



**ACCOUNTABILITY SECTORAL  
FOLLOW-UP SESSION  
FLIP CHART NOTES  
MÉTIS BREAKOUT GROUP**

The following reflects a transcription of the comments posted on flipcharts in response to the questions indicated below in boldfaced text, during the breakout group discussions.



**MÉTIS BREAKOUT GROUP  
ACCOUNTABILITY SECTORAL FOLLOW-UP SESSION  
FLIP CHART NOTES**

**MÉTIS BREAKOUT GROUP**

**DAY 1 - MÉTIS Breakout Room**

Plenary (opening messages on flipcharts)

The facilitators outlined the Purpose of the session, which was to discuss accountability in a Métis context, to:

- Identify the issues, and
- Provide recommended actions to address the issues

The questions that will be discussed in Day 1 include:

1. What does accountability mean in a Métis context? (A Métis description of accountability)?
2. What are the various accountability relationships relevant to the Métis, present and future?
3. What are the critical issues relating to accountability?

The facilitators also reviewed Group Norms that will help move through the two days in a respectful and effective way. These included:

- diversify people at the tables
- respect yourself and others
- everyone's opinion is valid
- capture everything on flipcharts
- issues outside the scope of the discussion will be placed in a "parking lot"
- cell phones on vibrate

**KEY MESSAGES**

Each participant introduced themselves and offered the following Key Messages to begin the session:

- 2-way track – expectation to be accountable; impedes creative work; want to be accountable
- urban Aboriginal issues have to be considered; separate round table
- figure out how both gov. and abor. orgs need to work on accountability; do things better
- has to come back to the people we serve
- need mechanisms to consider a woman's perspective in segregating information



- change way federal government does business
- Métis structures be recognized
- structures should not be imposed on Métis
- place appropriate resources in areas that can improve accountability
- accountability requires support; mechanisms to assist accountability
- transparency between government and the Métis nation
- understanding each`s expectations
- 2-way street; prov & fed does not answer questions on accountability
- include gender bases analysis
- women have a key role to play; balanced approach
- non-abor. orgs. Accessing abor. resources need to be accountable
- working together and in partnership we can accomplish much
- we need to be accountable to the Métis for inclusion in the processes
- funding for abor. programs have to be secure
- ownership creates accountability
- Métis currently have little control – control with feds.
- True meaningful participation and partnerships are required
- Proper funding
- Measurement and accountability go hand in hand
- Improvement is a goal
- Based on respectful and evolving relationships
- for results – speaks to the future
- base accountability on actions taken
- measure based on goals
- need something to accountable for; give programs & Métis will be accountable
- government make groups 4-5 times more accountable; needs to level the field
- optimistic on the outcomes from the roundtables
- social indicators need to be addressed
- urban dynamic need to be reflected
- management of your live is being accountable to yourself
- Government needs to be accountable; why do we always have to prove our accountability?
- Report card: solid economic factors; how Canada is decolonizing itself; self-sufficiency; self-government; sovereignty - <these elements need to be> measured
- Need more mechanisms other than the courts; to ensure accountability
- Need a way to reduce the burden of tracking – shift to emphasis on helping people

## ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS

**Question # 1: What does accountability mean in a Métis context? (A Métis description of accountability)**

### TABLE 1

For the urban (status and residency blind) people (rural and remote) and Aboriginal women accountability means:



1. the need for definitions: some key principles for accountability framework:
  - a) holistic / culturally appropriate
  - b) 2 tracks: gov't; abor. community
  - c) openness / transparency / inclusiveness / ensure equality and gender based analysis
  - d) Aboriginal community should be funded to be active partners (capacity building)
4. government should recognize the link between financial resources levels and accountability
5. plain language
6. accountability should seek to demonstrate the greatest good e.g. Link amount of funds to population and need

For the urban (status blind) peoples (rural and remote) and Aboriginal women, the components for accountability:

- Governance – progress to self-gov't; rights (voting); inclusive participation; access to courts; community driven
- Financial – equity of resource allocation amongst management all aboriginal groups; track financial contributions to meeting Canada national / international Human Rights commitments; simplify and reduce reporting / duplication; gender budgeting
- Data - use ancestry data; streamline reports and provide detailed information to Aboriginal community (Métis/status/non-status/Inuit/women/disabled)

## TABLE 2

- Recognition and respect for Métis inst.
- Multi-year federal framework
- Leveling the reporting requirement field
- HR component to accountability
- More block funding
- Gov't has to be accountable to the Institutions
- Identifying indicators
- Establishing agreeable reporting / outcomes (multiyear)
- Métis ownership of programs and services
- Gov't needs to transfer block funding to Métis institutions
- Cultural component

## TABLE 3

- to the constituency we represent: to our people
- to ensure that public funds are used for the purposes for which they are intended
- to ensure that desired results are achieved: results-based outcomes – improvements in living standards at the community level



- elected representatives reporting to the people who elected them: in our case the Métis people; only organizations that have a link to the Métis people through elections can be accountable to the Métis people
- in between elections, people expect to be consulted, engagement, informed in a meaningful way
- accountability implies that results/outcomes are measured, monitored and reported
- having measured, (monitored and reported) etc. the implication is that the info would be used to change programs etc. if need be – stuff will be used

#### **TABLE 4**

- Being responsible to: individual; organization; community-regions-locals
- Accountability is the same (meaning) across the board – everybody
- Government needs to be accountable to the Métis in the same way it is to FN and Inuit
- Government needs to be accountable to the Canadian constitution, where the Métis are recognized as one of the Aboriginal people.
- Financial accountability – two way street
  - o funds need to be secure and provided on a timely basis
- With respect to community-related accountability, recognized Métis provincial and/or governing play a critical role in identifying / establishing Métis communities
- Government allocation of funds should be transparent and equitable
- Jurisdictional issues e.g. Funding for Métis students – all A
- aboriginal people
- Streamline reporting formats – all funding sources be made accessible equally to all aboriginal people – more dollars

#### **Question # 2: What are the various accountability relationships relevant to the Métis, present and future?**

#### **TABLE 1**

1. Equity between partners e.g. Share data with each other (all Métis across Canada participation > federal, provincial and territorial as well)
2. Federal > aboriginal orgs. in the community; orgs. > members; funders> fundees must be understood as a government to government relationship

#### **TABLE 2**

- considered like `projects`; relationship must change
- absence of policy resources with Métis institutions creates constantly ??? relationship – measurement / resulting challenging to meet
- need to establish a fiscal relationship as set out by the Feds Fid (sp?) responsibility
- current cash flow analyst creates Métis institutions to play catch-up with resources at year end



### TABLE 3

1. Métis people <-- two way street --> elected representatives
  - A.G.A.
  - Presentation of financial reports
2. Funding agencies / gov`ts fed and prov  
Métis orgs <-- two way --> funding agencies
3. Socio economic response
  - Policy developments
  - Common objectives /policy <--> funding
  - Funding <--> results

### TABLE 4

- Métis know what is best for Métis issues
- Métis leadership must be involved in all aspects of relationships
- different perspectives need to be reflected including: women; youth; disabled; elders; urban
- Process that are working for other aboriginal groups can be revised and build upon for Métis specific issues without having to re-invent the wheel

### Question #3: Accountability critical issues

#### TABLE 1

##### Critical Issues

1. Funding mechanisms should be reflective of the track record of the funding recipient
2. Power imbalances must be addressed between a) Cdn gov`t and orgs (i.e. Cdn. Govt have to have respect for our processes and seek to understand them); b) orgs and its members; c) men and women, people with disabilities, etc.; d) geographic areas (urban, rural, remote) e.g. These areas are excluded from having a specific roundtable (like women)
3. Need to use Aboriginal knowledge > valued as equivalent to Western notions of accountability
4. Address underlying causes of unequal participation / relationships (e.g. Violence against Aboriginal women leads to inequitable representation and participation of women)

#### TABLE 2

##### Critical Issue

- New fiscal relationship is needed with Métis institutions to meet accountability
- Financial system creates a deficit situation.
- Need for a new fiscal relationship.
- Existing funding should not be up for grabs by gov`t
- Appropriate way for government to deal with scandals.
  - increases onus on Métis
  - doesn`t solve problem
  - decreases flexibility
- Relationship with federal government



- Community relationships
- Inclusion, meaningful dialogue and consultations with Métis institutions on policy development
- Gender based analysis
- Human resource capacity
- How do we measure results?
- What do we do with the measurements?
- Define the communities and being clear about who and what we are measuring?
- gender based analysis
- we do not all fit into one box (Métis / Inuit / FN ) we are multi dimensional

### CRITICAL ISSUES – World Café Exercise

NOTE: Because of the World Café exercise there are no tables. Instead each chart dealt with Question #4 plus other questions specific to each chart.

#### **Question # 4: (For all tables):**

Recommend actions to address these critical issues.

1. What are the issues?
2. How should the issues be addressed?
3. Apply the lens: women, urban, rural, remote & disabilities.

#### **CHART 1 – ISSUE: How do we measure results?**

- What do we do with the measurements?
- Define the communities and being clear about who and what we are measuring?
- gender based analysis
- we do not all fit into one box (Métis / Inuit / FN ) we are multi dimensional

What is the issue?

- funds are available to carry out programs but there is no capacity to evaluate/measure results
- Gathering of Métis specific data across Canada is incomplete.
- Socio-economic development, health, education
- Need to get counts of Métis population as defined by Métis governing organizations
- Difference in definitions across federal organizations and aboriginal organizations
- Métis organizations need capacity to carry out complete development of Métis registry, including maintenance and administration
- Full consultation with statistics Canada in development of national Métis statistics with the involvement of Métis leadership organizations.
- Evaluation for on-going programs development and continuation
- Comprehensive coverage in programs to avoid fragmentation between Aboriginal peoples.



#### Measurements:

- look at best practices re: measurement & Métis (i.e. Alberta and BC) – adding identifier to monthly labor force participation
- need agreed upon measurement (with appropriate consultations esp. social thematic areas)
- need to differentiate between broad indicators and program indicators
- measurement can best streamlined and not be such a cumbersome process
- Measurement need to be identified in advance and capacity (funding & resources provided) to ensure tracked for future shared policy & accountability.
- Tailored processes so measurements tools can be used to address a number of funding accountability requirements (less burdensome) i.e. logic model.
- Need results-criteria that are relevant to the programs or activities being measured.
- Current post-census surveys are not appropriately sampling certain populations (i.e. Métis children, youth)
- Need to include questions on Aboriginal identity and address on short form
- Need to ensure better measurement techniques to allow for sufficient sampling (esp. by having Métis self-identification on surveys.
- Under representation means Métis are losing out on program allocations & support.
- Everything should be done on basis of gender analysis.
- Measurement should be based on outcomes (i.e. systemic process, administration short-term & long term results), but need to be appropriate measures
- Need investment in development of more appropriate tools.

#### **CHART 2 – ISSUE: Appropriate way for government to deal with scandals**

- increases onus on Métis
- doesn't solve problem
- decreases flexibility

Federal officials are reacting to so-called “scandals” by imposing more stringent “accountability” on us through C.A.

How should the issues be addressed

- through partnerships\negotiation and not unilaterally, imposed provisions, should be done through mutual agreement
- identify if there is a problem with us
- Transparency from the bad to the front room – dig, T& C, auditor reports we never see
- Feds have to stop
- Evaluating themselves -- evaluation should be joint efforts and framework should be done jointly too!
- Dispute resolution mechanism is essential in relationship where officials want to impose conditions – subject to interpretation.

What issue: decreased flexibility:

Recommendation

How: results-based accountabilities



- Measures on outcomes
- Leave program design up to Aboriginal organizations
  
- Financial integrity of Métis organizations should be assured through standard auditing and accountability to people -- Any additional requirements should be developed mutually and administrative resources provided to meet them. (One size does not fit all)
- reducing flexibility in program management and delivery erodes partnership principles upon which our relationship should be based.
- Adding reporting requirements and decreasing flexibility adds to our admin costs – this is not recognized.
- “For approval of Canada” giving discretion to junior officers to tell us what we can and cannot do.
  - It is easy for federal officials to add to our reporting burden, and reduce our flexibility, but federal bureaucracy is not set up to operate this system.
  - Gender analysis – we have to the size of the problem.
  - Resources sufficient to undertake assumed responsibilities
  - Not more reporting, but better reporting enhanced capacities on both sides
  - Need for capacity development, including resources, training and mentoring
  - Identify needs, particularly those groups – organizations that lack resources (i.e. youth, new organizations – women’s group)

Appropriate way government dealing with scandal

- Keep the issue isolated
- Keep the issue with the particular department
- Targets to be streamlined, rather than increased
- Deal with particular people
- Don’t penalize the program
- Don’t paint everything with the same brush.

### **CHART 3 – ISSUE: Human resource capacity**

*What?*

For Aboriginal urban, rural (remote) and women

- retention strategy
- high turnover
- more resources for training, pre-employment
- federal government should promote, recruit and retain more Aboriginal employee for all levels of work (Aboriginal Millennium fund)
- address systemic barriers (i.e.: racism and gender)
- when funding programs, and program administration adequate levels of funding similar to that of government should be provided to Aboriginal organizations
- Annual report for Feds and Aboriginal community on equitable employment level (to include a gender based/disabled analysis).
- A gender-based analysis applied to program and policy development would lead to, in the education system



- 1) Portrayal of women & girls in positive role in curriculum & research & young girls are encouraged to pursue careers in the sciences and technology fields
  - 2) Aboriginal women are directly involved in the design, development, & evaluation of Aboriginal-specific curriculum & research.
  - 3) Aboriginal women have access to women's resource centers, counseling services, pre-employment & life skills programs that are culturally appropriate.
  - 4) Economic development strategies & initiatives involved autonomous Aboriginal women's groups & individual Aboriginal women.
  - 5) Unique needs of Aboriginal women such as childcare are considered\met.
  - 6) Access to capital & investment development program is improved\increased for Aboriginal women.
- Government need to fulfill equity legislation. Requirements with respect to Aboriginal youth-women-disable.
  - Need to reverse "brain-drain" by increasing resources to the aboriginal organization in a clear, transparent, long-stable multi-year agreements.
  - All federal departments need to have and make available to the Aboriginal organization capacity enhancement funds – along the lines of HRDSC.
  - Secondment framework needs to be implemented. Clear lines, agreement
  - TB needs to be consistent exemption outside of the traditional guidelines (increasing flexibility and otherwise)
  - Make available to Aboriginal terms and conditions that affect contribution agreement
  - Tracking human resource capacity as part of the report card.
  - Gender lens: (already covered by previous group)
  - Long term educational focus on improving capacity
  - \$ to support public service education: individual, institutional
  - centre of excellence for aboriginal public service (include research)
  - professional development plans should be compulsory in the Aboriginal public service
  - education/training needs analysis of Aboriginal public servants required (RCAP)

#### **CHART 4 – ISSUE: Relationship with federal government**

- Community relationships
- Inclusion, meaningful dialogue and consultations with Métis institutions on policy development
  - Gender based analysis
  - Constitutional accountability of federal government to Métis, rights and interests. Broadly addressed
  - Mechanism redress

#### *What?*

- One way relationships
- Can't have a rel. with comm.
- Does not equal a balance of acc.;
- lack of meaningful dialogue / consultations with Métis



- Fed government does not understand us (the Métis cultures (on and off reserve, identity, needs, aspirations)
- Currently not inclusive
- Government does not recognize inclusion of Métis in constitution ; just paying lip service and has not engaged with us re mechanism to make the partnership real
- urban – status rural/remote disabled are equally important to national Aboriginal organizations
- Roundtable is an example of the lack of focus by the federal government. No status-residency blind urban table; no Aboriginal women`s table.
- Urban aboriginal people are taxpayers and have right to access to federal resources for our respective communities

### *How?*

- Nation building ; can`t be independent without access to resources
- Teaching mainstream Canadians Métis histories and cultures: new arrivals to Canada; school children; bureaucrats
- Have the fed. government develop Métis-specific research
- Gov`t should come to us (all Aboriginal people) and ask who are you and what can we do
- Be inclusive in decision-making that affects us (not this is what you can get)
- Recognize us as nations in the process (self-gov`t) as one of 3 levels of government (fed/prov/us)
- Separate issues and resolutions for Métis (not combined with First Nations, Inuit)
- Respect who the right of Métis peoples to define their own membership
- Need an independent body to oversee and address government fulfillment
- Federal government needs to recognize Aboriginal right of association (e.g. Aboriginal participation in urban groups)
- Local control of federal Aboriginal initiatives
- Working group for Accountability (CAP/NWAC/MNC/AFN/ITK)
  - o Adequate resources
  - o An external evaluation body to report on the AWG
- International accountability revise on how governments work with indigenous populations: Australia; New Zealand; U.S., Sweden
- Accountability should be framed in federal legislation and tied to performance review
- Communications strategy to broaden the understanding and knowledge of the accountability agenda
  - o Canadians in general
  - o Build awareness of best practices
- Train federal officials in accountability and TB guidelines
- Federal political commitment needs to be tied or translated into bureaucratic operational policy and delivery
- Clear lines of authority leading to a “transparent” negotiating process with the aboriginal organizations
- Continuity of decision-makers at the table throughout the negotiating / implementation process, along with an evaluation process



- Federal recognition of who the representative authorities are at both national and regional levels with respect to federal / urban initiatives
- Federal recognition of the “structures” the Métis have created (province-wise)

### **CHART 5 – ISSUE: Financial system creates a deficit situation**

- Need for a new fiscal relationship.
- Existing funding should not be up for grabs by gov` t

#### *What*

- Accountability is doing something
- All partners in the process want results
- Can we have one single window?
- Could we do this thru thematic areas
- Could we collectively identify indicators/issues? \* - need to shift away from issue managing
- What is the level of provincial involvement
- What is the level of involvement / commitments from the feds re: Métis
  - o What could we do together?
- Equity of funding as between Aboriginal peoples is a major issue
- Timeliness of contribution agreements – leads to disruption of cash flow – forced to spend all \$ in last few months / weeks of fiscal year

#### *How*

- Collectively areas re: clusters – education, life long learning, Métis self-reliance
- In building strategic objectives to meet the needs of Métis/fed/provincial
- Strategic objectives can be tailored by provinces
- Build upon jurisdictions strengths
- Committed funding must be secure
- adjustments for inflation and increasing program costs
- recognizing operation and maintenance costs
- visibility on internal government costs and budgets
- multi-year funding and sustainability
- funding for women on an equitable basis
- targeted strategies for marginalized groups (e.g. People with disabilities, sexual minorities, seniors
- minimal holdback on program funding
- Métis-specific investment fund
- Should be required to reimburse “bank charges” on operating loans
- Make bank charges eligible expenditures for reimbursement
- Move to “block grant” approach
- Streamline and reduce reporting requirements
- Multiyear funding
- Proposed development funding should be integrated to programs
- Carry-forward must be allowed
- Federal government should eliminate / forgive debt of NAO (one-time)



- Federal government should disclose “lapse funding” program by program and “official” reasons why
- Federal government should disclose amount of aboriginal program dollars consumed by federal bureaucracy – this is not on
- Federal government should disclose how many officials it hires to manage “us” -> while we are limited to no staff increases -> no COLAS (cost of living allowances) ever

### **Summary**

- need new fiscal relationship: identify strategic objectives to meet shared outcomes; prov. can tailor shared objectives; increase flexibility; programs/shared outcomes should meet social indicators

## **DAY 2 - REPORTING**

### **PROPOSED QUESTIONS FOR CONSIDERATION TODAY:**

1. What are the elements of good reporting?
2. How do we ensure that Métis women, Métis living with disabilities and Métis living in urban rural and remote areas are captured in the reporting process?
3. What are the Report Card critical issues and recommendations?
4. Measurements and indicators.

...BUT UPON REFLECTION, THE GROUP WISHED TO FOCUS CONSIDERATION EXPLICITLY ON THE REPORT CARD.

1. The Report Card (considering both `what` and `how` elements – criteria, content, purpose)

---

\*\*\*ROUND 2 – FOR AFTERNOON SESSION CONSIDERATION OF SPECIFIC LENSES AND ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS AND ISSUES ON TOPICS\*\*\*

**Lenses include:** Métis women; Métis people living with disabilities; Métis people living in urban, rural and remote locations

### **General discussion**

- linkage and influence to all available resources
- danger – limited set aside of resources – fight amongst ourselves
- consider aboriginal social debt – gap between aboriginal and Canadian population – debt reduction targets
- address aboriginal public service development needs
- (levels or strata along which data issues need to be considered) – National; provincial; project; community/regional; nations – Métis, cities



- federal \$ for Aboriginals is limited; need to ensure other departments don't exclude providing service
- how do services to Aboriginal people get recorded for those accessing non-Aboriginal services
- federal to take lead and integrate Aboriginal issues with provincial programs e.g. housing, cities agenda
- need a separate, women, urban component to the Report Card
- federal expenditures should be broken for urban centres

### **Parking Lot Issues**

- we do not all fit into the 3 boxes (FN/INUIT/MÉTIS)

### **General proposed elements of a focused discussion on a Report Card:**

- Expenditure data – devolution; core funding
- The relationship – measure; grade; rights, process and partnership
- Quality of life indicators – national; provincial; local; national, cultural retention
- Who and how/when to grade, report on – feedback from community (satisfaction); categories (who/how)
- Service utilization – CHST; measuring how we get access; institutional access; constitutional access

### **CHART 1: Expenditure data – devolution; core funding**

- AHRDS need challenge
- We need the political will to change this. Answer: have urban allocations and equitable access. 80% population, 10% unemployment, 10% isolation – problem with this formula is that it is not given to the communities in need.

#### Devolution:

- 2 categories: 1) federal to Aboriginal communities; 2) provincial to Aboriginal communities.

#### 1). Feds:

- measure the amount of actual increase \$ devolved to community
- (First Nations, Métis, Inuit, Women, non-status, status, urban, rural, & remote)
- This should be broken down by departments and type of expenditure
- For the 1<sup>st</sup> report card, benchmarks need to be established

#### 2) Provincial: (as above)

- Social Union Framework as report on amounts provincial governments actually spends.



#### Core Funding:

- Report on levels of core funding provided to Aboriginal organizations, correlated to population, programs and results (tracking per unit costs)
- Comparative analysis to core funding provided to feds\prov.\terr. Governments to provide Canadian comparable programs and services.

#### Equitable distribution based on population:

- equitable distribution based on population
- cost-effectiveness should be measured
- Data collection and analysis should be broken down by gender, geography location (urban, rural & remote), FN (status, non-status) Inuit, Métis, disability, sexual orientation, age etc.
- using ancestry data (vs. identity data)

#### Economic model:

- use the report card to demonstrate cost-benefit analysis of expenditures
- Aboriginal led programs and services (i.e. Health prevention programs (diabetes)
- Strategic investment that go beyond limitations of programs such as AHRDS (i.e. hairdressers as opposed to changing knowledge economy)

#### Miscellaneous:

- Who – an independent body should complete the Report Card. Selected by Aboriginal organizations (5 – NWAC/AFA/CAP/MNC/ITK) + Feds
- Distribution of funding – allocation model based on population, community needs (urban, rural, women, disability, etc.), changes in economy
- Core funding – more \$, governance
- Devolution – re-structure present federal program funding to go directly to the 5 NAOs.
- Structure of expenditure data – standard template (with Métis input)

### **CHART 2: The relationship – measure; grade; rights, process and partnership**

First group considered 3 distinct Main Areas to Measure: Participation, Governance/Self-Government and Recognition and Affirmation of Métis Rights

#### Participation Criteria

1. Level of effective involvement in decision-making on policies, programs and processes affecting Métis at federal, provincial and local levels.
2. Equitable Métis share of resources being devoted by fed, prov, local governments to Aboriginal peoples.
3. Partnership arrangements with F/P/T and private sector.
4. Level of participation by individual Métis in mainstream political and corporate initiatives and processes



### Governance / Self-Government Criteria

1. Devolution of responsibilities and resources to Métis governments.
2. Participation of Métis leaders in F/P/T conferences and international forums
3. Recognition of Métis governments on a Nation to Nation basis thru Agreements, Treaties and Legislation.

### Recognition and Affirmation of Métis Rights Criteria

1. Creation of forums/frameworks for the negotiation of Métis rights
  2. Federal acceptance of responsibility for Métis under section 91(24)
  3. Settlement of Métis land claims; constitution under S.35.
- Métis women and youth and disabled should be at the table in all forums/process etc
  - Inclusion of all Métis comm./nations
  - Part. Should be measured by rep. Of the lenses
  - Internal consultations req. by our leadership that is inclusive of youth/women/elders/north/disabled/urban/etc.
  - Inclusion under s.91(24) is inconsistent with self-government
  - Measured by the quality of the relationship between the feds and Métis nation e.g. Métis land claims / self gov. agreements
  - Measuring the quality of the relationship between fed departments and urban aboriginal programs (ie. Headstart)
  - Measure Canada`s knowledge of Métis
  - Canada should be measured against International human rights instruments and commitments that Canada has made – UN/OAS – DD of Ind. Peoples rights; Beijing and 5 woman conference on women; convention on racial discrimination; all UN conventions; convention of rights and child; CEDAW; measuring with other nation states, etc.
  - Need to recognize that Ab. People have rights, inc. right to org. in groups (ie. Choose their affiliations) therefore urban, women, rural, etc.
  - There is a need for representative orgs for each interest group
  - Report card requires grass roots interest group participation
  - Should follow a model like Aboriginal Healing Foundation community evaluation guide (culturally relevant)
  - Consensus
  - Meaningful consultation with Métis leadership
  - Prioritizing – we need to take the lead

### **CHART 3: Quality of life indicators – national; provincial; local; national, cultural retention**

What is important to know / areas for action?

- Life-cycle – birth; pre-natal; birth rates; high/low; child; pre-school; head start; education readiness; language transmission; transitions in school; elementary, high; post choices
- Education – graduation rates; enrollment; education support



- Family – home; housing; types of families; single parent; extended family
- Transition of youth to Labour Force
- Labour force participation
- Employment rates
- Mobility – inner city; high mobility in school; crime; urban rural

#### Indicators

- Graduation ratio
- Life expectancy
- Disability rate
- School readiness
- Retention rates
- Household income
- Home ownership (stabilization)
- Mobility rates
- Housing indicators – quality of housing; crowding; cost/accessibility

#### Breakdown by:

- Urban/rural
- Gender
- Cultural content in schools
- Aboriginal curriculum
- Staff are Métis?

#### Identifiers

- Indicators in School System (Alberta/BC)
- Child Welfare system
- Language identifiers
- Correctional System
- Head Start
- Health (?) - user fee data
- Market Basket Measures
- Poverty Rate
- Community well-being index
- UN Ranking
- Family Violence
- Teen Pregnancies
- Suicide
- Juvenile Detention
- Individuals - Families; communities
- Broad, priority outcomes
- Education cycle – graduation rate/age cohort; return rates; age in post secondary; family status; children
- Adult education – training to employment
- Educational – financial supports
- Training for what – types of jobs and transition to other programs



- Educational & support - priority
- Longitudinal data
- Trend analysis
- 5 years
- Volatile
- Data to be released in context
- International comparisons
- Ethnic Identity – mobility; changing population
- Culture
- Language – transmission generates use – home
- Ancestry / Identity
- Infant / Preschool / school / teen

...given these elements, the following Framework is proposed:

**Strategic Areas for Action** - early school performance; families; education; economic participation

**Headline Indicators (Relevant)** – Individual capacities (disability, school retention); material / economy; employment; income; spiritual / cultural (language); family and community violence

**Priority Outcomes** – Good family environment; strong communities; cultural identity; positive child development; preventing violence and crime; improved wealth creation & economic sustainability; individuals, families and communities

#### Priorities

- Poverty Rate
- Violence against women
- Infant Mortality
- Sexual and Reproductive Health - longitudinal study on Abor. populations
- Census – more culturally appropriate
- Set benchmarks – all areas; life cycle
- Educate Métis – self-educate on benchmarks

#### Costs

- Food
- Shelter
- Childcare
- Transportation
- Poverty rate
- Access to emergency housing (shelter)

When developing the Report Card, involve all NAO organizations, P/T, Local – local broad based discussions

Aboriginal community own data



## Telling the story

- Aboriginal involvements
  - Context
  - Different stories need to reflect local circumstances and history
1. Breakdown info into Aboriginal groups; communities, nations, urban
  2. Access to services e.g. Health, housing, education
  3. Governing Infrastructure – compare small city to Métis nation and aboriginal groups e.g. MMF comparison to provincial Depts.; access to recreation

## CHART 4: Who and how/when to grade, report on – feedback from community (satisfaction); categories (who/how)

- Fed -- to report to report to Canadians about Aboriginal peoples
- Us --- to have the Feds report to us on how they are meeting their obligations to us (rights, relationships)
- Should capture what the federal government does, what the Métis do and what the provinces do

## Gap Analysis:

- Difference between Métis and others

## When?

- Stages: frequency of reporting will vary by indicator.
- Relationship – annually
- \*Data available drives frequency and capacity to analyze, compile & communicate and resources for development.
- out leading to the report card, before &

## Who

- independent and representative oversight is critical to legitimacy (i.e. BC Progress Board)
- Another idea – Indigenous Peoples Forum. Needs to be tabled with Aboriginal assemblies and legislative assemblies. Citizen engagement at all 3 levels (risky)
- BLOG – running commentary on how we are doing this and to share progress.
- Linkage with report card to party ultimately responsible. Process to follow report card, outside of political process to people: make it a tool
- Substantive reporting grade
- Participation reporting grade
- Reporting on activity, results, man't performance
- identifying land-based Métis and communities including a description of urban/rural/remote
- rationale – recognition of land-based leads to securement and later negotiation on resources



- current/future situation – current land-base (settlements) in AL could serve as a model to build upon
- federal departments with Aboriginal programs (urban Aboriginal programming lens) annually, with input from community
- independently done and report to assemblies (parl. + 5 NAOs, incl. Women)
- Métis, aboriginal women, also included in process
- include NAFC in process and provincial PTA`s

#### Who has to report?

- Métis comm. reports on federal
- provincial governments through their responsibilities, keeping in mind the minority groups within the Métis organizations

#### Who receives and acts upon the Report Card?

- How – defining the indicators
- Accountability working group with Aboriginal organizations

#### What

- clearly identify investments in urban services
- targeted spending identified by appropriate group e.g. When discussing youth, urban, remote, rural
- Métis is to report on their membership

### **CHART 5: Service utilization – CHST; measuring how we get access; institutional access; constitutional access**

#### What do we want to measure?

- 1). Program and services up-take by Métis
- 2). Satisfaction with programs and services by Métis client users
- 3). Range of programs and services available to Métis
- 4). Extent to which programs and services are provided by Aboriginal/Métis specific agencies
- 5). Value of the programs and services access/utilized by Métis
- 6). Personnel/human resources – Métis public service

#### Up-take criteria

1. number of Métis using programs and services
2. utilization rates
3. demand and pent-up demand by Métis for programs and services (i.e. waiting lists).
4. ability to access services (i.e. waiting times, geographic impediments)

#### N.D.

- a) have to have comparable data with other Aboriginal peoples and non-Aboriginal
- b) has to be done for federal, provincial & municipal levels



## Data

- We recognize that data is usually collected on Métis utilization
- One way to get around this is to rely on post –census and other surveys to get the data.
- This is to be complemented by voluntary identification of Métis users
- Continue to work with provinces and service providers to provide sound Métis specific data

## Satisfaction Criteria

1. Objective mapping of program and service availability at local/community level
2. Subjective evaluation by Métis population of satisfaction with access to, level of and quality of services in their community

## Range of Program and Services available to Métis

1. Inventory of programs and services available to Métis at federal & provincial level, compared to other Aboriginal peoples, and distinguishing between those available to all people, those available to all Aboriginal, and those that are Métis specific.
2. Expenditure data on each program and service activity, distinguishing between budget & actual, and calculating a/b spent on Métis

## N.B.

- in-depth inventory every 3 years and up-dated every year
- to be produced by a joint F/P/T Aboriginal Technical Committee responsible to the First Ministers/Aboriginal leaders forum.
- Point 4) & 5) relating to Métis specific delivery and value of programs to Métis could be dealt with through Inventory and Expenditure Data designed for point 3

## Personnel in Métis public service

1. Number of employees of Métis organizations, distinguishing between Métis and non-Métis employees, gender, and academic background, and experience
2. Administration and capacity building budgets and expenditure
3. Personnel and administrative data by region & home office.

**\*\*\*WRAP UP AT DAYS END\*\*\***

## **HOW AND FOR WHAT SHOULD A REPORT CARD BE USED - PLENARY**

- needs to tell a useful and interesting story
- needs to be contextual, and used to inform the communities
- give hints for government action
- to change government relationships with Métis people and urban groups
- tell the Métis story
- used to inform and influence public policy



- to increase equality among aboriginal groups, between aboriginal and non-aboriginal people
- will assist government in continually improve what they are doing
- basis of discussion for forming / developing consensus
- part of monthly departmental discussions on priorities and objectives
- a standing strategic planning item in all departments
- tabled in parliament and Métis assemblies
- reflect lenses: women (application of gender based analysis), disabilities, geographic
- plain language to transmit to everyone
- translated to French, English, Michif
- used for international audiences (i.e. UN)
- Human Development Index at UN for comparative purposes
- To hold the government accountable for what they are doing for Métis
- To hold the government accountable for what they are doing for urban aboriginal groups
- To hold the government accountable for follow through on past commissions and inquiries
- To hold all parties accountable

## KEY MESSAGES

- Urban Aboriginal groups have to be recognized in this process including friendship centers and NWAC
- When you look at governance and self-government you have to recognize and deal with organizations that represent the peoples concerned
- There is a role for urban aboriginal organizations such as friendship centers in policy development; this role needs to be defined

What report card should not be used for:

- rhetoric
- remember – won't tell you everything; one more piece of puzzle
- external factors

Verbal questions, at end of day (not written down)

- Who will be writing the report?
- How will intricate details from the tables be captured
- The term 'Eskimo' was always a familiar term, so one participant hopes that we did not lose anything by adopting the Term Inuit.
- Canadians embrace the pride of Inuit culture.