunities, and greater representation of Indigenous perspectives in the research funding system. Whether these changes will result in the desired concrete changes in how researchers practice and engage with Indigenous communities, increased autonomy for Indigenous communities, increased representation of Indigenous researchers within the research ecosystem, and the centering of Indigenous-led, Indigenous-serving research with and for Indigenous communities is yet unknown.

Section 2: Articulating the Scope, Principles, and Processes of Research Involving Indigenous Peoples

The major events described above provide a somewhat comprehensive view of the path towards an Indigenous-rights framework within the context of research involving Indigenous peoples and communities in Canada. While the outcomes of these events has resulted in substantive recognition of human and Indigenous rights over time, there are latent impacts related to Indigenous research and research involving Indigenous peoples that have also emerged. In the section to follow, principles and concepts of Indigenous research will be explored in an effort to build an understanding of how non-Indigenous researchers must approach and design research for and with Indigenous peoples and communities in ways that cause no more harm. Moreover, what will also be set forth is an understanding that research involving Indigenous peoples must principally benefit not the sole researcher or the research team, but rather Indigenous peoples and communities themselves as we work towards redressing the painful colonial legacy in respect of research, and lastly to advancing the process of reconciliation that has as its core the principle aim of rebuilding and strengthening Indigenous communities, practices, traditions, languages, to name a few, for current and future generations.

Scope of Indigenous Research

Chapter 9 of the Tri Council Policy Statement (2018) on research involving First Nation, Metis and Inuit populations in Canada "marks a step toward establishing an ethical space for dialogue on common interests and points of difference between researchers and Indigenous communities engaged in research." Chapter 9 also sets out the minimum standard for the ethical conduct of research involving Indigenous peoples. Further, the federal Tri-Agency Research Data Management Policy (2021) requires that all elements of this research, including its governance, recognize, assert, and support Indigenous self-determination. "In line with the concept of Indigenous self-determination and in an effort to support Indigenous community to conduct research and partner with the broader research community, the agencies recognize that data related to research by and with the First Nations, Metis, or Inuit whose traditional and ancestral territories are in Canada must be managed in accordance with data management principles developed and approved by these communities, and on the basis of free, prior, and informed consent. This includes, but is not limited to, considerations of Indigenous data sovereignty, as well as data collection, ownership, protection, use, and sharing."

Within the context of NorQuest College, the Research Office and the college's designated Research Ethics Board are responsible for ensuring all research and research management is in compliance with the federal research guidelines, including the Tri Council's Ethics

Framework and its three core principles of Respect for Persons, Concern for Welfare, and Justice. To this end, NorQuest College recognizes that the practices and processes developed when working with Indigenous persons and communities are best practices, and should be followed when working with any traditionally marginalized, vulnerable, or equity-seeking population. This recognition extends researchers' obligations to these populations beyond the minimum standards set out by the TCPS2, which requires researchers closely attend to the unique circumstances of, potential risks to, and historical harms committed against those who are vulnerable. By following the same practices as are employed when working with Indigenous persons and communities, researchers will more fully demonstrate Respect for Persons, Concern for Welfare, and Justice with all populations.

Principles of Indigenous Research

In their exploration of research with Indigenous peoples, Hardy-Cox and Pidgeon (2002) set out an important ethical and principles-based framework for developing a culturally sensitive research process when "exploring Aboriginal issues" (p. 96) that, when designed and implemented in coordination with Indigenous peoples and communities, serve as a protective factor from exploitation, misrepresentation, and/or the advancement of tired tropes, assumptions, and ideologies that further dispossess Indigenous peoples.

To begin, Hardy-Cox & Pidgeon attest to limited resources that guide researchers as they approach research with Indigenous peoples, which is further compounded by the understanding that where resources may exist, they are often undergirded by Western ideologies, "with undertones of colonialism and imperialism [that] fail to consider an Aboriginal perspective." (p. 97). To counter these prevailing methods and practices, Hardy-Cox et al advance the understanding that "Research can benefit from an Aboriginal point of view, that is, a view that encompasses respect for individuality and relevance to an Aboriginal world view that promotes reciprocal relations with others and encourages responsibility over one's own life." (p. 97). Perhaps most significantly, Hardy-Cox et al. articulate and confront the painful mistakes of past research that failed to advance the voices, needs, and perspectives of Indigenous peoples and that have, without question, resulted in the treatment of Indigenous peoples "as outside viewers in their own lives" (p. 97). To better support and advance the needs of Indigenous peoples and communities, Hardy-Cox & Pidgeon outline Guiding Values to guide researchers in working with, for, and among Indigenous peoples in the research process. These will be briefly explored below.

Respect

The principle of respect within Indigenous research begins with "the involvement of Aboriginal groups, communities, and individuals in the research process, discussing each other's ideas, helping to ensure the project will of benefit to all parties." (p. 102). However, in order for researchers to come to the place where open dialogue about research ideas takes place, "attention to this initial relationship" will serve as the building block for trust, honesty, and respect throughout the research process which includes, among other things:

- Attending to and upholding the ways in which Indigenous peoples and communities wish to describe and represent themselves;
- Acknowledging the long-term practice and primacy of centering western thought as the only way to ensure credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability of the research outcomes.
    - An important and necessary practice for non-Indigenous researchers is to advance and uphold the understanding that Indigenous knowledges are equally valid, credible, reliable, and confirmable.
    - Further, that Indigenous research methodologies that prioritize qualitative methods are as valid as quantitative studies and work to destabilize Eurocentric understandings of "research".
- Respecting the sovereignty and self-determination of community and respect the relationship between community and NorQuest College.
- Respecting the individual, community, or institution's right to say no to a proposed research project.
- Recognizing Indigenous researchers as equal and centering/amplifying their voices and perspectives in the research process
- Acknowledge the unique challenges that Indigenous researchers face and the pressures that others place on them (i.e. Indigenous researchers are often overburdened in the research process and inequitable expectations are placed on them).

Relevance

Hardy-Cox & Pidgeon explain that "relevance takes into consideration the importance and relevance of the study to the researcher and Aboriginal group(s) involved"(p. 103). Specifically, they articulate that "what is relevant to the researcher may not be a priority to the Aboriginal peoples involved in the research…[and] understanding each other's expectations and points of view will help the communication process and build relationships" (p. 103). Most importantly, they go on to state that it is the "researcher's ultimate responsibility to the people involved and the research process itself to ensure that respect and integrity are observed" (p. 103) and that researchers ask themselves the following core questions:

1. How will the research contribute to Aboriginal peoples?
2. What support exists among Aboriginal people for the research?
3. What is its relevance?
4. What research gaps will be filled?
5. What questions will be addressed?

Importantly, the answers to these questions, among others, will naturally flow once a sound and trusting relationship with the community has been established and once the community decides the research topic is something they want to pursue and/or believe the research

proposal is one that will be relevant to the needs of the community and/or address a specific question or problem. Researchers must be able to demonstrate:

- That they have researched the community they wish to engage prior to pursuing the research proposal and/or relationship building process with the community.
- The research proposal is something that the community wants to pursue;
- The issue identification has been co-developed or has been identified by the community;
- That they understand and acknowledge themselves and the outcomes of their work as a tool to build an awareness of the issue or topic identified by the community;
- That they have explored whether the research question has already been examined by the community and/or whether there are community members already undertaking similar research objectives (and, if so, if the researcher is working with them on this);
- That they are in service to the community, and that research must be either or a combination of:
  - Community-driven or led, and participatory. A full partnership between researchers and community where community members hold equal power and are integrated fully into all stages of research (McDonald, 2008); or
  - Community-based. A collaboration between researchers and community where the researcher is guided by community members, who are experts on community needs, culture, and practices (Strand et al., 2003).
- The researcher acknowledges that the community is the expert and the role of the researcher is to share the knowledge safely and respectfully with the view of improving the health and well-being of a people.

Reciprocity

Reciprocity is defined as the practice of exchanging things with others for mutual benefit and is underscored by the understanding of mutual dependence. Within the contexts of research involving Indigenous peoples and communities, reciprocity "entails honoring each other's roles, which is important for the success of the project [where] there is a balance of sharing and gathering information" (Hardy-Cox et al, 2002, p. 103). More specifically, the research proposal must make clear "what the researcher will have to contribute…and what is the cost to the community." (p. 103). Through that lens, from the outset of the research process, the benefits accrued for the researcher and the community will be clear (i.e. researcher will have publishable material and the community will have reliable research to assist them with a political or developmental issue).

The principles that underlie ensuring that the benefits are clear from the outside is that the research cannot be extractive. As explored above, Indigenous peoples have for far too long be positioned as "passive subjects of research", where the benefits of past research has often contributed to their further subjugation and oppression. When reciprocity for the researcher and the community are fully explored and articulated, the power differential

inherent in the research process is disrupted and is instead replaced by a holistic understanding of the multidimensional and multidirectional impacts and benefits.

Relatedly, as NorQuest researchers build their capacities in this way, they strengthen and amplify the understanding that research involves building a "forever family" with the community – that the bonds established in developing a sound relationship forms the foundation for a relationship that lasts a lifetime. This practice counters the Eurocentric assertion that research must be distanced, apolitical, and neutral, and also entrenches an institutional practice of continuous learning about Indigenous research processes, methods, and methodologies.

Responsibility

Past research involving Indigenous peoples and communities has often been detrimental to the health, well-being, and ongoing efforts by communities to advance their needs, perspectives, and rights. As the TRC made clear, past research has been irresponsible both in its approach and in its outcomes that have in many cases caused significant harm. Responsibility in that regard involves the acknowledgement and commitment to "do no more harm" and to actively identifying potential and real harms of research proposals involving Indigenous peoples and communities. Hardy-Cox & Pidgeon suggests,

> responsibility ensures that researchers are cognizant of their responsibilities to the research, to the people, and to themselves. Designing a research process in consultation with key stakeholders, allowing flexibility in the research process, and maintaining integrity of research will ensure that respect and honour of all involved are observed.

At NorQuest College, researchers are responsible for proactively identifying any and all potential risks to their study participants and those communities that may be impacted by their work, not matter how small the risk, and developing appropriate mitigation strategies to reduce those risks and minimize the change of the risk resulting in harm to the individual participants, their community, and Indigenous peoples in Canada. Risks should be identified and mitigation strategies developed in partnership with the persons and communities the researcher wishes to engage. These include:

- Physical risks or discomfort (e.g., fatigue, physical stress, injury or infection),
- Psychological risks or discomfort (e.g., mental fatigue due to intense concentration)
- Emotional risk or discomfort (e.g., embarrassed, worried, anxious, scared)
- Social or cultural risk or discomfort (e.g., loss of privacy, status, or reputation)

Researchers should also attend to the potential risks to the communities participants are part of. These risks include things such as inappropriate sharing of cultural knowledge, undermining community relational structures, and drawing unwanted attention to the community. In addition to the immediate risks faced by their participants, researchers must understand and are accountable for the potential 'downstream' impacts of their research on

persons and communities. This includes harms caused by resulting publications and any secondary use of their data. It is, therefore, essential that researchers develop in advance and continue to refine in partnership with the community respectful, community-informed protocols for participant engagement, data collection and analysis, knowledge dissemination, and data storage and future data access. The research practices employed and the safeguards undertaken must respect the wishes of the community involved in study. Moreover, where a researcher becomes of a direct or direct risk to the community—whether prior to, during, or after a project has been completed—they must bring it to the community's attention and develop a mitigation plan for it.

As more and more truth-telling emerges in the post-TRC era, it is becoming increasingly important for researchers to accept and demonstrate responsibility in the following ways:

- That the relationship between researcher and community is maintained and preserved over the long-term (i.e. that the community has access to the researcher post research process to alleviate any lingering concerns and to demonstrate reciprocal accountability);
- That the researcher is accountable for the outcomes of the research and that there are active measures in place to reduce or eliminate any risks of dispossession or misinterpretation of research findings;
- That researchers have adequately accounted for, and made explicit, the historical contexts in which the research is being framed so as to avoid pathologizing and marginalizing Indigenous peoples as inferior or in need of "salvation";
- That the researcher has made explicit their commitment to doing sound and ethical research;
- That the researcher has properly situated/located/identified themselves in the research publication. This avoids any assumptions about the researcher themselves, and makes clear the motivations for the research. You are still responsible for doing sound, responsible research.
- That the researcher has made explicit their responsibility for caring for Indigenous knowledges by upholding the principles of OCAP (Ownership, Control, Access, and Possession)

The Importance of Relational Accountability and Relationality Relationality

Indigenous knowledge systems designed to promote and generate life: not just human life, but all life. Indigenous worldviews are shaped by a deep sense that all living things are interconnected (Cajete, 2000; Fernandez et al., 2020). According to Weber-Pillwax (1999), the principle of relationality is at the centre of research with Indigenous peoples and guides the recognition that

All forms of living things are to be respected as being related and interconnected. This is a powerful command for transformation in the way we conduct any business today, including research. Think about implementing a research project while these words are ringing in your heart: "The earth and myself are of one mind. The measure of the land and the measure of our bodies are the same." These words come from Chief Joseph or Thunder Traveling to Loftier Heights (McLuhan, 1971, p. 54). Respect does not simply mean knowing and following basic rituals and practices as part of the protocols of interactions with indigenous people. It means believing and living that relationship with all forms of life, and conducting all interactions in a spirit of kindness and honesty. (p. 41, emphasis added).

Elliott-Groves et al (2020) expands on this understanding to state that relationality is an ethical commitment based on principles of "reciprocity, respect, noninterference, self-determination, and freedom" (Simpson, 2017, p. 8) and that "any threat to Indigenous relationality makes it difficult to form and sustain strong communal relations. (p. 160)

Relational Accountability

As explored above, Indigenous peoples' ethical precepts regarding relationality specify that relationships to the land and to each other are commitments. These commitments thus create accountability to the land and to each other and to act as responsible stewards of the relationship to maintain balance and to protect Indigenous knowledge systems.

When the head and heart are actively balanced, partners enter the ethical space between worldviews. They engage in a way that creates a growing sense of relational accountability (Wilson 2009). As Wilson and Wilson (1998) explained, relational accountability involves respect for, and taking care of, all one's relations. Within an Aboriginal worldview, one's relations include not only family and community, but also the intricate web of all living organisms. All one's relations, then, is a phrase that expresses one's place in the universe. Researchers and educators in higher education need to understand how they participate in this web; how they impact the web of relations of research partners, participants and students; and what they are responsible for as a result of this impact. Responsible relations account for their actions in relation to others, not in isolation. Thus they participate in an intricate web of relationships in a way that demonstrates both personal responsibility and responsibility to the other. Balancing the head and heart enables awareness of this link between self and other and entrance to the ethical space where worldviews collide. Further, it calls on all partners to act in the best interest of self and other equally. (Kajner, Fletcher & Makokis, 2011, p. 266)

A key aspect of respectful engagement with Indigenous peoples is understanding and acting within a framework that values relationship building as fundamental to the research process. Today's researchers must understand that the peoples generally referred to as Indigenous peoples are made up of thousands of different communities and that building a relationship with one community does not automatically speak to a relationship with any other nor should there be an assumption that the needs, teachings, or strengths of one is identical to

any other. That "the situation of indigenous peoples varies from region to region and from country to country and that the significance of national and regional particularities and various historical and cultural backgrounds should be taken into consideration" (United Nations, 2008, p. 3). Knowledge cannot be divorced from the culture it's a part of, knowledge is not neutral or a- cultural (Meyer, 2001) so the acknowledgement of which relations and communities had contributed to a research project does not negatively impact the findings but rather recognizes the inherent connection between the peoples and their knowledges.

It should be stated that the goal of relationship building is not to accomplish a goal of research, but rather exercise our responsibility as relatives to ensure we are in relation to the communities we are interacting with. NorQuest needs to work with the community to understand what their role is in working with the community. Once this relationship and understanding is developed, research ideas can be developed organically with the community instead of extractive nature of traditional research. This approach aligns well with NorQuest College's approach of using community-based participatory research.

Communities refers to groups of individuals marked by a shared piece of identity - in the case of Indigenous identity this could be being members of a single family or nation though it can also refer to experiential aspects such as 'local urban Indigenous community' referring to those who identify as Indigenous and live in the local urban center. A single individual may be part of many different communities.

Importance of relationship/relationships and research/centering on communities advances:

- Research that seeks to redress the legacies of colonialism and advance the process of reconciliation.
- Research that advances the identified needs and objectives of the communities with which the researcher has developed a relationship. Within the context of relationships and relationality, it should also be understood that the relationship has no end – that is, in most cases, the relationship bounds the researcher to the community forever ("forever family")
- Ethical; practices and an ethos of "do no more harm";
- The understanding that Indigenous peoples and communities must be the largest beneficiaries of the research processes and outcomes;
- The understanding that Indigenous peoples and communities have the right to say "no." This right is recognized and upheld by the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (Article 12, Article 31)

Section 3: Application of the Tri Council Policy Statement in Indigenous Contexts

Elements to Consider when Applying these Guidelines

As researchers and research administrative staff proceed in developing relationships and projects with Indigenous communities and peoples, the full scope of how one needs to proceed in relationship with others and the questions they should contemplate can seem daunting. To support this effort, the following outlines some of the conditions that need to be made. Please note, while this is list extensive, it is not exhaustive. At all times, researchers must reflect upon their actions and positions and consider if they are embodying the values put forward in this guideline.

Identifying Applicable Research

The most common question researchers have when considering research with Indigenous communities is "Does this idea qualify as research with Indigenous communities and peoples?" As a general rule, if you are asking the question, the answer is nearly always "yes." Article 9.1, of the TCPS 2 specifies that:

> "Where the research is likely to affect the welfare of an Indigenous community, or communities, to which prospective participants belong, researchers shall seek engagement with the relevant community. The conditions under which engagement is required include, but are not limited to:
>
> - research conducted on First Nations, Inuit or Métis lands;
> - recruitment criteria that include Indigenous identity as a factor for the entire study or for a subgroup in the study;
> - research that seeks input from participants regarding a community's cultural heritage, artefacts, traditional knowledge or unique characteristics;
> - research in which Indigenous identity or membership in an Indigenous community is used as a variable for the purpose of analysis of the research data; and
> - interpretation of research results that will refer to Indigenous communities, peoples, language, history or culture."

Research with Indigenous Peoples: Guiding Questions

Having established that your project involves and/or impacts Indigenous persons or communities, the following questions should give the ways in which you proceed:

About relationships and community need for your project

- Do you have a relationship with this community? Are they welcoming you to do research with them?
- How have you involved the community in your research at every stage? How have they been involved, and in what ways? How will you demonstrate their involvement?
- Who from the community have you included, and why?
- Where will the research take place (both physically and within the community's social structure)?
- Is there a place that is suitable to their needs? Do you have sufficient resources? What are your limitation? What is the impact and will it be a burden? Have you talked openly with the community and are they willing to take it on?
- How are you maintaining reciprocity? Demonstration of exchange? What seems fair to the community?
- How does your research support and advance the community's visions, goals, and aspirations?
- How, and in what ways, can you demonstrate that you followed community protocols surrounding research, and research process?

About your research questions

- Is this a question a community wants answered? Is this the most important question that needs to be worked on right now according to the community?
- Are the questions directly tied to the identified needs of the community?

Ethical Approval for Projects

- Do you have formal community approval for your project? Does the community have a project approval process? If yes, have you secured their approval?
- When you are asked to provide evidence of community support, what types of evidence can you provide? How is it documented? How do you know this research is valuable to the community?
- How will you know you are conducting research in ways that do no more harm, immediately or over the long-term? Does the community agree with your assessment?
- How will you know you are conducting research in ways that benefit the community? Does the community agree with your assessment?
- How have you been in conversation with the REB, keeping them informed, guidance, as etc. as your project proceeds.

Research Methodology & Methods

- Have you discussed your proposed research methodology and data collection methods with community? Have you considered Indigenous Research Methodologies?

If you are using traditional western methods, how are you decolonizing your process?
- Have you reflected on how the community would like you to proceed and what does that mean in terms of your methodology?

Recruitment

- How are you ensuring that a broad-section of the community have access to participation in the research?
- How are you working with community to ensure that awareness is far-reaching and aligned with community direction?

Data collection

- Have you consulted with the community on how they want you to collecting new data?
- What impact will the data you collect have on the community?
- Have you considered how this data may be used by others in the future and what impact it may have on the community?

Analysis & reporting

- When you conduct your analysis, who will be involved in the analysis?
- How have you navigated the conversation with community about the types of information that will be shared, with whom, and why?
    - Gaining cultural knowledge, but also research knowledge that is not yours to share.
    - How are you deciding what "is" your research data? What from your work with community can be shared, interpreted? What needs to be vetted, or validated, by community?
    - How will you ensure that the knowledge that has been shared with you is carried forward in a good way, and how will you know?
- How will you ensure that the community is represented in your analysis in the ways they believe suit their needs and aspirations?
- How will your data and results be made accessible to the community?
- How and in what ways will you ensure that the research findings are accessible and that are understandable? (i.e. Format customized to differing audiences)

Documentation

- Documenting the decisions by participants: How are you tracking this and documenting your process? Who is involved, not involved, and why?
- How have you ensured you have received free, prior and informed consent? Is your method of securing consent appropriate for this community?

- What are the internal pressures that impact informed consent?
- Ongoing consent: Consent may be withdrawn at any time. How are you ensuring that you are checking in with participants? What do you do when it's withdrawn?
- How are you ensuring that communities can participate to their given capacity? How are communities given the opportunity to define their levels of participation?

Data Management & Control

- When are you handling data, how will you manage Indigenous Research Sovereignty?
- How will the data be used by the community?
- How will it stay in the community?
- What formal protocols will need to be put in place to ensure Indigenous Sovereignty and community ownership over your data when/if you submit a copy of your data to a university or college data archive?

Decolonizing Research

- Have you considered how research is colonial enterprise? Have you considered your role in this enterprise as a researcher?
- How are you trying to actively decolonize your research mindset?
- How has your thinking, behaviour and actions shifted as a result of this process?
- How has your relationship with other researchers shifted?
- Can settlers decolonize?

Connection to NorQuest College's Mandate, Strategic Plans, and Operations

Beyond ensuring alignment with federal requirements, this guideline is essential as NorQuest College moves towards implementing it Strategic Institutional Plan NorQuest 2030: We are who we include, with its focus on increasing applied research activity for the benefit of our learners and our communities. As our college's applied research prioritizes community-driven, community-engaged engaged projects, it is imperative that faculty, staff, and students undertake projects with Indigenous peoples in full alignment with these guidelines. This will ensure that projects occur within long-term meaningful partnerships with community and in support of community interests and needs. These expectations will also promote an understanding among our faculty, staff, and students researchers an understanding of what it means to be in good relations with Indigenous people, not just as researchers, but as relatives.

Additionally, by enacting the values and practices outlines in this guideline, NorQuest researchers advances the desired states outlined in our Academic Strategic Plan, Reimagine Higher Education, specifically our goals to be a leader in Indigenous education and to be an

anti-racist organization. This guideline not only provide researchers with direction on how to proceed in relationship with Indigenous communities, it requires that researchers consider their role and responsibility in decolonizing research and the academy, and advance reconciliation. Further, if the directions provided by this document are consistently applied in the spirit that they are intended—not as a checklist of items to be done, but a fundamental reconsideration of why and how we engage in research with other—and this is done by all NorQuest researchers and research staff, it should result in improved educational, research, work, and personal experiences of Indigenous students, faculty, and staff throughout the college, as well as the Indigenous communities with which we partner.

NorQuest College employees and students, as well as those external researchers wishing to access the college, must understand the college's expectations of them as regards to any proposed research with Indigenous persons or communities. This guideline outlines the expectations and standards of practice for research occurring under the auspices of the college. We also provide this guide in order to clearly articulate that conducting research with Indigenous persons and communities carries with it additional obligations and expectations beyond those associated with research as a general practice. Moreover, conducting research, particularly with Indigenous persons and communities, should be understood as a privilege not a right. The college, therefore, reserves the right to refuse to support or allow research that does not meet these expected standards. Finally, this guide recognize the unique challenges faced by Indigenous researchers and the college's fiduciary responsibility to ensure they are appropriately supported in their work.

Conclusion

The ideas and considerations presented herein are not new. Indeed, as explored in Section 1, while a significant transformation has taken place within the realm of research involving Indigenous peoples over the last two centuries, it has done so against the backdrop of significant and collective action on the part of Indigenous peoples to cease the harm and suffering that has been brought about by unmitigated and extractive research that had, as its aim, to "fix" the Canada's Indigenous peoples "problem." Indigenous peoples' collective resistance to these processes and practices have been well-chronicled, yet the sentiment and aim remains unchanged: our desire to have our distinct rights upheld, to be recognized as fully human, and to examine and explore the questions that are of greatest importance to our communities as a means of nation-building, strengthening our connections to our cultures, languages, and traditions, and to each other.

These guidelines recognize that there are researchers who endeavour to serve as co-resisters to the ongoing processes of colonization that are distinct to Indigenous peoples by undertaking, participating in, and co-leading research that serves the interests and needs of Indigenous peoples themselves. We recognize the significance of researchers who take an active stance alongside Indigenous peoples as we work to redress the harms of historical and contemporary colonization, and where we co-create a vision for the future within the realm of institutional and applied research within Alberta, and across the country. These guidelines are intended to support the efforts of all researchers contemplating research with Indigenous peoples and to create a space for critical self-reflection about the researchers aims, aspirations, and intents that have at the centre, to do no more harm. These guidelines are not; however, intended to be a checklist for non-Indigenous peoples to use to circumvent the oft-cited "issues" within research involving Indigenous peoples such as access, relationships, and time. These guidelines actively call into question and pose critical questions of the researcher and the research team to build an understand researchers' roles and deep responsibilities when contemplating research with Indigenous peoples and communities, as well as their roles in changing the trajectory of the relationship between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples towards right-relations.

References

Assembly of First Nations. (2019). Section 35 of the Constitution Act, 1982. Retrieved from:
https://www.afn.ca/timeline/198/

Battiste, M. (1998). Enabling the autumn seed: Toward a decolonized approach to Aboriginal knowledge, language and education. *Canadian Journal of Native Education*; 22(1). p. 16-27.

BC Mental Health &Substance Use Services. (1998). Tri Council Policy Statement on Ethic Conduct for Research Involving Humans. Retrieved from:
http://www.bcmhsus.ca/Documents/tri-council-policy-statement-ethical-conduct-for-research-involving-humans.pdf

Canadian Encyclopedia. (2019). Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples. Retrieved from:
https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/royal-commission-on-aboriginal-peoples

Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. (2007). Canada votes 'no' as UN native rights declaration passes. Retrieved from: https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/canada-votes-no-as-un-native- rights-declaration-passes-1.632160

Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. (2016). Canada officially adopts UN Declaration on Rights of Indigenous People. Retrieved from: https://www.cbc.ca/news/indigenous/canada-adopting-implementing-un-rights-declaration-1.3575272

Cardinal, H. (1969/1999). The unjust society. Vancouver, BC: Douglas & McIntyre.

First Nation Caring Society. (2016) The Legacy of Duncan Campbell Scott: More than just a Canadian Poet. Retrieved from:
https://fncaringsociety.com/sites/default/files/duncan_campbell_scott_information_sheet_final.pdf

First Nation Information Governance Centre. (2019). The First Nation Principles of OCAP. Retrieved from: https://fnigc.ca/ocap

Government of Canada. (1996). Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples. Volumes 1-5. Retrieved from: https://www.bac-lac.gc.ca/eng/discover/aboriginal-heritage/royal-commission-aboriginal-peoples/Pages/final-report.aspx

Government of Canada. (2017). TCPS2 (2018) - Introduction. Retrieved from:
https://ethics.gc.ca/eng/tcps2-eptc2_2018_introduction.html

Hawthorne, H. (1967). A Survey of the Contemporary Indians of Canada. Part 1, Volume 1. Retrieved from: http://caid.ca/HawRep1a1966.pdf

Hawthorne, H. (1967). A Survey of the Contemporary Indians of Canada. Part 2, Volume 1. Retrieved from: http://caid.ca/HawRep1b1966.pdf

Hawthorne, H. (1967). A Survey of the Contemporary Indians of Canada. Volume 2. Retrieved from: http://caid.ca/DVol2_Haw.html

Kajner, T., Fletcher, F., & Makosis, P. (2012). Balancing Head and Heart: The Importance of Relational Accountability in Community-University Partnerships. Innovations in Higher Education, 37, 257–270.

Lambert, L. (2014). Research for Indigenous survival: Indigenous research methodologies in the behavioral sciences. Pablo, MT: Salish Kootenai College Press

McDonald, M.A. (2008). Practicing Community-Engaged Research. Duke University School of Medicine. https://doi.org/10.15766/mep_2374-8265.1127

Meyer, M. (2001). Acultural assumptions of empiricism: A Native Hawaiian critique. *Canadian Journal of Native Education. 25*(2). 188-98

Mosby, I. (2013). Administering Colonial Science: Nutrition Research and Human Biomedical Experimentation in Aboriginal Communities and Residential Schools, 1942–1952.

Histoire sociale/Social history 46(1), 145-172. https://www.muse.jhu.edu/article/512043.

Mosby, I., & Galloway, T. (2017). "Hunger was never absent": How residential school diets shaped current patterns of diabetes among Indigenous peoples in Canada. Canadian Medical Association Journal, 189(32), E1043–E1045. Retrieved from http://www.cmaj.ca/content/189/32/E1043.full

Pidgeon, M., & Hardy Cox, D. (2002). Researching with Aboriginal Peoples. Canadian Journal of Native Education, 26(2), 96–106.

Strand, K., Marullo, S., Cutforth, N., Stoecker, R. & Donohue, P. (2003). Community-Based Research and Higher Education: Principles and Practices. Jossey-Bass.

Truth and Reconciliation Commission. (2015). The History, Part 2: 1939 to 2000. Retrieved from: http://www.trc.ca/assets/pdf/Volume_1_History_Part_2_English_Web.pdf

Truth and Reconciliation Commission. (2015). Calls to Action. Retrieved from: http://trc.ca/assets/pdf/Calls_to_Action_English2.pdf

Turner, D. (2006). This is Not a Peace Pipe: Towards a Critical Indigenous Philosophy. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

United Nations. (2008). United nations declarations on the rights of Indigenous peoples. Retrieved from https://www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/documents/DRIPS_en.pdf

Wilson, S. (2003). Progressing Toward and Indigenous Research Paradigm in Canada and Australia. *Canadian Journal of Native Education*; 27(2). P. 161-178.

Wilson, S. (2008). Research is ceremony: Indigenous research methods. Black Point, NS: Fernwood Publishing.