



Indigenous Services  
Canada

Services aux  
Autochtones Canada



# Data Discussion Paper: Inuit-specific child welfare data

2024

# About Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami

Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami (ITK) is the national representative organization for Inuit in Canada, the majority of whom live in Inuit Nunangat, the Inuit homeland encompassing 51 communities across the Inuvialuit Settlement Region (Northwest Territories), Nunavut, Nunavik (Northern Quebec), and Nunatsiavut (Northern Labrador). Inuit Nunangat makes up nearly one-third of Canada's landmass and 50% of its coastline. The voting members of the ITK Board of Directors are democratically elected by the beneficiaries of their respective land claims agreements, and Directors in turn elect the ITK president. ITK therefore represents the rights and interests of Inuit at the national level through a democratic governance structure that represents all Inuit regions. ITK advocates for policies, programs, and services to address the priorities identified by our people.

ITK's Board of Directors are as follows:

- Chair and CEO, Inuvialuit Regional Corporation
- President, Makivik Corporation
- President, Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated
- President, Nunatsiavut Government

In addition to voting members, the following non-voting Permanent Participant Representatives also sit on the Board:

- President, Inuit Circumpolar Council Canada
- President, Pauktuutit Inuit Women of Canada
- President, National Inuit Youth Council

## **Vision**

Canadian Inuit are prospering through unity and self-determination.

## **Mission**

Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami is the national voice for protecting and advancing the rights and interests of Inuit in Canada.



# Table of Contents

Executive Summary .....	3
<b>1.0 Introduction .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>1.1 Objective .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>1.2 Background .....</b>	<b>8</b>
1.2.1 The Inuit Data Strategy Working Group and Initial Data Inventory .....	10
1.2.2 Data Inventory 2.0 .....	11
<b>1.3 The Challenge .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>1.4 Current Status of Child Welfare Services for Inuit Children     and Youth Across Inuit Nunangat .....</b>	<b>13</b>
1.4.1 Overview .....	13
1.4.2 Inuvialuit Settlement Region .....	15
1.4.3 Nunavut .....	16
1.4.4 Nunavik .....	17
1.4.5 Nunatsiavut .....	18
<b>1.5 Current Status of Child Welfare Services for Inuit Children     and Youth from a Provincial and Territorial Perspective .....</b>	<b>19</b>
1.5.1 Yukon .....	19
1.5.2 Northwest Territories .....	20
1.5.3 British Columbia .....	21
1.5.4 Saskatchewan .....	21
1.5.5 Manitoba .....	23
1.5.6 Prince Edward Island .....	23
1.5.7 Newfoundland and Labrador .....	24
1.5.8 Nova Scotia .....	26
<b>2.0 Inuit Child and Family Services Data</b>	
— <b>Current Situation Within Inuit Nunangat .....</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>2.1 Data from within Inuit Nunangat .....</b>	<b>27</b>
2.1.1 Nunatsiavut/Nunatsiavut Government (Labrador) .....	28
2.1.2 Nunavut/Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated (Nunavut) .....	31
2.1.3 Inuvialuit Settlement Region/Inuvialuit Regional Corporation (Northwest Territories and Yukon) .....	32
2.1.4 Nunavik/Makivvik Corporation (northern Quebec) .....	33
<b>2.2 Information from Provinces and Territories .....</b>	<b>34</b>
2.2.1 Yukon .....	35
2.2.2 Northwest Territories .....	36
2.2.3 Nunavut .....	36
2.2.4 Newfoundland and Labrador .....	37
<b>3.0 Inuit Child and Family Services Data; Current Situation Outside of Inuit Nunangat .....</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>3.1 Data from outside Inuit Nunangat</b>	
— <b>as reported by Provinces and Territories .....</b>	<b>39</b>
3.1.1 British Columbia .....	39
3.1.2 Manitoba .....	40
3.1.3 Ontario .....	41
3.1.4 New Brunswick .....	41
3.1.5 Nova Scotia .....	42
3.1.6 Prince Edward Island .....	42
3.1.7 Saskatchewan .....	43



- 3.2 Inuit Child and Family Services Data, as Compiled by ISC from Publicly Available Sources** .....45
  - 3.2.1 Alberta .....45
  - 3.2.2 Quebec .....46
- 3.3 Other Partners and Inuit Child and Family Services Data** .....46
  - 3.3.1 Indigenous Services Canada (ISC) .....46
  - 3.3.2 Public Health Agency of Canada .....47
- 4.0 Barriers & Limitations** .....48
- 5.0 Conclusion** .....52
- 6.0 Supporting Actions** .....53
  - 6.1 For all Working Group Members** .....53
    - Supporting Action #1 - Identification .....53
    - Supporting Action #2 – Training and Skills .....53
    - Supporting Action #3 – Information-sharing Agreements .....53
    - Supporting Action #4 – Notice of Significant Measure .....54
  - 6.2 Tiered Supporting Actions for All Provinces and Territories** .....55
- 7.0 Next Steps** .....56
- 8.0 Appendices** .....57
  - Appendix A: Data Inventory Template (PTs) .....57
  - Appendix B: ITO Data Input Template .....59
- 9.0 Bibliography** .....62



# Executive Summary

## Background and Context

The Inuit Data Strategy Working Group was co-established by Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami (ITK) and Indigenous Services Canada (ISC) to co-develop with partners new multi-jurisdictional data approaches to improve child and family services (CFS) for Inuit children and families. The working group commenced on February 4, 2021; since that time, participating members have included ITK's Ad-hoc Child Welfare Working Group, consisting of representatives from ITK, four (4) Inuit Treaty Organizations, Pauktuutit Inuit Women of Canada and the National Inuit Youth Council, plus representatives from three (3) Territories, nine (9) Provinces and the federal government.

Within the Working Group, ITK was responsible for leading, driving, and approving the content of this Discussion Paper. Provinces, Territories, and Inuit Treaty Organizations (ITOs) contributed technical knowledge and information about their current approaches to data related to Inuit children and families. ISC supported the development and coordination of the paper.

## Objective

**Purpose:** In an effort to support an Inuit-led approach to child and family services, this Discussion Paper explores:

1. The current state of child and family services data indicators (most notably, Inuit-specific data indicators) that are being collected.
2. The quality of data, the levels of granularity of each indicator, and the gaps that exist across provinces, territories, and regions.
3. Tiered supporting actions that can be adopted to foster collaboration between partners, improve data-sharing and collection, and develop data-driven programs and services.

**Audience:** This paper has been prepared for federal, provincial and territorial stakeholders, along with Inuit Treaty Organizations, at the technical level.

**Dissemination:** This paper may be made available online through the ITK and ISC websites.

**Roles & Responsibilities:** ITK led the creation of the paper as co-chair of the Working Group meetings. Provinces, Territories, ITOs, and other partners, such as the Public Health Agency of Canada, contributed technical knowledge, data and information about the current state of Inuit CFS data. ISC supported the development and organization of the paper, coordinated data activities and compiled data inputs from partners captured in the data inventory.

## Data Analysis

This Discussion Paper is divided into two areas of focus regarding Inuit CFS data: the current situation *inside* and *outside* of Inuit Nunangat.

The information from across Inuit Nunangat is based on data submissions from all four Inuit Treaty Organizations (ITOs) — Nunatsiavut Government (NG), Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated (NTI), Inuvialuit Regional Corporation (IRC), and Makivvik— and most of the provinces and territories inside of Inuit Nunangat (Yukon, Northwest Territories, Nunavut, and Newfoundland and Labrador). Provinces outside of Inuit Nunangat also provided information, at present, contributing provinces include British Columbia, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Ontario, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, and Nova Scotia. A few provinces did not submit data; as such, a jurisdictional scan of publicly available child and family service information was conducted for Alberta and Quebec.

It is important to note that there are several differences in child welfare systems across Canada, from legislation to policy, practices, and data collection. These challenges make comparison difficult and provide an important caution when considering calls for pan-Canadian reporting on child welfare. These differences also mean that reporting on child welfare indicators must be done carefully in the context of partnerships, for instance, ITK, PHAC, provinces, and territories should continue to work closely to solve existing challenges.

Nevertheless, the following overall observations emerged in the analysis of the data collected across all provinces, territories, and regions:

1. **Incomplete information and reporting:** Many provinces were unable to report on specific data, had limited data, or had large inconsistencies regarding what they could or could not report on. Several provinces have not yet submitted information on their CFS data.
2. **Inconsistent Data Inventory and Definitions:** There appears to be little standardization and consistency across provinces and territories regarding the definitions used to evaluate data regarding child and family services. This has made it challenging to make comparisons when reporting on identity-based data, placement information, maltreatment, children in need of protection, service delivery, serious occurrences, and quality standards.
3. **Limited distinctions-based data:** There is limited distinctions-based data to capture the diverse identities of Indigenous children and youth interacting with CFS programs. Currently, provinces tend to only make distinctions based on whether someone is Indigenous or non-Indigenous, amalgamating all Indigenous youth and children into a single, homogenous category.

## Inside of Inuit Nunangat

Information from inside of Inuit Nunangat explores both the provincial and territorial data available from Yukon, the Northwest Territories, Nunavut, Newfoundland and Labrador, and Quebec (which has yet to submit data regarding its Inuit child indicators). It also encompasses the information from Inuit Treaty Organizations covering the four regions of Nunatsiavut, Nunavut, Inuvialuit, and Nunavik.



The following specific observations were noted, according to seven child and family services themes identified by ITK (excluding Quebec):

1. **Identity-based Data:** Provinces and territories (PTs) collect basic demographic details and Indigenous identity where the degree of specificity is unknown, with the exception of the Northwest Territories, Yukon, and Newfoundland and Labrador which collect distinctions-based data. In terms of ITOs, the Nunatsiavut Government collects basic demographic data and is transforming to collect distinctions-based data. Other ITOs had limited information beyond beneficiary enrollment.
2. **Placement:** The PTs were able to report on the type of orders and placement provided, total days in care, and children and youth placed in kinship care, foster care, and staff placements. The majority of PTs could also report on where children are placed in relation to their home community, the number of foster homes (Inuit and non-Inuit), and the number of children placed with extended family caregivers. Some ITOs could report on placement type and location. ITOs would like to see the overall number of intakes, response times, reasons for contact with the welfare system, and reasons for re-reporting. They would also like to see total days in care (by placement type), number of foster placements (Inuit and non-Inuit), rate of community placement, placement with an Inuit family, location by placement status, and average location changes per child.
3. **Maltreatment:** There were inconsistencies across PTs regarding the collection of maltreatment data. Some PTs tracked characteristics of parents and children, others tracked only time to permanency, and others only collected data on types of maltreatment. Some ITOs could report on type of maltreatment, and one specifically had data on the main reasons for the removal of Indigenous children.
4. **Children in need of protection:** All the PTs tracked the number of adoptions by type, the number of children/youth in care and in out-of-care placements, as well as the type of order and placement. The majority of PTs also reported on youth agreements and supervision orders. Some ITOs could also report on some of this data with ranging consistency. They would like to see more data on placements with one parent/stepparents, extended family, and siblings. They would also like to see more information regarding supervision orders, Voluntary Services Agreement and Case Plan (VSAs), and family reunification.
5. **Service delivery:** All PTs reported on reasons for removal, number of referrals, and service length. Most were also able to report on service type, incidence or status of maltreatment, and reasons for prevention services. ITOs had limited and varying information regarding service delivery, such as the enrollment and registration information, as well as number of children and youth receiving direct support. Some ITOs were also able to report on Inuit cultural connections completed, the unique needs of the child, the proportion of permanent and temporary care, voluntary versus non-voluntary service requests, and number of interactions with CFS. ITOs would like to see more data regarding service gaps, types, and prevention. They would also like to see more information on the type of contact and number of children in contact with family and visiting home, and the number of children/youths accessing services.

6. **Serious occurrences:** All PTs were able to report on deaths and serious injuries of children and youth.
7. **Quality standards:** All PTs track the total days in care and the dates the files were opened and closed.

### Outside of Inuit Nunangat

When evaluating the Inuit CFS data situation outside of Inuit Nunangat, the following specific observations were noted across the remaining provinces, that is, British Columbia, Alberta, Quebec, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Ontario, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, and Prince Edward Island:

1. **Identity-based Data:** There was inconsistency in the degree to which provinces could provide basic identifying information. Aside from British Columbia, Saskatchewan, Nova Scotia, and Manitoba, which track distinctions-based data, the degree of specificity for Indigenous identity is unknown. One caveat is that identity has historically been self-reported and is also dependent on frontline workers accurately inputting information.
2. **Placement:** With a few exceptions, most provinces can report on the number of children in care. There is varying consistency in the ability to report on the type and order of placement, the total days in care, and where children and youth are placed.
3. **Maltreatment:** There is no consistency regarding the data available for reporting maltreatment across provinces. Provinces reported data ranging from type of maltreatment, recurrence of protection, and time to permanency.
4. **Children in need of protection:** There is also some inconsistency in provinces' abilities to report on children in need of protection, with the majority of provinces being able to report on supervision orders, youth and agreements, and the number of children in and out of care. Few provinces were able to add additional details like previous investigations and open cases, adoptions, and type of protection.
5. **Service delivery:** There is limited information across provinces regarding service delivery data, with the most common data being reported in terms of the program type followed by service delivery length.
6. **Serious occurrences:** Aside from British Columbia, Saskatchewan, and Manitoba, other provinces were unable to report on deaths and critical injuries of children and youth.
7. **Quality standards:** Most provinces were able to report on when files were opened and closed, as well as total days in care. Based on the available information, it is challenging to differentiate when total days of care was used as a quality standard or a placement standard.



## Supporting Actions

To combat some of the data challenges and limitations identified in the analysis, this paper offers Supporting Actions for all provinces and territories to adopt. This includes:

1. Provinces and territories should, at minimum, identify all Inuit children and youth connected to their child welfare systems including the identification of the corresponding Inuit Treaty Organization as standard practice moving forward.
2. Provinces, territories and Inuit Treaty Organizations should deliver child welfare services that ensure all staff have the knowledge and skills to gather Inuit-specific data from children, youth and families.
3. Provinces and territories should consider information-sharing agreements with Inuit Treaty Organizations to improve data collection, reporting, and sharing.
4. When a child is identified as Inuit, the Inuit Treaty Organization must be notified, provided an opportunity to exercise their legislative authority over Inuit child welfare and child services, and/or provide support/services.

Understanding that each province and territory has varying capacity and resources, the following Supporting Actions are applicable based on the proportion of Inuit children in contact with child welfare in each jurisdiction. This can be defined as any child or youth whose information has been collected for the purpose of inquiry, investigation or when procuring services, either preventative or protective, by a mandated CFS agency (including personal data obtained during inquiry, investigation, protective placement, preventative services or referral).

### Tier 1: Fewer than 12% of Inuit Children in Contact with Child Welfare

- Annually, provinces and territories should share point-in-time reports with Inuit Treaty Organizations.
- Determine outcome indicators to enable outcome monitoring, progress reporting, and evidence-based decision-making (regions will determine how they will be involved, intent of use etc.). This action indicates that with lower populations of Inuit children in contact with child welfare in tier 1, it may not be possible to extract the same quality data as in other jurisdictions, so there may need to be adjustments to the reporting requirements.

### Tier 2: Between 13 - 24% of Inuit Children in Contact with Child Welfare

- On a bi-annual basis or upon request for data, provinces and territories will provide and share point-in-time reports with Inuit Treaty Organizations (ITOs).

### Tier 3: More than 25% of Inuit Children in Contact with Child Welfare

- Territories and provinces should maintain information systems usable in both English and Inuktitut, and to conduct regular performance audits to ensure and maintain data quality.
- On a bi-annual basis or upon request for data, provinces and territories should have the ability to provide and share point-in-time reports with Inuit Treaty Organizations.

# 1.0 Introduction

## 1.1 Objective

This discussion paper was prepared to better understand the current state of child and family services (CFS) data indicators collected by provinces, territories and regions, and the degree to which Inuit identity is recorded and distinguishable. As part of the exploratory portion of the work, we are looking to develop a better understanding of the type and quality of data currently being collected, along with the availability of Inuit-specific identity indicators of children, youth and families in contact with child and family services. This includes, but is not limited to, the level of granularity of each indicator, the ability to distinctly identify Inuit, the extent to which data is currently being tracked, and whether the existing data is reliable for decision-making.

This discussion paper is designed to support an Inuit-driven approach to child and family service delivery. Through compilation and analysis of current data, supporting actions are provided to lead us towards improved data sharing, collaboration, collection and ultimately the development of data-informed preventative and protective programming to support Inuit children, youth and families.

As the availability and quality of data and information about Inuit children, youth and families and their contact with child and family services varies across provinces, territories and amongst the federal system, the following paper is intended to inform all levels of government alongside Inuit Treaty Organizations. By documenting the current state, we can move forward in the development of pragmatic and implementable solutions to improve the outcomes of Inuit children.

ITK and ISC worked closely together on the compilation of this paper; ITK was responsible for leading and approving the content of the paper and ISC provided support related to the development, data compilation and coordination of the content. Provinces, territories, Inuit Treaty Organizations and other partners (such as the Public Health Agency of Canada) were significant contributors of technical knowledge and information with respect to their current state.

## 1.2 Background

In late 2015, the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada (TRC) concluded its research and produced 94 *Calls to Action*, which urged all levels of government to make changes to policies and programs as a concerted effort to reconcile and address the harm caused by residential schools. The first five Calls are specifically related to child welfare calling for Indigenous child welfare legislation with national standards. The report also called upon the federal government to work with the provinces and territories to report data on Indigenous children in care, including specific data such as reasons for apprehension.<sup>1</sup> These *Calls* are also reflected in the *Calls for Justice* from the National Inquiry into Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls and point to a need for improved data related to Inuit children and more specifically built upon in the National Inuit Action Plan on Missing and Murdered Inuit Women, Girls and 2SLGBTQQIA+ People.<sup>2</sup>

---

1 Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada. *Calls to Action*. December, 2015, [https://ehprnh2mwo3.exactdn.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/Calls\\_to\\_Action\\_English2.pdf](https://ehprnh2mwo3.exactdn.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/Calls_to_Action_English2.pdf)

2 "National Inuit Action Plan on Missing and Murdered Inuit Women, Girls and 2SLGBTQQIA+ People." Pauktuutit. Accessed February 17, 2022. [https://pauktuutit.ca/wp-content/uploads/Pauktuutit\\_MMIWG\\_Action-Plan\\_English\\_PDF-Version.pdf](https://pauktuutit.ca/wp-content/uploads/Pauktuutit_MMIWG_Action-Plan_English_PDF-Version.pdf)



In 2018, an Emergency Meeting on Child and Family Services was held, whereby the Government of Canada committed to six points of action to address the overrepresentation of Indigenous children and youth who are in care, in Canada.<sup>3</sup> Of these six points, one was the creation of a data strategy with provincial, territorial and Indigenous partners to increase inter-jurisdictional data collection, sharing and reporting to better understand the rates and reasons for apprehension. An additional point of action targeted was the co-development of *An Act respecting First Nations, Inuit and Métis children, youth and families* (the Act). Within this Act, Section 28 provides authority to the federal Minister of Indigenous Services to enter into information-sharing agreements across jurisdictions.

On June 21, 2019, the Act received Royal Assent, coming into force on January 1, 2020, a historic step in Canadian legislative history. The legislation was co-developed among Indigenous partners as a means to affirm the inherent right of self-government, which includes jurisdiction in relation to child and family services, on a national level, to set out principles for the provision of child and family services in relation to Indigenous children, and to contribute to the implementation of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP).

The four Inuit Treaty Organizations (ITOs), Inuvialuit Regional Corporation (IRC), Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated (NTI), Makivvik, and the Nunatsiavut Government (NG), are now able to exercise their legislative authority in relation to child and family services. Should an ITO want to provide notice and exercise jurisdiction, the Act provides a framework to enact laws concerning child and family services, which could extend to all the ITO's beneficiaries, no matter where they are located in Canada.<sup>4</sup>

As with many other institutions, child welfare in Canada is rooted in colonialism, with colonial concepts informing policies and practices, negatively affecting Inuit children's safety and family wellbeing and failing to respect the rights of children and parents. As a consequence, too many Inuit children and youth have been and continue to be placed in the care of child welfare agencies due to issues of neglect, which can be largely attributed to a lack of attention to addressing social and economic inequities among Inuit, including but not limited to areas such as food security, housing, mental wellness, availability of health services, income distribution and quality of early child development.

The Act, through the creation of national standards, the commitment to resources and the ability to exercise jurisdiction over child and family services by Inuit Treaty Organizations, has the potential to change outcomes for Inuit children and families across the country. What is still required is improved collection, sharing, and reporting of Inuit-specific data. Such improvements will play a significant role in better understanding the current circumstances including the rationale for involvement, the measurement of racial disproportionality and disparities, evidence to inform policies, practices and protocols, and identifying the location of all Inuit children.

---

<sup>3</sup> Indigenous Services Canada. Governance Engagement Mechanisms: Topic 8 – Development of a Data and Reporting Strategy. Presentation. September 22, 2021.

<sup>4</sup> Indigenous Services Canada. Act respecting First Nations, Inuit and Métis children, youth and families: Policy Intent. Presentation, Ottawa, ON, December 17, 2019.

### 1.2.1 The Inuit Data Strategy Working Group and Initial Data Inventory

Following these events, the Inuit Data Strategy Working Group was established jointly by Indigenous Services Canada and Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami. The group began meeting on February 4, 2021, with ISC, ITK and ITK's Ad-hoc Child Welfare Working Group. Representatives from all provinces and territories were also invited to attend. Participants began to meet quarterly to focus on compiling a data inventory while using an online, co-development platform for asynchronous communication and collaboration and to ensure that Inuit governing bodies could know more about provincial/territorial data.

Through the completion of an environmental scan, the workplan goal of creating a data inventory could be targeted; the scan would allow the identification of gaps in data and the extent to which changes need to be made to current data management systems. Alongside this, it would also allow for the identification of trends, factors impacting, such as barriers, and commonalities that will support the collaborative efforts moving forward with respect to data and information sharing.

**Figure 1. Inuit data scan distributed to Inuit Treaty Organizations**

Data Collection					
ITO/Working Group Member	With respect to Inuit children and families involved with child welfare in your region, what data is currently available to you?	What key indicators would support you in the implementation of the federal legislation? (i.e., coding/eligibility of service, risk factors, response time, court, etc.)	What are the barriers you have faced with respect to accessing data?	With respect to data you can access, what is the frequency and process?	What recommendations would you provide to P/T child welfare systems in relation to data access and delivery as we move toward implementation? (How would you like to see data directed to the Regions?)
Example ITK	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Data publicly released from P/T governments.</li> <li>Information captured by TI under the OCYFSA given that ITK is currently the listed community.</li> <li># of intakes</li> <li>Date of each intake</li> <li>Intakes by land claim regions</li> <li>Current residence</li> <li>Child Protection Agency</li> <li>Underlying issues</li> <li>Notification reason</li> <li>Action taken by TI</li> <li># of families receiving direct support</li> <li># of children/youth receiving direct support</li> <li># of referrals made — internal and external</li> <li># of interactions with children, youth families</li> <li># of cultural connection</li> <li># of enrollments/registrations</li> <li>Notable achievements by TI each month as the Inuit representative</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li># of Inuit children in care within each PT.</li> <li>LCA affiliation</li> <li>Reason for contact with the system</li> <li># of days in care by placement type</li> <li># of foster parent placements available (Inuit and non-Inuit)</li> <li>Location of Inuit children who are in placement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Privacy concerns</li> <li>Lack of data availability</li> <li>Point in time count</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Monthly report provided by IT</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Indigenous identifiers should be tracked, especially Inuit and by LCA</li> <li>Information should be shared regularly with Inuit LCA</li> </ul>



In May 2021 a template specific to Inuit Treaty Organizations was developed and circulated. The template sought to understand what types of child welfare data were available to them, what indicators would support them in the implementation of the Act, what the barriers to accessing data are, and for data they can access, at what frequency. Lastly, the template also queried how ITOs would like to see data directed to the regions (see Figure 1).

A template was also created for and distributed to provinces and territories to gain an understanding of what is being collected across the country at the time, and more specifically, what is known about where Inuit children are located. The provinces and territories were asked to outline their Indigenous-specific data alongside key indicators, frequency of collection, who can access the data and what the process would be for ITOs to access this data (see Figure 2).

**Figure 2. Inuit data scan distributed to provinces and territories**

Data Collection					
Province / Territory	With respect to Indigenous children and families involved with child welfare in your region, what data is currently being collected?	Of this data, what key identifying indicators exist? (i.e., First Nations, Inuit, Métis, Inuit Land Claim Organization affiliation, Band, etc.) coding/eligibility of service, risk factors, response time, court, etc.)	What is the frequency of your data collection?	Who can access your data internally and externally?	In follow-up, what would be the process for Inuit Land Claim Organizations and/or governments to access this data? If citing privacy, please note specific section of legislation that prevents information from being shared.
Example Name of PT	# of children in care; days of care in placement; placement type; age; sex.	Indigenous identifiers are tracked; however, do not indicate which Inuit LCA a child identifies with.	Monthly reports produced.	Information is available to specific staff within the Department of X. Information is shared with X Indigenous organization when requested.	Request would need to be made and data could be shared within X days.

While Canada and Indigenous Services Canada do not collect any direct Inuit child welfare data, they do have data related to various social determinants.

### 1.2.2 Data Inventory 2.0

The initial data collection templates were intended to take a broad approach to understanding data gaps and needs. Following that exercise, subsequent meetings with the Working Group raised the importance of having well-defined indicators of measurement, more details regarding what data should be included within them, and how they could reasonably be assessed. With an understanding that PTs have different legislation, policies, procedures, and service delivery models, there was a desire to identify specific child welfare indicators to better understand the types of data that could be available.

The data inventory circulated with PTs can be found in Appendix A. The indicators are categorized as the following: identity-based data; built environment and social determinants; placement; cultural continuity; maltreatment; children in need of protection; service delivery or case management standards; service length; serious occurrences; and quality standards. Similarly, the ITO data collection template can be found in Appendix B. It includes indicators for: referral data; service delivery; children in need of protection; children in care; placement; categories of maltreatment; and identity-based data. The details of what is included within

each category can be located in the appendices. The templates were co-developed with the Working Group, and the granularity of the indicators were prepared by ITK through the help of technical experts (including social workers and data experts).

This revised Data Inventory 2.0 was intended to adopt a granular approach. As a result, it is aspirational, and its purpose is to highlight the art of the possible. It is understood that some of the indicators may vary drastically in terms of how feasibly they can be tracked. For example, some of the indicators listed (such as social determinants) may only be included in the case notes of social workers, while others may be formally inputted in a PT's or ITO's data management system. There are also challenges to how much some of the indicators can be measured. For instance, there may be data collected on types of maltreatment, but not potential harm (at least not in a formal capacity).

Nevertheless, collecting data on the basis of these indicators would assist ITK and ITOs in developing a data-driven approach to service delivery. For instance, having details on very granular indicators such as a child, youth, or families' environment can assist ITOs to arrange for the most appropriate support resources. The more information available, the better ITOs can play an intermediary role and help reduce the demand on social workers to provide essential services. As a result, the Data Inventory 2.0 outlines the ideal amount of data granularity that ITOs would like to see from PTs around Inuit-specific data. This is intended to be an ambitious approach for the future, and it recognizes that at present, PTs are starting at a minimum to identify all Inuit children and youth.

With respect to provinces and territories, the template to date has been completed by the Governments of Yukon, Northwest Territories, Nunavut, British Columbia, Manitoba, Ontario, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, and Newfoundland & Labrador. ISC then compiled the data and created a summary dashboard, stored within a collaborative workspace, to be reviewed by the participants. PTs were encouraged to provide feedback and updates, which ISC then incorporated into the document. With respect to ITOs, the templates were completed by all four Inuit Treaty Organizations: the Inuvialuit Regional Corporation, Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated, Makivvik and the Nunatsiavut Government.

### 1.3 The Challenge

As has been noted in recent years, the overrepresentation of Indigenous children in child welfare systems is one of the most pressing social issues in Canada. Although the federal government has a responsibility to provide support for First Nations, Inuit and Métis peoples, including children, child welfare systems currently exist under the authority of provincial and territorial law and policy. As such, PTs have an important role to play in addressing the overrepresentation of Indigenous children.<sup>5</sup>

Key to addressing this overrepresentation is the need for better data. Canada does not have one child welfare system, it has thirteen, each of which reflects a complex arrangement of laws, policies, funding models, and engagement with Indigenous peoples and the federal government. This makes it challenging to collect common data on a pan-Canadian level.

---

<sup>5</sup> Canada. Forum of Ministers Responsible for Social Services Indigenous Children and Youth in Care Working Group. Report on Indigenous Children and Youth in Care. August, 2020.



This report highlights the various challenges in gathering common data. PT laws, definitions, and policies differ, as do the service delivery models in each province and territory. Fundamental differences in how each system operates and captures data mean that even when considering a straightforward measure such as the number of Inuit children in care across Canada, the number identified by provinces and territories reflects gaps in the data. The specific interaction of the federal government with Indigenous children is also different. PTs varied significantly in their ability to report based on current data, and on some indicators various PTs were unable to report. As a result, there are significant challenges involved in having all PTs report on common child welfare data indicators.

These challenges are intended to illustrate the reality of data comparison in Canada. Any future discussions of pan-Canadian reporting, even on straightforward indicators, will need to contend with these challenges. As child welfare in Canada enters a new era, it is important to understand the complex realities of collecting data and sharing information about child welfare across Canada.<sup>6</sup>

## 1.4 Current Status of Child Welfare Services for Inuit Children and Youth Across Inuit Nunangat

### 1.4.1 Overview

Inuit reside primarily in Inuit Nunangat, the Inuit homeland of Canada which is made up of 51 communities in the Inuvialuit Settlement Regions (Northwest Territories and Yukon), Nunavut, Nunavik (Northern Quebec) and Nunatsiavut (Northern Labrador).<sup>7</sup> Inuit Nunangat, a term that includes land, water and ice, makes up 40 percent of Canada's land area and 72 percent of its coastline.<sup>8</sup>

Today in Canada, child welfare is the responsibility of provincial and territorial governments through legislation and child welfare ministries. Within the varying regions of Inuit Nunangat, there are times whereby agreements and policies between treaty organizations and the corresponding province/territory overlap as it relates to responsibility and service delivery. Regardless of location, all regions of Inuit Nunangat face similar challenges in their child welfare systems in that they are not fully meeting the needs of Inuit children and families.

In each region, child welfare departments and agencies respond to reports of acts of harm towards children and youth, assess the safety and well-being of children and youth as well as respond to requests for support from children, youth, and caregivers. The specific conditions which trigger government's duty to intervene are also similar in each region and include, but are not limited to, allegations of neglect, physical abuse, sexual abuse, exposure to violence, behavioral issues, and caregiver capacity.

As in other jurisdictions in Canada, all four regions' services are delivered either via "voluntary" services or by court order. The range of supports and interventions again reflects that of the rest of Canada; it can include advocacy work and linkages to other systems up to the permanent removal of a child as a result of court orders.

---

6 The Provincial-Territorial members of the Indigenous Children and Youth in Care (ICYC) Working Group. Report on Indigenous Children and Youth in Care. August, 2020.

7 "Inuit Regions in Canada." About Inuit, Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami. Accessed February 17, 2022. <https://www.itk.ca/about-canadian-inuit/>.

8 "Introduction." About Inuit, Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami. Accessed February 17, 2022. <https://www.itk.ca/about-canadian-inuit/>.

With respect to Indigenous children, and in particular, Inuit children and families, there remain parallels between Canada's residential school history and modern-day child welfare policies and practices. In the 1900s day schools and hostels were established in the North; Inuit children were taken from their homes with little to no consultation or consent from the parents, forced to travel incredible distances and, thus, were separated from their families for years.<sup>9</sup> Through these years of separation, it is not new information when we reference the atrocities that occurred toward Inuit children and youth in addition to the loss of their connections and their culture. By the 1960s, Canada's residential school buildings were often being used as orphanages and child-welfare facilities.<sup>10</sup>

Following residential schooling, the harm to Indigenous children and families continued with the "Sixties Scoop;" the apprehension of Indigenous children at preposterous rates by child-welfare systems. Similar to day schools and hostels, Inuit children and youth were taken from their home, families and communities and forced to live across the country or even further.<sup>11</sup> For Indigenous families today, the child welfare systems across Canada continues to disrupt, separate and eliminate the intergenerational sharing and passing on of cultural values, skills and connections. According to the 2022-2023 Annual Report of the Director of Child and Family Services for the Government of the Northwest Territories, 97% of children and youth receiving prevention and protection services identified as Indigenous (with 16% identifying as Inuit), whereas only 57% of children and youth in the territory identified as Indigenous.<sup>12</sup> In Saskatchewan 81.2% (as of March 31, 2019) of children in care were Indigenous, yet 16% of their total population identified as Indigenous.<sup>13</sup> According to the 2016 Census Data, 52.2% of children in foster care were Indigenous while only making up 7.7% of the population. As only some PTs collect distinctions-based data, we do not know currently how many of these children and youth are Inuit.

Past audits by the Office of the Auditor General of Canada in both the Northwest Territories and Nunavut have identified major challenges with meeting the standards set out in each respective jurisdiction's legislation and regulations. This includes non-compliance at the front-line level as well by senior management. In one circumstance, an assistant director reportedly did not have access to the system's database and thus could not monitor and assess the services for which they were responsible for delivering under the Act.<sup>14</sup> In a separate circumstance, it was identified that the Department of Family Services' data was not reliable with respect to the number of children in foster care, a problem identified in 2014 as a result of ineffective information management; the issue remained relevant in 2022.<sup>15</sup>

9 Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada. *Canada's Residential Schools: The Inuit and Northern Experience*. Accessed April 26, 2022.

10 McKenzie, Brad, and Pete Hudson. "Native Children, Child Welfare, and the Colonization of Native People." In *The Challenge of Child Welfare*, edited by Ken Levitt and Brian Wharf, 125–141. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1985.

11 Sinha, Vanda, and Anna Kozłowski. "The Structure of Aboriginal Child Welfare in Canada," *International Indigenous Policy Journal* 2, no. 4 (2014). <https://ojs.lib.uwo.ca/index.php/iipj/article/download/7405/6049>

12 Northwest Territories. Department of Child and Family Services. 2022-2023 Annual Report of the Director of Child and Family Services. October 5, 2023. <https://www.hss.gov.nt.ca/sites/hss/files/resources/2022-2023-cfs-director-report.pdf>.

13 The Provincial-Territorial members of the Indigenous Children and Youth in Care (ICYC) Working Group. *Report on Indigenous Children and Youth in Care*. August, 2020.

14 Canada. Office of the Auditor General. *Many Services Provided to Children and Families Have Worsened Since 2014*. October 23, 2018. [https://www.oag-bvg.gc.ca/internet/English/mr\\_20181023\\_e\\_43175.html](https://www.oag-bvg.gc.ca/internet/English/mr_20181023_e_43175.html).

15 Canada. Office of the Auditor General of Canada. *Report of the Auditor General of Canada to the Legislative Assembly of Nunavut Child and Family Services in Nunavut, 2023*. Accessed January 10, 2024. <http://www.oag-bvg.gc.ca/>.



Through these audits across Inuit Nunangat, other key challenges have been identified, including staffing challenges, lack of foster placements in the region, and a system that is focused mainly on crisis intervention and not on prevention.

#### 1.4.2 Inuvialuit Settlement Region

Inuvialuit Regional Corporation (IRC) is the Inuit Treaty Organization which represents the collective interests of Inuvialuit including the communities of Aklavik, Inuvik, Paulatuk, Sachs Harbour, Tuktoyaktuk, and Ulukhaktok, with a combined population of over 6,000. Each community has a Community Corporation with elected directors; the directors of six community corporations elect the Chair of the IRC and as such the Inuvialuit beneficiaries directly control IRC and its subsidiaries through a democratic process of the above-noted elected directors. In addition to this, locally elected community councils oversee the administration and delivery of a wide variety of services to the hamlet residents.<sup>16</sup>

Currently, in the Inuvialuit Settlement Region, child and family services is delivered by the Government of the Northwest Territories; however, the Inuvialuit Regional Corporation served notice under Section 20(1) of the Act indicating that they intended to exercise jurisdiction in the future. This was followed in November 2021 by the passing of their new law,<sup>17</sup> as well as several associated regulations. The legislation will ensure that Inuvialuit children, youth, and families are cared for in a way that is aligned with Inuvialuit priorities and was produced through a meaningful process of consultation with their communities. On November 24, 2021, Chair and CEO Duane Smith served notice under Section 20(2) to the Government of Canada, and to governments of the Northwest Territories, Yukon, and Alberta, that the IRC intends to exercise its legislative authority in relation to child and family services and requested a coordination agreement with their governments), as well as several associated regulations. The legislation will ensure that Inuvialuit children, youth, and families are cared for in a way that is aligned with Inuvialuit priorities and was produced through a meaningful process of consultation with their communities. On November 24, 2021, Chair and CEO Duane Smith served notice under Section 20(2) to the Government of Canada, and to governments of the Northwest Territories, Yukon, and Alberta, that the IRC intends to exercise its legislative authority in relation to child and family services and requested a coordination agreement with their governments.

IRC is actively negotiating separate Coordination Agreements with the governments of Canada, the Northwest Territories, and the Yukon. They are proceeding on the gradual implementation of *Inuvialuit Qitunrariit Inuuniarnikkun Maligaksat* and IRC staff are already monitoring high-priority CFS cases involving Inuvialuit; their attention and support has already improved outcomes in cases.

---

<sup>16</sup> "Corporate Structure." Inuvialuit Regional Corporation. Accessed February 17, 2022. <https://www.irc.inuvialuit.com/about-irc/corporate-structure>.

<sup>17</sup> "Inuvialuit family way of living law (Inuvialuit qitunrariit inuuniarnikkun maligaksat) passe after community consultation." Inuvialuit Regional Corporation. November 24, 2021. <https://irc.inuvialuit.com/news/inuvialuit-family-way-living-law-inuvialuit-qitunrariit-inuuniarnikkun-maligaksat-passes-after>.

### 1.4.3 Nunavut

Nunavut has an Inuit population of over 30,000 living in the regions of Qikiqtaaluk (eastern region), Kivalliq (central region), and the Kitikmeot (western region).<sup>18</sup> Nunavut is a non-Inuit, consensus-style, public government with cabinet operating via a Legislative Assembly. Legislation gives authority to delegate functions and services under various Acts to Indigenous communities this includes the delivery of child and family services; however, currently the Government of Nunavut maintains responsibility for the delivery of child welfare services through their Department of Family Services.

Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated (NTI) is the Inuit Treaty Organization representing Inuit under the Nunavut Agreement with a mission to foster Inuit economic, social and cultural well-being through its implementation. NTI is governed by a Board of Directors elected by Nunavut Inuit; three members of NTI's 10-member Board of Directors are executive officers of NTI, six members are nominated by Regional Inuit Associations and include their presidents. NTI represents beneficiaries of the Nunavut Agreement who reside both within the 25 communities throughout Nunavut and across Canada.<sup>19</sup>

At this time NTI is actively participating in virtual engagement sessions to discuss and develop tools and mechanisms required for implementation, communication and funding alongside the completion of a legislative review of Nunavut's *Child and Family Services Act* to determine its standing in relation to meeting the minimum standards as set out in the Act.

The Auditor General's 2023 Report on Child and Family Services in Nunavut identifies "funding, staffing, lack of housing and office space, lack of timely training, and poor information management" as "root causes that have contributed to this present and chronic crisis." It is recognized that the report findings require a detailed and resourced action plan to address the underlying gaps and insufficiencies within the department. In this light, the department has crafted a Strategic Framework aimed at charting the course for formulation of a strategic plan. This plan will provide opportunities for feedback through consultation with Nunavut Departments, NTI, Stakeholders and Communities.

The Strategic Framework is organized according to seven priority areas:

1. **Organizational Effectiveness**

This priority area was listed as the foremost priority with a commitment to substantially reduce risks and ensure the safety of children, youth, and families in need.

2. **Adoption, Foster Care and Kinship Services**

This priority area includes a focus on providing a nurturing family environment for children requiring out-of-home care in Nunavut. This priority area underscores the importance of maintaining cultural and community connections and emphasizes the provision of local care to keep children connected to their ancestral lands and traditions.

18 Statistics Canada. Census Profile: Nunavut, 2016 Census. Accessed May 18, 2022. <https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2016/dp-pd/prof/details/Page.cfm?Lang=E&Geo1=PR&Code1=62&Geo2=&Code2=&Data=Count&SearchText=Nunavut&SearchType=Begins&SearchPR=01&B1=All&GeoLevel=PR&GeoCode=62>.

19 "Organizational Chart," About NTI, Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated. Accessed February 17, 2022. <https://www.tunngavik.com/about/nti-organizational-chartnti-timiup-havaktut-naunaitkutaat/>.



### 3. Inuit-Specific Services

This priority area is rooted in the understanding that Inuit children, youth, and families possess distinct cultural, social, and historical identities that significantly shape their needs and interactions with child and family services.

### 4. Investigations

This has been identified as a priority area as investigations are recognized as a cornerstone in safeguarding the welfare and rights of children and families. This priority is shaped by the necessity to protect those most vulnerable from abuse, neglect, or other harm.

### 5. Case Management

Case management is another priority area centered around continuously enhancing standards and procedures, integrating Inuit Societal Values and Inuit Qaujimagatuqangit, and ensuring robust training and support for staff.

### 6. Support for Out-of-Territory (OOT) Children and Youth

Providing support for OOT children and youth is identified as an important strategic priority. This acknowledges the unique needs of children and youth from Nunavut receiving care in other territories and provinces.

### 7. Recruitment and Retention

This area focuses on implementing innovative staff development strategies to attract and retain skilled professionals and fostering a supportive work environment which contributes to enhanced service quality and team morale.

Nunavut acknowledges the importance of accurate data collection; a new electronic case management system, Matrix, was launched in November 2023. This system will provide reportable data reflective of legislative categories of service delivery. Collection of data will reflect referral data, service delivery, children in need of protection, children in care, placement, incidents of maltreatment and identify based data. Phase 2 of this project will focus on completion of all data migration, enhanced staff training and completion of privacy impact assessment outstanding recommendations. The strategic framework also addresses the need for improved quality assurance program, management of serious occurrences and standards of practice that reflect best practice and are culturally informed.

PHAC has engaged with Nunavut to provide assistance with data collection, engaging in change management project that will assist in overall use of this electronic case management system and improving collection of data.

## 1.4.4 Nunavik

The region of Nunavik is located in the Province of Quebec,<sup>20</sup> where over 12,000 Inuit call Nunavik home throughout the 14 communities of Akulivik, Aupaluk, Inukjuak, Ivujivik, Kangiqsualujjuaq, Kangiqsujaq, Kangirsuk, Kuujuaq, Kuujjuarapik, Puvirnituaq, Quaqtuaq, Salluit, Tasiujaq and Umiujaq.<sup>21</sup>

<sup>20</sup> Government du Québec. Profiles of the Nation: Inuit. Accessed November 2023.  
<https://www.quebec.ca/en/government/quebec-at-a-glance/first-nations-and-inuit/profile-of-the-nations/inuit>

<sup>21</sup> "Our Communities." Nunavik Communities, Makivvik Corporation. Accessed February 17, 2022.  
<https://www.Makivvik.org/our-communities/>.

Makivvik (“Makivvik”) is the Inuit Treaty Organization which represents the collective interests of Inuit in Nunavik and protects their rights and interests provided by the 1975 James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement (JBNQA) as well as the Nunavik Inuit Land Claims Agreement that came into effect in 2008. The five-member Makivvik executive and 16 members of the Board of Directors are elected by the Inuit residents of Nunavik; in addition to this, a two-member Board of Governors is appointed by the Executive and Board of Directors to serve as a council of elders.<sup>22</sup>

In Quebec, legislation includes authority to delegate function and services to Indigenous organizations. However, at this time, the Nunavik Regional Board of Health and Social Services is responsible for coordination and organization of community and social services, youth-protection services and rehabilitation services. The delivery of community, social and youth-protection services are under the responsibility of the Inuulitsivik Health Centre (IHC) for 7 communities, with the Ungava Tulattavik Health Centre (UTHC) also providing services to the following communities: Kangiqsujuaq, Quaqtaq, Kangirsuk, Aupaluk, Tasiujaq, Kuujuaq, and Kangiqsualujuaq. The UTHC is also providing youth rehabilitation services for the entire region.

#### 1.4.5 Nunatsiavut

Nunatsiavut is located through parts of the northernmost coastal communities of Labrador and Newfoundland. The Nunatsiavut Government (NG) is the Inuit Treaty Organization representing Inuit under the *Labrador Inuit Land Claims Agreement and Labrador Inuit Constitution*; Nunatsiavut is the first and only of the Inuit regions in Canada to have achieved self-government, and its current status is focused primarily on partnership and collaboration.

Nunatsiavut is a consensus form of parliamentary democracy designed to ensure a separation of power between the political and operational levels of government; at the political level, the democratically elected representatives of the Nunatsiavut Assembly make laws and provide broad policy direction for the government.

The land claims agreement has 7,206 beneficiaries, of which 2,301 live in Labrador (but outside of Nunatsiavut) and 2,361 live within Nunatsiavut (across the communities of Nain, Hopedale, Postville, Makkovik and Rigolet).

On June 17, 2021, the Nunatsiavut Government released a statement indicating they were developing a plan that will eventually see the transfer of child welfare services from the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador to the Nunatsiavut Government. With respect to section 17.5 of the *Labrador Inuit Land Claims Agreement*, this section allows the Nunatsiavut Government to make laws in Labrador Inuit Lands and in Labrador Inuit communities concerning social, family, youth and children’s services.<sup>23</sup> Currently, the Nunatsiavut Government takes on several roles related to child and family services through the operations of preventative programs and services and acting as the Indigenous Representative for all notifications in accordance with CHAPTER C-12.3, *Children, Youth and Families Act*.

<sup>22</sup> Makivvik.” Makivvik Corporation. Accessed February 17, 2022. [www.makivvik.ca](http://www.makivvik.ca).

<sup>23</sup> “Process under way to take over child welfare services.” Nunatsiavut Government. June 17, 2021. <https://nunatsiavut.com/process-under-way-to-take-over-child-welfare-services/>.



Particularly, Nunatsiavut Government's Family Connection Program works directly with families who are struggling with child protection concerns to provide culturally appropriate services. Some objectives for this program include promoting positive parent–child relationships which focus on healthy child development; enhancing parenting knowledge and skills through information sharing and problem-solving; connecting families to formal and informal community services and supports to build up social and professional networks; promoting family wellness through the enhancement of healthy coping with everyday challenges; and, helping build stronger communities by strengthening capacity for family planning and preventative service delivery.

## **1.5 Current Status of Child Welfare Services for Inuit Children and Youth from a Provincial and Territorial Perspective**

### **1.5.1 Yukon**

As of 2021, 22.3% of Yukon residents identified as Indigenous. Of these residents, 78.7% identified as First Nations, 14.6% identified as Métis, and 3.0% identified as Inuit. As of March 2023, the estimated population of the territory was 44,692 with an estimated Indigenous population of approximately 25%. Notably, Yukon's Inuit-identifying population has shown steady increases over the past decade (2.3% in 2011 to 2.8% in 2016). The territory has 14 different Yukon First Nations, 11 of which are self-governing and three of which are bands under the Indian Act. Currently, approximately 95% of the children and youth in out-of-home care are Indigenous with approximately 5% identifying as Inuvialuit.

The Yukon Government's Family and Children's Services (FCS) is the only child welfare agency in the territory, governed by the *Child and Family Services Act (CFSA)*. The CFSA is applicable throughout the territory until Yukon First Nations draw down their jurisdiction. However, the Department of Health and Social Services has signed Memorandums of Understanding (MOU) with five First Nation governments. These MOUs work together and guide the delivery and administration of child welfare services to children and their families from their respective First Nations.

Guided by the Calls to Action from the Truth and Reconciliation Commission and the Calls for Justice from the Final Report of the National Inquiry into Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls, FCS continues to prioritize working closely with Yukon First Nations and the Council of Yukon First Nations (CYFN) to address the overrepresentation of Indigenous children in care. This includes working with Yukon First Nations and IRC to continually improve the collaborative approach to supporting their members with FCS involvement through avenues such as less restrictive information sharing agreements and supporting the work of Yukon First Nations governments in their efforts to exercise their jurisdiction over the provision of family and children's services.

The enhanced working relationship between FCS and Yukon First Nations culminated in an innovative approach to amend the CFSA. A government-to-government legislative amendment process was developed that implemented the 'Required Actions' from the *Embracing Children of Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow* report and brought Yukon's legislation into compliance with the Government of Canada's *An Act respecting First Nations, Inuit and Métis children, youth and families*.

FCS continues its philosophical shift in child welfare practice to move away from an intervention-based approach that brings children into the Director's care to a prevention-based approach that creates safety within families and communities. Ongoing and future initiatives to further this work include continuing to improve FCS' Caregiver Strategy, focusing on caregiver recruitment, retention, training, and support initiatives with the goal of providing more culturally-appropriate out-of-home placements for children; prioritizing the remainder of the CFS operational policy changes; continuing to improve and expand data management/ useability capabilities; and the implementation of cultural plans for all children in care, with CYFN, Yukon First Nations, and IRC.

### 1.5.2 Northwest Territories

The Government of the Northwest Territories' (GNWT) Child and Family Services system is responsible for delivering services to ensure the best interests of children, youth, and families; maintaining family unity; and promoting the strength of communities.

Child and Family Services in the Northwest Territories (NWT) includes voluntary prevention supports, family preservation, and protection services, which are available and provided to each of the 33 communities in the Northwest Territories. As of 2023, 57% of NWT's child and youth population (ages 0-19) identify as Indigenous (16% identified as Inuit, 5% identified as Métis and 36% identified as First Nation). Whereas 97% of children/youth receiving prevention and protection services through CFS identify as Indigenous:

- 16% of prevention and protection services were delivered to Inuit children/youth;
- 5% of prevention and protection services were delivered to Métis children/youth; and
- 76% of prevention and protection services were delivered to First Nations children/youth.

The overrepresentation of Indigenous children and youth receiving CFS in the NWT and across Canada serves as evidence that the CFS system needs to shift the delivery of services. It is important to acknowledge the ongoing impacts of colonial systems and systemic racism that maintain inequities for Indigenous families. As such, creating and sustaining meaningful change within the CFS system means that careful efforts must be made to repair relationships and build trust with Indigenous people and communities. With this lens, the GNWT's new Child, Youth and Family Services Strategic Direction and Action Plan (2023-2028) was developed with the aim to build a CFS system that ensures more families stay together and provides support to children and youth in a way that promotes their overall safety and wellbeing so they can thrive.<sup>24</sup>

Children, youth, and families receiving CFS are often better supported when there is engagement and pathways for community and Indigenous government participation. To improve services and supports, collaboration with Indigenous governments and organizations must be at all levels of CFS delivery. The GNWT's CFS system is also working collaboratively with Indigenous governments who are developing and enacting child and family services laws under the Federal Act respecting First Nations, Inuit and Métis children, youth and families

---

<sup>24</sup> Government of Northwest Territories. Child, Youth and Family Services Strategic Direction and Action Plan (2023-2028). <https://www.hss.gov.nt.ca/sites/hss/files/resources/cfs-strategic-direction-action-plan-2023-2028.pdf>



(Federal Act) or through a final self-government agreement. Since January 2020, the GNWT has been working to advance the mandate of the Federal Act by implementing the national principles and standards in the delivery of CFS in the NWT.

To further support the implementation of the Federal Act and having more relevant information to support Indigenous governments, the GNWT made changes to its electronic CFS information system (Matrix NT). A new feature in Matrix NT was added in April 2023 to enable community social services workers to add the child/youth's affiliation(s) to Indigenous Governments and/or Organizations (i.e., Inuvialuit Regional Corporation, Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated, etc.). Work is underway to update this information for all active files within the Matrix NT.

### **1.5.3 British Columbia**

British Columbia's Ministry of Children and Family Development (MCFD) is committed to upholding the rights of First Nations, Inuit, and Métis people to care for their children and families. While the number of Indigenous children in care is lower than it has been for decades, these numbers are still too high proportional to the population, and the existing system continues to fail Indigenous Peoples.

On November 24th, 2022, BC passed the Indigenous Self-Government in Child and Family Services Amendment Act. The legislative amendments remove barriers and gaps within provincial legislation, enabling the Province and Indigenous Peoples to collaborate and ensure Indigenous Peoples can govern and provide services based on their own child and family laws. The new act lays the path for Indigenous Peoples in B.C. to legally assume jurisdiction over child and family services in their communities. Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami was engaged on the scope and policy direction for the 2022 amendments. Four Indigenous governing bodies in B.C. are currently engaged in collaborative discussions with the Province and Canada to exercise their jurisdiction, with one Indigenous governing body having concluded a coordination agreement and now exercising jurisdiction under their own laws.

MCFD is also engaged in a process to reform the child and family service system. To inform direction for future reforms, MCFD initiated engagements in the spring and summer of 2022 — which included meetings with the ITK Child Welfare Working Group and National Inuit Youth Council on their priorities for Inuit families in BC.

ITK is also being engaged in the development of regulations to implement the Indigenous Self-Government in Child and Family Services Amendment Act — for example, in the development of an Indigenous Child Welfare Director.

### **1.5.4 Saskatchewan**

The Saskatchewan Ministry of Social Services is committed to improving the lives of children and families, and to preserve connections to culture and communities. Child and Family Programs has introduced initiatives to help identify First Nations, Métis and Inuit children, youth, and families at the onset of involvement with the Ministry to efficiently notify and engage the child's respective community in planning.

Our data collection, quality and reporting has evolved and is reflective of these new procedures. This has enabled an expansion of our reporting to include a broader sharing of information with a First Nations band, Indigenous Governing Body, First Nation Child and Family Services (FNCFS) Agency and/or the Métis Nation- Saskatchewan.

The Ministry's case management system, Linkin, was upgraded to accurately identify constitutional status for First Nations, Métis, and Inuit children in care, including "Status eligible, Métis eligible and Inuit eligible" values to identify children who may have unresolved registration needs. Further upgrades to the Linkin case management system provide ability to identify the name of an Inuit land claim and beneficiary number.

In 2021, the Ministry introduced Indigenous cultural planning policy to support the delivery of culturally responsive services to children. Cultural planning is identified as a standard practice for all Indigenous children in care. The process is intended to engage the child, family, caseworker, caregiver, and community, in development of individualized cultural plans reflective of the distinct cultural needs and interests of the child, and prioritize a child's connection with family, community and culture.

The introduction of the Ministry's Indigenous Registration policy in 2021 further supports early identification of Indigenous membership status and determination of eligibility to register children for Treaty status, Métis Citizenship, or eligibility as a beneficiary to either of the four Inuit Treaty Organizations. The registration process, initiated upon a child's admission to care, ensures the inherent rights of Indigenous children are respected and protected, and that children are aware of and have access to the services and support that may be available through their respective First Nation band, FNCFS Agency, community or Indigenous Governing Body. The process is intended to ensure children and youth have access to, and remain connected to culture, family, and community beyond their involvement with the ministry. A central point of contact with the Ministry was created to oversee all Indigenous registration applications, questions, and inquiries regarding registration for children in care. The new process and, upgrades to the ministry's electronic case management system, will improve ability to provide accurate statistics regarding the number of Indigenous children being registered each year and the number of applications being submitted, accepted, or rejected.

In November 2022, legislative amendments to the CFSA were tabled in the Legislative Assembly. Bill 101 identifies amendments in three main areas: Raising the age of the child entitled to receive protective services up to 18 years of age; Increasing the flexibility of information-sharing; and strengthening language in the CFSA to enhance family, community, and cultural connections for children and youth. The best interests of the child are embedded throughout all the proposed amendments, including updates to the act's "best interests of the child" provision to recognize the unique cultural aspects of Indigenous children, and requires preservation of the child's Indigenous identity, experience, and connections in case planning. The proposed legislation also clarifies several aspects related to working with Indigenous children and families, including broadening information-sharing to Indigenous Governing Bodies, and expanding notice to First Nations Child and Family Services agencies at various stages of planning. This will embed the significance of family, community and culturally based care and inclusion within planning with Indigenous children.



The first Coordination Agreement in Canada was signed on July 6, 2021, with Cowessess First Nation, the Government of Saskatchewan, and the Government of Canada. The Coordination Agreement supports the transition of an Indigenous Governing Body exercising jurisdiction over their members on and off reserve regarding Child and Family Services. The ministry continues to work collaboratively with the Indigenous Governing Body (IGB) to fulfill the objectives of the Coordination Agreement as lead by Cowessess.

### 1.5.5 Manitoba

Manitoba's child welfare system has devolved service delivery to four culturally based CFS Authorities since 2003. There are two First Nations Authorities (Northern and Southern), one Metis Authority, and one general Authority. Each Authority is responsible for mandating CFS Agencies, which provide front-line service throughout the province.

There are a very small number of Inuit children in care in Manitoba (less than one per cent of the total child in care population). The agencies under the Métis Authority currently provide services for children, youth and families who are Inuit.

Manitoba has been engaged in significant efforts to reduce the overrepresentation of Indigenous children in care for several years. This includes undertaking significant legislative reforms, supporting Indigenous community capacity, and working closely with Indigenous partners. Manitoba has created a new branch of the Department of Families to support the implementation of the federal Act respecting First Nations, Inuit and Métis children, youth and families. The department is actively participating in coordination agreement discussions and holding initial conversations with Indigenous Governing Bodies seeking to assume jurisdiction.

### 1.5.6 Prince Edward Island

Prince Edward Island has passed the new *Child, Youth and Family Services Act (CYFSA)* that, once enacted, will replace the current child protection legislation that is over 20 years old. This legislation clarifies the disclosure of information to third parties: i.e., *The Director may disclose personal information under section 54.(e) to a person or organization for the purpose of research, compiling statistical data or academic activities provided the person or organization has entered into an agreement with the Director respecting the security, use, disclosure and destruction of the personal information.*

Child Protection Services are provided to all Indigenous children and families living both on-reserve and off-reserve on Prince Edward Island through the Department of Social Development and Seniors. The Director of Child Protection is required to provide notifications to the designated representative of the band on PEI or contact the child's Indigenous governing body if located outside of the province. As well, a cultural connection plan for an Indigenous child must be completed in collaboration with the designated representative or Indigenous governing body. This cultural connection plan must align with the principles outlined in *An Act respecting First Nations, Inuit and Métis children, youth and families.*

Prince Edward Island is committed to reducing the overrepresentation of Indigenous children involved in the child welfare system. The Department of Social Development and Seniors has hired an Indigenous Program Analyst to work collaboratively with service providers who work to support Indigenous children, youth and families. As well, PEI has created an Indigenous Services Team to support Indigenous families. There are a number of initiatives including: 1) training provided to all staff regarding *An Act respecting First Nations, Inuit and Métis children, youth and families*; 2) a compliance guide for the *An Act respecting First Nations, Inuit and Métis children, youth and families*, which was created to assist staff in their work; 3) changes to existing policies and legislation to support the work with Indigenous children and families.

A Child and Family Services dashboard is currently in development, which will be used to display real-time data internally. The department is aiming to have annual reporting data from the dashboard become public facing in 2024. The dashboard will enable the department to quickly find service delivery data with the ability to filter by variables such as date of service, identity factors, and placement type. The dashboard will also display financial information and total amounts spent on the different services provided by Child and Family Services. Real-time data will support case management and quality standards within the department and improve efficiency of monitoring key performance indicators.

The department is reviewing current cultural identifier options within client information forms to improve data and align documentation practices. This will help to ensure data collection is consistent across government services and support the department's ability to offer culturally relevant services for clients.

### **1.5.7 Newfoundland and Labrador**

In Newfoundland and Labrador, information is shared with the Nunatsiavut Government (NG) as part of collaborative case planning, and under the provisions of our child protection legislation regarding Indigenous Representatives. This includes official notifications and the development of cultural connection plans for Inuit children and youth in care.

Additionally, the Department of Children, Seniors and Social Development (CSSD) collects data related to services to Inuit in the province through our information and data management system. CSSD publicly reports on a quarterly basis the number of Inuit children and youth in care by region and the location of their placements in relation to their home communities. CSSD also provides data related to services provided to Inuit children, youth, and families directly to the NG on an annual basis. These data reports include the demographic information of children and youth in care (e.g., name, date of birth, community of origin), current placement location, beneficiary/registration status, beneficiary number, whether or not siblings are in care, the names of the case management team (i.e., social worker, supervisor, and zone manager), placement type (e.g., foster home, group home etc.), custody status, cultural connection plan status, and the current plan for the child (e.g., reunification, adoption, etc.). In consultation with the NG, in this annual release of data, CSSD also provided the same information listed above for children and youth in care, as it pertains to children and youth in receipt of kinship services, which are children and youth that reside in out-of-home placements with kin but are not in care.



In 2020, CSSD released its first *Report on Child Welfare Services to Indigenous Children, Youth and Families*, which includes statistics regarding services to Inuit. This report includes the proportion and number of Inuit receiving services from the protection, kinship, in care, and youth services programs; reasons for involvement with programs; and placement location and types for those not living at home with their parents.

CSSD works closely with NG to collaborate and improve services. This includes a joint policy working group and efforts to improve policy and services through better understanding of data. Discussions about data include ways to improve quantitative data collection, as well as qualitative reviews of files.

From a quantitative point of view, it was identified that system updates were needed to allow more distinctions-based demographic information and easier collection of data related to cultural connection plans. As a result, new data fields were added to CSSD's system in 2022 that require staff to enter whether a person who identifies as Inuit is a NG beneficiary, as well as a new mandatory field that indicates whether a cultural connection plan has been completed. These changes allowed CSSD to more accurately report on the number of Inuit receiving services and more easily report on the number of cultural connection plans completed. Within fiscal year 2024-25, CSSD will begin reporting on outcome indicators on the permanency, safety and well-being of children and youth involved with the child welfare system. Each outcome indicator will be disaggregated by distinctions-based Indigenous identity.

From a qualitative point of view, NG has made a number of inquiries related to Inuit children and youth receiving services. As a result, CSSD is collaborating with NG to complete case reviews of Youth Services files, as well as a complete audit of all files for Inuit children and youth placed outside their home communities.

The completion of the file audit is part of the NG-led collaborative work in response to the Office of the Child and Youth Advocate's Report, *A Long Wait for Change: Independent Review of Child Protection Services to Inuit Children in Newfoundland and Labrador*. Recommendation 7 calls upon CSSD to complete an audit on all out-of-community placements and engage NG to ensure all placement options have been considered first within the child's family and/or community, and secondly within Nunatsiavut territory. A Long Wait for Change has a total of 33 recommendations, which CSSD has accepted and is working to implement, including the following data related recommendations:

- Recommendation 14: CSSD develop and evaluate outcome goals for child protection services in partnership with NG.
- Recommendation 33: CSSD monitor and evaluate the state of Indigenous children and youth involved in protection-related services in Newfoundland and Labrador, and report this annually to the Legislature.

### 1.5.8. Nova Scotia

In Nova Scotia Mi'kmaq Family and Children's Services have delegated authority under the Children and Family Services Act to deliver child and family services to all 13 Mi'kmaq communities. Mi'kmaq Family and Children's Services board of directors is governed by Mi'kmaq leadership.

In 2017 amendments were made to the Children and Family Services Act. There were 25 amendments incorporated from input provided by the Mi'kmaq. Amendments were specific to culturally-informed practice and including the following examples:

- Requirement of a cultural connection plan, which must offer information and guidance to preserve a child's cultural identity and, where the child is a Mi'kmaq child, must be developed with input from the child's band and foster the child's connections with their First Nations culture, heritage and traditions;
- Requirement for provision of notice to the child's band where a matter involving a Mi'kmaq child is brought to court under the Children and Family Services Act;
- Recognition of customary care and custom adoption.

To support the federal legislation, *An Act respecting First Nations, Inuit and Métis children, youth and families*, Nova Scotia has:

- Amended the Family Court Act to ensure provincial courts could hear matters impacted by the federal act.
- Worked with Mi'kmaq Family and Children's Services to better align provincial policies and procedures with the principles set out by the *Federal Act* to ensure social workers are aware of their responsibilities. This includes defining significant measures for the purpose of providing notice to Indigenous Governing Bodies under section 12 of the *Federal Act*.

Nova Scotia has worked with Mi'kmaq Family and Children's Services to better align provincial policies and practices with the principles set out by *An Act respecting First Nations, Inuit and Métis children, youth and families*. Nova Scotia follows the provision of notices of significant measures to Indigenous governing bodies.

In 2023 Nova Scotia implemented the collection of race-based and Indigenous identity data to enable planning and delivery of culturally inclusive and responsive program operations and activities. The provision of race-based and Indigenous identity data is voluntary and based on self-identification.

The Mi'kmaq are currently working towards self-governance of child and family services at the Nova Scotia Main Table with Canada and Nova Scotia.

Nova Scotia is currently undertaking a formal review of the Children and Family Services Act. Nova Scotia is engaging with partners and stakeholders to help further strengthen the act.



## 2.0 Inuit Child and Family Services Data — Current Situation Within Inuit Nunangat

### 2.1 Data from within Inuit Nunangat

The following information is based on the data and responses from members of the Inuit Data Strategy Working Group and the ITK Ad-hoc Child Welfare Working Group. It features a collection of Inuit child welfare indicators compiled to understand the current climate related to child welfare data collection, accessibility to data, and to identify opportunities and barriers. Responses were initially collected in mid-2021 and updates were made in 2023 (see Appendix B for the collection template).

Responses were grouped based on child and family services themes, as identified by ITK:

- Identity-based data
- Placement
- Maltreatment
- Children in need of protection
- Service delivery
- Children in care
- Referral data

Please find a summary table below highlighting the indicators available within each province and territory within Inuit Nunangat.

**Table 1: Summary Table of Inuit CFS data current situation from Inuit Treaty Organizations**

Inuit Treaty Organization	Identity-based data	Placement	Maltreatment	Children in need of protection	Service Delivery	Children in care	Referral data
Nunatsiavut Government (NG)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated (NTI)	✓	✗	✗	✗	✓	?	?
Inuvialuit Regional Corporation (IRC)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	?
Makivik Corporation (MC)	?	✓	✗	✗	✗	?	✗

- ✓ Indicators are available
- ✗ Indicators may be available or are partially available
- ? Indicators not yet available

### 2.1.1 Nunatsiavut/Nunatsiavut Government (Labrador)

**Referral Data** – Information regarding the placement of Inuk children and youth and the overall placement of Indigenous children and youth in kinship care are available. There may also be basic information related to: the number of child protection referrals, number of intakes, intakes by land claim region or community, response time, reasons for child welfare act incidents, reason for initial child welfare involvement for families with at least one Indigenous child, reason for contact with the system, date of intake, the child protections agency, number of at-risk mothers referred for services, and the number of referrals and intakes by land claims region/community (may be provided upon request). While the child protection system does not provide prenatal care, it does have a voluntary program for expectant parents who wish to avail themselves of services to address protection issues prior to the baby's birth. Department of Children, Seniors and Social Development (CSSD) could provide information, such as number of Inuit expectant parent program participants.

- NG would like to see notable monthly achievements as Inuit representatives, number of single parent referrals, child/youth age, number of child/youth in the home.

**Service Delivery** – Nunatsiavut Government (NG) may be served notification about apprehensions. NG has access to the number of Indigenous and non-Indigenous, including Inuit, clients for all programs offered through the child protection system, including the numbers of children, youth, and families receiving direct support. NG also has data on the types of significant measures: NG is served notice when a child is removed, however, if a child is subsequently placed in a voluntary care agreement or a kinship arrangement, NG is not served notice as this is not considered a “significant measure.” Other indicators like service delivery statistics (supervision orders, intakes, VSAs), actions taken, and total proportion of Indigenous and non-Indigenous youth services clients may be available.

- NG has indicated that it would like to see data related to gaps in available services, types of available preventative measure, frequency of preventative services accessed, types of services accessed by at-risk mothers, number of at-risk mothers accessing services number of interactions with children, youth and families, the number of children in non-Indigenous foster home care who are provided care in accordance with Inuit customs/traditions, number of notices of significant measures, number of children/youth receiving direct support, number of families receiving direct support, and child and family services outcomes (aging out of care, reunification, exiting care, adoption).

**Children in Need of Protection** – NG has access to the proportion of Indigenous families and non-Indigenous families receiving protection services (i.e., services related to the assessment of a child in need of protection) by region and Indigenous identity. They also have access to the reasons for child protection involvement (i.e., reasons why a child is assessed as needing protection) and data related to maltreatment type and allegations of neglect for Indigenous and non-Indigenous families. They also have information regarding the number of children placed in an Inuit community that can be provided to NG, as well as details regarding whether siblings are in care. NG also has access to some sibling in care data (i.e., whether children are placed with siblings or siblings are placed in a different location).



- NG would like to see data reflecting the number of children placed with one parent or step parent, the number of cases where immediate and extended family were contacted, the number of children placed with a member of another Indigenous group, the number of children placed in care with siblings, the number of children placed near siblings, and lastly, the number of children receiving regular visits with siblings.

**Children in Care** – A 6-year trendline for Indigenous and non-Indigenous children and youth in care can be found in the Indigenous Reports CSSD public releases. It includes proportion of Indigenous and non-Indigenous children in care by region and Indigenous identity, reasons for removal, and comparison between removal reasons for Indigenous and non-Indigenous children and youth. It also provides a breakdown of Inuit-specific over-representation in the report but does not provide Inuit-specific breakdowns of those trends (which can be provided from existing data sets, as the data can be disaggregated by distinctions-based Indigenous Identity). NG has access to case-based data regarding the completion of cultural connection plans annually. CSSD has provided statistics regarding the number of cultural connection plans that have been completed for Inuit children and youth in care and are currently making changes in its information system to make this data more readily available to regularly track and share with NG. CSSD has also recently added new demographic data fields in its system that require staff to indicate whether an Inuit child or youth is a registered NG beneficiary.

- NG would also like to see:
  - the number of cultural connection plans being followed;
  - the number of children in contact with immediate and extended family;
  - the number of children accessing services;
  - the number of children in care who visit their home community;
  - the number of days in care;
  - the number of children in contact with immediate and extended family and the type of contact children in care experience with immediate and extended family (NG and CSSD are currently looking at these items as part of the audit on all files where an Inuit child is placed outside their community, specifically in response to A Long Wait for Change);
  - those involved in cultural connection plan development;
  - identified physical, mental, cultural, social and psychological needs of children;
  - how often children in care are in contact with immediate and extended family;
  - barriers to immediate and extended family contact with children in care;
  - frequency of home community visits for children in care;
  - types of services accessed by children in care;
  - how often siblings celebrate special occasions together; and
  - reasons why cultural connection plans are not followed.
- Beyond the indicators in the template, NG would also like to see the number of children and youth in care involved with their in-care plan.

**Placement** – NG has access to the proportion of Indigenous children/youth in care by region, Indigenous identity, placement type, and location in relation to their home community; proportion of Indigenous children/youth in kinship by region and Indigenous identity and location in relation to their home community. This data is provided to NG annually as case-based data that outlines the specific demographic information, as well as all the specific indicators in this paragraph. Previously, this information was only provided for children in care, but as of July 2023, this information will also begin to be provided for Inuit children and youth in kinship.

- NG would also like to know the number of foster parent placements available (Inuit and non-Inuit).

**Categories of Maltreatment** – Information may be available regarding the types of maltreatment identified in Indigenous and non-Indigenous files, allegations of neglect by subtype for both Indigenous and non-Indigenous families, and the proportion of the top six removal reasons for Indigenous children and youth in care.

**Identity-based Data** – Collection of identity-based data is taking place and includes demographic information of children and youth in care (e.g., name, date of birth, community of origin), beneficiary/registration status, beneficiary number, location of placement within and outside of Nunatsiavut (province), Indigenous identity of families, Indigenous identity of children and youth, distribution of families by Indigenous identity, and distribution of kinship children/youth by Indigenous identity. It may also be possible to access information regarding current residence, the breakdown for the number of children by community, proportion of families with at least one Indigenous child in care vs. families with an Indigenous child in care, proportion of families with at least one Indigenous child in care out of total families by region, the total proportion of Indigenous and non-Indigenous kinship children/youth, proportion of Indigenous and non-Indigenous children and youth in care by region of placement, and proportion of Indigenous and non-Indigenous youth services clients by regions.

However, there continues to be work needed in providing distinctions-based data specific to Nunatsiavut Inuit. This mostly evolving around the ability to separate identity-based Nunatsiavut Inuit data from other Indigenous groups. There are also concerns of dual Indigenous identities and how these are captured within current data management systems. There are children we know who are eligible for NG beneficiary membership, however, they are missed due to being identified within another Indigenous group (e.g., children who have Innu and Inuit biological parents but only have their Innu Nation status formally recognized). Along with this, there is a need for specific identity-based data on Nunatsiavut Inuit parents to ensure no Nunatsiavut Inuit child is missed or overlooked. Such data will also ensure that the child of a Nunatsiavut parent receives services supportive of NG's policies. This is particularly important as all children born to a Nunatsiavut Inuk parent are eligible to receive NG services from birth to eighteen months without having to go through the formal application/approval process for an active beneficiary membership.



CSSD has recently improved demographic data collection by requiring further distinctions-based data fields be completed in the information system for Indigenous children, youth and families. These new fields allow CSSD to identify if a person identifying as Inuit is a NG beneficiary. Upon the annual provision of data to NG, there is often correspondence about children and youth who should have appeared on the list provided to NG, as well as children and youth who appeared who are not NG beneficiaries and identify as members of Nunatukavut. CSSD is aware this puts an onus on the NG to ensure the data is up to date, but this has been a helpful procedure for ensuring that all NG children and youth are included. In cases where a particular child or youth has been absent from the data, CSSD ensures the case management system is updated to reflect NG's data, as well as provide the demographic fields for the children and youth that were previously missed to NG. CSSD has also entered additional fields to separate between NG and NCC Inuit children and youth.

- NG would like to know the number of Nunatsiavummiut children in care within the province, ages of children receiving any level of child welfare services, the proportion of Indigenous and non-Indigenous youth services clients by region, and the address of the child or youth.

### 2.1.2 Nunavut/Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated (Nunavut)

**Referral Data** – NTI is currently able to access the date of intake, child protection agency and notable monthly achievements (completed only when children and youth are in out-of-territory placements or placed at Illagiitugut Group Home [IGH] in Iqaluit and not done for any other children and youth accessing services). Further, "Inuit Representative" is not included when reporting monthly achievements.

- Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated (NTI) would like to see data related to the number of intakes, number of referrals, intakes by community, reasons for child welfare involvement for families with at least one Indigenous child and reasons for contact with the system and placement of Indigenous kinship children and youth.

**Service Delivery** – NTI has access to the number of interactions with children, youth and families, number of children and youth receiving direct support, number of families receiving direct support, and actions taken. These are departmental point-in-time data and can be found in the fiscal year summary reports. In response to the 2023 Auditor General CFS report, Nunavut has committed to continuously enhancing standards and procedures, integrating Inuit Societal Values and Inuit Qaujimagatuqangit, and ensuring robust training and support for staff in its strategic plan.

- NTI would like to see data related to service delivery statistics (supervision orders, VSAs, etc.) and children and family services outcomes (aging out of care, reunification, exiting care, adoption).

**Children in Need of Protection** – No data available. However, as part of the 2023 Auditor General report, Nunavut has stated that it will prioritize support for out-of-home care and out-of-territory children and youth in Nunavut.

- NTI would like to see data related to the number of children placed in an Inuit community.

**Children in Care** – NTI has access to the number of enrollments/registrations and it may be possible to access reporting on the identified physical, mental, cultural, social and psychological needs of children. It was noted, however, that there seems to be a misalignment of who has care and custody when children and youth are in a plan of care. Furthermore, while Nunavut does not currently track indicators related to cultural continuity, it has identified that it will prioritize Inuit-specific services and providing/maintaining cultural and community connections in its forward-looking strategy.

- NTI would like to see data reporting on the number of days in care.

**Placement** – No data available.

- NTI would like to see data reporting on the proportion of Indigenous children and youth in care by placement type and the number of foster parent placements available (Inuit and non-Inuit).

**Categories of Maltreatment** – No data available. However, Nunavut indicated in the 2023 Auditor General report that investigations and risk-reduction will be a priority.

**Identity-based Data** – NTI has access to current residence data. Identity-based data is a default to reporting given that the vast majority of those accessing services are Inuit, but it is not actively tracked by the department.

- NTI would like to see data reporting on the number of children in care within each PT who are beneficiaries (or eligible to be) of NTI, ages of children receiving any level of child welfare services and location of placement within and outside of Nunavut.

### **2.1.3 Inuvialuit Settlement Region/Inuvialuit Regional Corporation (Northwest Territories and Yukon)**

**Referral Data** – Inuvialuit Regional Corporation (IRC) has access to intakes by land claims region or community; it may also be possible to access reporting on date of intakes.

- IRC would like to see data reporting on response times, reasons for child welfare act incidents, reason for initial child welfare involvement for families with at least one Indigenous child and reasons for contact with the system.

**Service Delivery** – IRC receives notifications about apprehensions, children and youth receiving support through Child and Family Services by type of service, and pathways to receiving Child and Family Services (requests for voluntary services vs. reports).

**Children in Need of Protection** – IRC has access to the number of adoptions, requests for voluntary services agreements, and requests for support services agreements.

**Children in Care** – IRC has access to the proportion of children/youth in temporary care and permanent care and percentage of youth in permanent care who signed an Extended Support Services Agreement when they reached the age of majority. It may also be possible to access reporting on data related to the number of enrollments/registrations and the number of children accessing services.



**Placement** – IRC has access to the number of children/youth in placements by type of resource, children and youth receiving support through CFS by location, location of children who receive services under a Plan of Care Agreement, and number and proportion of individuals receiving Child and Family Services out-of-territory.

**Categories of Maltreatment** – The number of reports of suspected child maltreatment, by type, are reported.

**Identity-based Data** – IRC has access to the beneficiary enrollment database and the breakdown of the number of children by community.

### 2.1.4 Nunavik/Makivvik Corporation (northern Quebec)

**Referral Data** – No data available.

- Makivvik would like to see data reporting on the reason for contact with the system and the rate of re-reported children.

**Service Delivery** – No data available. Makivvik may receive data related to total interventions and intervention intensity.

- Makivvik would like to receive data compiled according to the boundaries of each Institution's population responsibilities defined for service providers Ungava Tulattavik Health Centre (UTHC), Inuulitsivik Health Center (IHC), West Island Health & Social Services Centre (CIUSSS ODIM), etc.

**Children in Need of Protection** – No direct data available.

- Makivvik may be able to make inference by comparing varying reports i.e., number of total active children under the Director of Youth Protection (DYP) to total number of children placed.

**Children in Care** – Some data is available. Makivvik receives data related to the number of total users in placement, number of children placed, number of placements, number of foster homes used, number of foster homes still active and the number of total active children under the DYP.

- Makivvik would like to see data reported on the number of Inuit children in care under the IHC DYP, under the UTHC DYP, and under the CIUSSS ODIM DYP (including Batshaw Youth and Family Centres) as priorities, as well as all DYPs in Quebec and in youth protection across Canada.

**Placement** – Makivvik receives ad hoc or annual public reporting that include information on foster home placement rates, the number of children placed, the number of placements, number of foster home placements, number of foster homes used inter-CJ, number of foster homes still active and the total users in placement (north and south).

- Makivvik would like to see data reporting on the number of days in care by placement type, number of foster placements available (Inuit and non-Inuit), rate of placement within a child's own community, rate of placement of a child within an Inuit family, location of Inuit children who are in placement by status (foster home, rehabilitation center, etc.) and place and average number of location changes per child in care.

**Categories of Maltreatment** – No direct data available.

**Identity-based Data** – Makivvik receives some Inuit-specific data publicly released by the Nunavik Regional Board of Health and Social Services (NRBHSS), the IHC and the UTHC.

## 2.2 Information from Provinces and Territories

The following data is based on provincial-territorial responses to the ITK Ad-hoc Child Welfare Working Group and the ISC’s Inuit Data Strategy Working Group collection of Inuit child welfare indicators. Responses were collected in mid-2021 (see Appendix A for the collection template).

Responses were grouped based on child and family services themes, as identified by ITK:

- Identity-based data
- Placement
- Maltreatment
- Children in need of protection
- Service delivery or case management standards
- Serious occurrences
- Quality standards

Please find a summary table below highlighting the indicators available within each province and territory within Inuit Nunangat. Given limitations/inconsistencies of data collection in Nunavut, the following data may be available, however it may not be collected in relation to all clients.

**Table 2: Summary Table of Inuit CFS data current situation from Provincial and Territorial governments within Inuit Nunangat**

Province or Territory	Identity-based data	Placement	Maltreatment	Children in need of protection	Service Delivery	Serious occurrences	Quality Standards
Yukon	✓	✓	?	✓	✓	✓	✓
Northwest Territories	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Nunavut	✓	✓	✓	✓	?	✓	?
Newfoundland and Labrador	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

- ✓ Indicators are available
- × Indicators may be available or are partially available
- ? Indicators not yet available



### 2.2.1. Yukon

**Identity-based data** – Basic identifying information including age, gender, name, address and Indigenous identity is collected. Distinction-based Indigenous identity is collected whenever possible. However, degree of specificity varies due to identity being self-reported and reliant on frontline workers accurately inputting this information. The number of children receiving services is tracked by location and a unique case or record identifier is assigned to track children and families who receive services.

**Placement** – Type of service order and placement is collected. This includes a range of data that can be reported on including children/youth with kin, with foster families, in staffed placement, the number of foster homes (Inuit and non-Inuit) and the number of children with extended family caregivers. The Yukon also collects the total days in care and may be able to track whether or not children/youth are placed in their home community based on existing placement data.

**Maltreatment** – The Yukon may be able to report on characteristics of individuals who have caused potential harm (reports of maltreatment), recurrences of protection concerns in a family after investigation, recurrences of protection concerns in a family after ongoing protection services were provided and the characteristics of children in maltreatment reports.

**Children in need of protection** – The number of children in care, number of children in out of care placements, number of children engaged in youth agreements/youth support services, and the type of order and placement (outside of territory or within territory) is collected. It may be possible to report on the number of adoptions and by type (departmental, private, registered custom adoption), previous investigations, previous open cases, and the number of youth who have aged out of care.

**Service delivery or case management standards** – Reasons for removal, reasons for requests of prevention services (i.e., financial support, housing), status maltreatment reports (screened in, screened out), service involvement by program type, removals by Indigenous identity, number of family files and number of referrals and reasons is collected. It may also be possible to report on incidence of maltreatment and service length using existing service delivery and case management data.

**Serious occurrences** – Number of deaths of children and youth receiving services up to one year prior to death and the number of critical injuries of children and youth receiving services is collected. This timeframe will likely be expanded as improvements are made to the data management practices (e.g., expanded scope of database queries).

**Quality standards** – Total days in care, and the date of file open, and date of file close is collected. The Yukon may also report on the date of adoption using existing data pertaining to when a file is opened and closed. Information on additional indicators (e.g., total days in care) may be available after upcoming changes to data management practices.

### 2.2.2 Northwest Territories

**Identity-based data** – Basic identifying information including age, gender, sex, address, and distinctions-based Indigenous identity data (i.e., First Nation, Inuit, and Métis) is collected. To track location, home community or region, and the number of children receiving child and family services by location is collected. It may also be possible to report on names as well as beneficiary information using existing identity data. Their information system also has the ability to input the child or youth's affiliated Indigenous government/organization/council/band (regardless of the "registration status."

**Placement** – Type of service order and placement, and total days in care is collected. Whether a placement is within or outside of territory can also be determined. It may be possible to report on children/youth placed with kin, foster families, or staffed placements, where children/youth are placed (i.e., home community or elsewhere), the number of foster homes both Inuit and non-Inuit, and the number of extended family caregivers using existing placement data.

**Maltreatment** – Characteristics of individuals who have caused potential harm (i.e., reports of maltreatment) and characteristics of children in maltreatment reports is collected.

**Children in need of protection** – Number of children under supervision orders, number of children engaged in youth agreements/youth support services, number of children in care, number of adoptions by type (i.e., departmental, private, registered custom adoption), and type of order and placement (i.e., outside or in-territory) is collected. It may also be possible to report on the number of children in out of care placements based on existing data pertaining to type of placement.

**Service delivery or case management standards** – Reasons for removal, reasons for requests of prevention services (i.e., financial support, housing), status maltreatment report (i.e., screened in, screened out), incidence of maltreatment, and service involvement by program type is collected. It may be possible to report on removals by Indigenous identity, number of family files, number of referrals and reasons, and service length based on existing service delivery and case management data.

**Serious occurrences** – There is a serious occurrence reporting mechanism in existence in the NWT.

**Quality standards** – Total days in care, date of adoption and date of file open, and date of file close is collected. Recurrence data has also now become available.

### 2.2.3 Nunavut

**Identity-based data** – Basic identifying information is collected, including age, sex, name, and indigenous identity (degree of specificity is unknown). Home community or region is also tracked. Based on existing identification data it may also be possible to report on the number of children receiving child and family services by location and address.



**Placement** – Type of service order and placement, number of Inuit and non-Inuit children/youth in foster homes (Inuit and non-Inuit), and total days in care by care type (i.e., regular, extended or group care both in and out of province), number of children/youth receiving services at home is collected. Nunavut may be able to provide data on the total number of nights spent in safe shelters by children and youth.

**Maltreatment** – Data is available regarding types and subtypes of maltreatment by region. Nunavut may be able to report on the time to permanency using existing data.

**Children in need of protection** – The number of children in care, number of adoptions by type (departmental, private, registered custom adoption), number of youth who have aged out of care, and type of order and placement (outside or in-territory) is collected. It may be possible to report on the number of children under supervision orders, number of children in out of care placements, and number of children engaged in youth agreements/youth support services based on existing child protection data.

**Service delivery or case management standards** – The number of referrals and reasons is collected. It may also be possible to report on service length using existing service delivery and case management data. A new electronic case management system, Matrix, was launched in November 2023. This system will provide reportable data reflective of legislative categories of service delivery.

**Serious occurrences** – The number of deaths of children and youth receiving services up to one year prior to death and the number of critical injuries of children and youth receiving services is collected.

**Quality standards** – The total days in care, date of file open, and date of file close is collected. It may also be possible to report on time to permanency and date of adoption using existing data. Additionally, a Quality Assurance Specialist has been hired to ensure that audits and investigations are performed in relation to programs under the Child and Family Services Division.

## 2.2.4 Newfoundland and Labrador

**Identity-based data** – Basic identifying information including name, age, gender, and address is collected. Indigenous identity and distinctions-based data is collected. It is also possible to report on home community or region, and when available, beneficiary information.

**Placement** – Children/youth placed with kin, foster family, or staffed placement, and where children/youth are placed (i.e., home community or elsewhere) is collected. It can also report on type of order and placement (i.e., within or outside of territory), number of children/youth in each type of care (i.e., kinship, residential care, foster care, and reunified with family following placement in out of home care), and the number of children/youth in out of care placements (i.e., in formalized placements, not temporary ones). Data on the number of foster homes, both Inuit and non-Inuit, and the number of extended family caregivers are partially available.

**Maltreatment** – Data is available to be shared with the Nunatsiavut Government regarding types and subtypes of maltreatment for Indigenous and non-Indigenous children and youth by region, and Indigenous identity. Other data like recurrence of protection concerns in a family after investigation and time to permanency can be available but have not been reported to date.

**Children in need of protection** – Number of children in care is collected, as well as the number of children in out of care placements, number of adoptions by type (i.e., departmental, private, registered custom adoption), and type of order and placement (i.e., outside or in-territory) based on existing data. There is also data available regarding previous investigations/previous open cases, number of children/youth in an out of court agreement (i.e., plans of care, voluntary service agreement, temporary care agreement), number of children/youth engaged in Youth Agreements/ Youth Support Services (i.e., out of court order), and number of youth who have aged out of care.

**Service delivery or case management standards** – Number of family files, reasons for removal, incidence of maltreatment, service involvement by program type, removals by Indigenous identity, number of referrals and reason, and service length is collected.

**Serious occurrences** – Number of incidents of verified maltreatment, removals, and serious injury and death are all collected and available to share by Indigenous identity and region.

**Quality standards** – Newfoundland and Labrador reports on total days in care, date of adoption, date of file open, date of file close using existing data, number of files reopened after closure, and rate of family or community reunification tracking quarterly whether or not Inuit children or youth are in their home communities and providing this information annually directly to NG. Community reunification as a field though does not exist in the system. Time to permanency may also be available but is dependent on the type of permanency and whether or not the information has been updated in the system. This is an outcome indicator CSSD will be reporting out on in 2024-25.

Other indicators like quality of caregiver-children/youth relationship for children in care and frequency of home community visits for children/youth in care are available in case notes and potentially in the In Care Progress report, but not something currently being reported on.



## 3.0 Inuit Child and Family Services Data; Current Situation Outside of Inuit Nunangat

### 3.1 Data from outside Inuit Nunangat — as reported by Provinces and Territories

Please find a summary table below highlighting the indicators available within each province and territory outside Inuit Nunangat, using the child and family services themes outlined in section 2.2. The following data is based on provincial-territorial responses (see Appendix A for the collection template). Quebec and Alberta did not submit a response (an overview of publicly available information for both provinces can be found under section 3).

**Table 3: Summary Table of Inuit CFS data current situation from Provincial and Territorial governments outside of Inuit Nunangat**

Province or Territory	Identity-based data	Placement	Maltreatment	Children in need of protection	Service Delivery	Serious occurrences	Quality Standards
British Columbia	✓	?	?	✓	✓	✓	✓
Manitoba	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓
Ontario	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
New Brunswick	✓	✓	?	✓	✓	✗	✓
Nova Scotia	✓	✓	?	✓	✓	✗	✓
Prince Edward Island	✓	✓	?	✓	✓	?	✓
Saskatchewan	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

- ✓ Indicators are available
- ✗ Indicators may be available or are partially available
- ? Indicators not yet available

#### 3.1.1 British Columbia

**Identity-based data** – Basic identifying information including age, sex, and distinctions-based Indigenous identity is collected. It may be possible to report on home community or region, name and address using existing identification data.

**Placement** – British Columbia is able to report on where children/youth are placed along with the number of placements, using existing data.

**Maltreatment** – British Columbia is able to report on types of maltreatment of children but does not collect information on individuals who may have caused potential harm.

**Children in need of protection** – The number of children under supervision orders, number of children in out of care placements, number of children engaged in youth agreements/youth support services, and number of children in care is collected.

**Service delivery or case management standards** – The reasons for removal, incidence of maltreatment, service involvement by program type, removals by Indigenous identity, and length of service length is collected. Number of referrals to community resources and reason for referral, may be collected, but would be difficult to access other than on an individual basis.

**Serious occurrences** – The number of deaths of children and youth receiving services up to one year prior to death and the number of critical injuries of children and youth receiving services is collected.

**Quality standards** – British Columbia is able to report on total days in care, and date of file open or close.

### 3.1.2 Manitoba

**Identity-based data** – Distinctions-based Indigenous identity is collected. It is possible to report on age, home community or region, using existing identification data. Manitoba captures Inuit as a Culture of Origin, however, does not capture details on membership with Inuit Treaty Organizations. Identity has historically been self-reported and is also dependent on frontline workers accurately inputting information. Manitoba currently captures sex but does not capture gender / gender expression.

**Placement** – Child and Family Services agencies are funded by their mandating Authority from within their applicable Single Envelope Funding allocations. Determining the number of days in care for each agency would require working with Authorities and agencies. Manitoba Families reports on placements, including the number of foster homes, which captures the child or youth in Care’s self-reported Culture of Origin.

**Maltreatment** – In Manitoba, the reasons for opening a file can only fall within six categories: Conduct of Parent, Conduct of Child, Condition of Parent, Condition of Child, Abandonment, and Other. There is therefore no single measure of “maltreatment”.

**Children in need of protection** – Children in care are children who have been deemed in need of protection, requiring intervention, as determined by The Child and Family Services Act or are voluntarily placed in care by agreement between parent or guardian and agency. For the purposes of Manitoba’s annual reporting, a child is considered in care when placed by a child and family services agency in substitute care; whose legal status is defined as a permanent ward, temporary ward, under a voluntary surrender of guardianship, under a voluntary placement agreement or under apprehension; who is under the age of 18, and whose care needs are financially supported by government.

Manitoba reports annually on the total number of children in care, including by placement type (i.e., foster home, place of safety, group care, other care, or independent living). Manitoba also publicly reports the number of youth under an Agreement with a Young Adult (young adult that is accessing post-majority services from a mandated CFS agency).

**Service delivery or case management standards** – Manitoba reports annually on the caseload of each Child and Family Services Authority, broken down by supports to families, supports to children and youth, supports to young adults and expectant parent services. Manitoba further reports annually on group care placements, including licensed facilities, licensed beds, places of safety facilities and places of safety beds.



**Serious occurrences** – Manitoba reports annually on the number of incident reports received and critical incident reports received, as well as abuse investigations. The Manitoba Advocate for Children and Youth is mandated to receive notifications of any child death and may conduct a formal child death review. The Advocate reports annually on the number of notices received and review completed.

**Quality standards** – CFS agencies are funded by their mandating authority from within their applicable Single Envelope Funding allocations. Determining the number of days in care for each agency would require working with Authorities and agencies.

### 3.1.3 Ontario

**Identity-based data** – Ontario may be able to report on age. Based on information provided to the Working Group, Ontario does not provide distinctions-based data. As a result, it is a challenge to access Inuit specific indicators in Ontario.

**Placement** – Ontario may be able to report on type and order of placement (i.e., outside or in-territory) and total days in care.

**Maltreatment** – Ontario may be able to report on recurrence of protection concerns in a family after investigation, recurrence of protection concerns in a family after ongoing protection services were provided, and time to permanency.

**Children in need of protection** – Ontario may be able to report on number of children in care, and type of order and placement (i.e., outside or in-territory).

**Service delivery or case management standards** – Data currently unavailable.

**Serious occurrences** – Data currently unavailable.

**Quality standards** – Ontario may be able to report on quality of caregiver-youth relationship for children in care, time to permanency, total days in care, and date of file open, and date of file close.

### 3.1.4 New Brunswick

**Identity-based data** – Basic identifying information including age, gender, home community and Indigenous identity (degree of specificity is unknown) is collected. It may be possible to report on address using existing identification data.

**Placement** – Type of order and placement (i.e., outside or in-territory) and total days in care is collected.

**Maltreatment** – New Brunswick may be able to report on recurrence of protection concerns in a family after ongoing protection services were provided.

**Children in need of protection** – The number of children in care, previous investigations, previous open cases, and type of order and placement (i.e., outside or in-territory) is collected.

**Service delivery or case management standards** – New Brunswick may be able to report on service length.

**Serious occurrences** – Data currently unavailable.

**Quality standards** – Total-days-in-care is collected.

### 3.1.5 Nova Scotia

**Identity-based data** – Indigenous identity (i.e., First Nations, Metis, Inuk or Inuit) and other basic identifying information including age, gender, sex, name, and address are collected.

**Placement** – Information is collected regarding the type of order and placement, total days in care, and where children/youth are placed (i.e., home community or elsewhere).

**Maltreatment** – Data is collected regarding time to permanency, recurrence of protection concerns, and maltreatment data (i.e., major presenting problems).

**Children in need of protection** – The number of children in care, type of order and placement, number of children under supervision orders, number of children in out of care placements, number of children who have aged out of care, number of youth engaged in youth agreements/youth support services, and number of adoptions is collected.

**Service delivery or case management standards** – Reasons for removal, removal by identity, number of family files, and number of referrals and reasons can be determined.

**Serious occurrences** – Data currently unavailable.

**Quality standards** – Information is collected regarding date of file open, date of file close, time to permanency, frequency of contact/access between children/youth in care and immediate/extended family, total days in care, date of adoption, date of reassessment, number of files reopened after closure, number of days beyond service delivery standard, rate of family reunification, and number of referrals before intervention.

### 3.1.6 Prince Edward Island

**Identity-based data** – Identity-based data is collected such as name, age, and sex. Additionally, Indigenous identifier data, at the distinction level, may be collected when completing a cultural connection plan. Currently reviewing identifiers within the department to develop and align documentation practices to ensure data collection is consistent across government services.

**Placement** – PEI is able to report on the number of children who received child protection services in their own homes, the number of children who received child protection services in the legal custody and guardianship of the Director of Child Protection, the number of children in foster care, the number of children that have been adopted, and the number of children in the Grandparent and Alternative Care Provider program.

**Maltreatment** – PEI collects maltreatment data related to alleged physical, sexual or emotional abuse, neglect, and domestic violence. Provincial reporting on maltreatment is not publicly available.

**Children in need of protection** – PEI is able to report on the number of child protection reports received, the number of child protection investigations opened, the number of focused intervention services provided, the number of children in care, and the number of children who are receiving extended services.

**Service delivery or case management standards** – It is possible to report on service involvement by program type and service type using existing data.



**Serious occurrences** – Serious occurrences are reported to the Office of the Child and Youth Advocate. Current improvements to data collection are being made that will include tracking the number of reports made to this office.

**Quality standards** – Total days in care, date of adoption, date of file open, and date of file close are collected. It is possible to report on time to permanency using existing data.

### 3.1.7 Saskatchewan

**Identity-based data** – Personal identification information collected by Saskatchewan includes name, age, sex, address, Indigenous vs non-Indigenous identification, distinctions-based data (i.e., Métis, Inuit, First Nation and/or multi-identities), Indigenous registration or membership/Inuit Land Claims Organization, the case or record identifier used to track children/youth and families involved in services, beneficiary/IGB information, home community or region, and communities in which reports of maltreatment originate. Saskatchewan does not collect data on gender or gender expression.

**Placement** – Saskatchewan is able to report on all of the data inventory indicators, including number of children/youth receiving child and family services by location, number of children/youth in each type of care, type of order and placement (i.e., OOT or in-territory), children/youth placed with kin, foster family, or staffed placement, locations of children/youth placed (i.e., home community or elsewhere), number of Inuit and non-Inuit foster homes (if the caregiver reports the same), number of children/youth in out of care placements, and number of extended family caregivers. Saskatchewan also collects data related to children and youth placed in temporary treatment facilities, other approved care providers, placement duration, and adoption including domestic and interprovincial adoption.

**Maltreatment** – Saskatchewan collects data based on categories of maltreatment (i.e., physical abuse, sexual abuse and exploitation, physical neglect, emotional maltreatment, exposure to domestic or interpersonal violence, and failure to provide essential medical treatment). Saskatchewan also collects information based on the type of order and placement (i.e., out-of-territory or in-territory), children/youth placed with kin, foster family, or staffed placement, locations of children/youth placed (i.e., home community or elsewhere), number of foster homes, both Inuit and non-Inuit, number of children/youth in out of care placements, and number of extended family caregivers. Saskatchewan collects child and youth maltreatment data through their intake process. The Intake Report is used to document all reports of child abuse and neglect, including allegations in foster homes, alternate care homes, person of sufficient interest (PSI) placements, facilities and institutions. Saskatchewan does not collect data regarding characteristics of individuals who have caused potential harm and characteristics of children/youth in maltreatment reports.

**Children in need of protection** – Saskatchewan collects data on previous investigations, previous open cases, number of children/youth under supervision orders, number of children/youth in an out of court agreement (i.e., plans of care, voluntary service agreement, temporary care agreement), number of children/youth engaged in Youth Agreements/Youth Support Services, child/youth safety plans, number of youth who have aged out of care, number of youth who have aged out of care that are accessing transition to adulthood services, and type of order and placement (i.e., OOT or in-territory). While number-of-adoptions information and type are stored on a separate database, this information is available. Saskatchewan does not report on details related to cultural continuity, however this information would be in contact notes and could be found through a manual search.

**Service delivery or case management standards** – Saskatchewan can report on reasons for removal, removals by Indigenous Identity, number of family files, number of referrals and reasons, and on status maltreatment reports. Saskatchewan does not provide prevention services and therefore cannot report on reasons for requests for prevention services. Saskatchewan also tracks child progression, historical child protection involvement, family strength needs assessment, family reunification risk assessments, and plan for the child within the next 120 days. Saskatchewan can report on the duration (days) of preventative services, protective services, investigation, and ongoing service delivery.

**Serious occurrences** – Saskatchewan reports on the number of deaths amongst children/youth receiving services up to one year prior to death, number of critical injuries to children/youth receiving services, and number of children and youth that have voluntarily left placement. While number of deaths is also recorded, the type of death is not.

**Quality standards** – Saskatchewan collects data on frequency of home community visits for children/youth in care, time to permanency, total days in care, date of adoption, date of file open, date of reassessment/ development of transition plans, date of file close, number of files reopened after closure, number of departures from service delivery standards (Saskatchewan can determine if an investigation was outside of the time lines for completion), number of days beyond service delivery standard, number of subsequent investigations identified within the departure from service delivery standards, and rate of family or community reunification. The following are captured in the caseworker notes: Quality of caregiver-children/youth relationship for children in care, type of contact children/youth in care experience with immediate and extended family (i.e., face to face, virtual), frequency of contact/access between children/youth in care and immediate/extended family, barriers to immediate and extended family contact with children/youth in care, and frequency of meaningful sibling access. Saskatchewan does not collect data on the number of complaints against case workers, the rate of response to case worker complaints, number of referrals before intervention (Saskatchewan does not offer preventive services and therefore does not have records of prevention referrals), household Income information, education level of parent, and some household information (e.g., size of home/ overcrowding).



### 3.2 Inuit Child and Family Services Data, as Compiled by ISC from Publicly Available Sources

Please find a summary table below highlighting the indicators available within Alberta and Quebec in the table below. This data has been populated by ISC based on publicly available resources.

**Table 4: Summary Table of Inuit CFS data current situation from Provincial governments outside of Inuit Nunangat, based on publicly available sources of data.**

Province or Territory	Identity-based data	Placement	Maltreatment	Children in need of protection	Service Delivery	Serious occurrences	Quality Standards
Alberta	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✗
Quebec	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✗

- ✓ Indicators are available
- ✗ Indicators may be available or are partially available
- ? Indicators not yet available

#### 3.2.1 Alberta

Alberta had indicated a willingness to provide a response to the Working Group but has yet to submit data regarding Inuit child welfare indicators. For the purpose of this discussion paper, the below indicators were derived from publicly available CFS data, reported through Alberta’s *Child Intervention Data Tool or Open Data Portal*.

**Identity-based data** – Personal identification information collected by Alberta includes age, sex, types of care services received and Indigenous or non-Indigenous identity. Region may also be identified, as CFS services are provided within 5 distinct regional zones and 19 delegated First Nation Agencies.

**Placement** – Alberta is able to report on where a child/youth are placed, specifically, publicly available reports detail if a child is at home, placed in independent living, other community resources, kinship care, foster care, permanent placement, community group care, or campus-based treatment. Alberta also collects adoption information.

**Maltreatment** – Child maltreatment data is collected through Alberta’s *Child and Youth Information Module*, including category of maltreatment (i.e., physical, sexual, neglect, emotional maltreatment, violence and exposure to intimate partner violence). Provincial reporting on maltreatment is not publicly available.

**Children in need of protection** – Alberta collects data related to the number of children and youth in care, placement care types, number of children, youth and young adults receiving support and financial assistance, the number of children and youth receiving post-intervention support, and child intervention caseload data.

**Service delivery or case management standards** – No service delivery or case management standards were observed.

**Serious occurrences** – Alberta currently releases an annual report detailing the number/type of deaths of children, youth and young adults while receiving intervention services. This report also includes additional indicators, such as Indigenous versus non-Indigenous status, age, and sex.

**Quality standards** – No quality standard data was observed.

### 3.2.2 Quebec

Quebec has not indicated a willingness to provide a response to the Working Group. For the purpose of this discussion paper, the below indicators were derived from publicly available CFS data, reported through Quebec's Ministry of Families homepage.

**Identity-based data** – Personal identification information collected by Quebec includes age, gender, and types of care services received. The existing Indigenous identity data may be limited to First Nation and non-Indigenous. No data reflecting Inuit or Métis identities were observed.

**Placement** – Quebec is able to report on the current placement of children and youth in care. This includes placement in kinship care, foster care, informal placement, group home or residential center or other substitute settings.

**Maltreatment** – Quebec collects maltreatment data related to neglect, physical abuse, sexual abuse, serious behaviour problems, abandonment, psychological ill-treatment, serious risk of neglect, serious risk of physical abuse and serious risk of physical abuse.

**Children in need of protection** – Quebec collects data related to the number of children and youth in care and the number of open, or previously open, cases.

**Service delivery or case management standards** – Quebec tracks family reunification rates, but no specific service delivery or case management standards were observed.

**Serious occurrences** – No data related to the tracking of serious occurrences was observed.

## 3.3 Other Partners and Inuit Child and Family Services Data

### 3.3.1 Indigenous Services Canada (ISC)

Indigenous Services Canada holds limited data related to Inuit children and youth, specifically:

- Education and post-graduation data for Inuit children
- Health and social determinant data for Inuit communities including population information, vital statistics (i.e., life expectancy and mortality rates), as well as health and oral health status and statistics related to the number of infectious diseases, chronic or mental health instances.



### 3.3.2 Public Health Agency of Canada

Public Health Agency of Canada (PHAC) and partners released the first report from the Canadian Child Welfare Information System (CCWIS) in 2024. *“Following several years of partnership building as well as a feasibility assessment, the CCWIS has been developed by PHAC to address national child welfare data gaps and monitor population-level indicators across person, place and time.”* For the first report, *“data were obtained from all 13 provincial and territorial departments responsible for child welfare services and were derived from one of three sources: (1) publicly available aggregate data from annual reports and data dashboards (“public data”); (2) custom tabulated aggregate data (“custom data”); and (3) de-identified record-level data (“record-level data”).”* In addition, *“for a sensitivity analysis, ... data from the provinces and territories were combined with public data from ISC.”* This report *“(1) describes the population of children and youth in out-of-home care; (2) estimates the rate of out-of-home care overall and by province/territory, year, sex/gender, age group, and placement type; and (3) compares rates by province/territory, sex/gender, age group, and placement type”*. Pending the creation of partnerships with rights-holders and pending resolution of data quality issues, future CCWIS reports will include distinctions-based analyses, as well as analyses of data about children and youth who are involved in child welfare but not in out-of-home care.<sup>25</sup>

The Public Health Agency of Canada, in the context of its work with CCWIS, could support ITK to coordinate across PT data systems to develop standards and consistent processes for identifying Inuit children whose data are in child welfare system records. Furthermore, through broadly defined indicators, PHAC can support in overcoming the challenges involved in having all provinces and territories report on common child welfare data indicators. For example, “out-of-home care” could be defined in such a way “to cover children in both formal and informal placements, with any legal status, and in family-based care, group care or other placement settings” as defined in CCWIS.

---

<sup>25</sup> Pollock J., Nathaniel J., Alexandra M. Ouédraogo, Nico Trocmé, Wendy Hovdestad, Amy Miskie, Lindsay Crompton, Aimée Campeau, Masako Tanaka, Cindy Zhang, Claudie Laprise, and Lil Tonmyr. “Estimating rates of out-of-home care among children in Canada: An analysis of national administrative child welfare data.” *Health Promotion and Chronic Disease Prevention* 44, no. 4 (2024). <https://www.canada.ca/en/public-health/services/reports-publications/health-promotion-chronic-disease-prevention-canada-research-policy-practice/vol-44-no-4-2024/rates-out-of-home-care-children-canada-analysis-national-administrative-child-welfare-dat.html>

## 4.0 Barriers & Limitations

Inuit-specific child welfare data collection must be consistent, culturally relevant and outcome driven, in order to be useful, impactful and effective. To be consistent is to ensure that those involved in the collection of Inuit-specific child welfare data are trained in the correct processes, methods and protocols. In terms of culturally-relevant Inuit-specific data collection, knowing that, Indigenous children are “more likely to be reported to child welfare authorities for neglect, fueled by poverty, poor housing and substance misuse, than non-Indigenous children”<sup>26</sup>, culturally relevant indicators that incorporate Inuit values, worldviews and perspectives must be utilized in order to obtain an accurate indication of themes, patterns and trends in the data.

In an effort to understand the barriers faced by ITOs, this was incorporated in the environmental scan. Of the four ITOs that provided information in this area, most shared some commonalities in terms of lacking sufficient data in the area of child welfare. Alongside this, some participating provinces and territories identified limitations that existed with respect to their data managements systems and reporting tools.

The IRC shared that:

- resulting from the absence of a child advocacy office in the NWT where children, youth, and families may seek or receive services, they faced barriers in obtaining relevant data.
- there are currently no data and information sharing agreements in place between the NWT and the IRC where data sharing is necessary in achieving the aim of providing culturally safe services for Inuit children, youth and families across Inuit Nunangat.

Similarly, NTI shared that:

- The Government of Nunavut does not currently have a database management system to pull information from, either from a point-in-time, or ongoing basis. This poses a significant barrier to Inuit child welfare data collection in that information regarding Inuit children, youth and families cannot be obtained rapidly, effectively and securely; further causing a pattern of misguided and inadequate services to the children and families involved in child welfare.

There are concerns of privacy in relation to data on Inuit children in care as well as accessing and storing the information. Privacy concerns coming from Inuit cannot be ignored, especially considering the colonial policies and structures imposed upon them. Throughout history, and to present day, data on Inuit has not always reflected their lived realities and priorities. This mismanagement of data has caused a distrust in providing relevant data to those seeking to collect it, resulting in an ongoing landscape of inadequacies and inconsistencies in all areas of Inuit wellness, including child welfare data collection.<sup>27</sup>

---

<sup>26</sup> “The Importance of Disaggregated Data,” National Collaborating Centre for Aboriginal Health, Accessed June 14, 2022. <https://www.nccih.ca/docs/context/FS-ImportanceDisaggregatedData-EN.pdf>.

<sup>27</sup> Government of Canada. What We Heard Report. October 4, 2022. <https://www.canada.ca/en/impact-assessment-agency/programs/aboriginal-consultation-federal-environmental-assessment/Indigenous-knowledge-policy-framework-initiative/what-we-heard-report.html>



Another barrier is the community capacity limitations faced in the region, such as having service providers function without Community Social Service Workers (CSSWs). The role of the CSSWs is to “enhance the overall health of individuals and families throughout Nunavut and to work with other professional services such as education and health personnel.”<sup>28</sup> Without the vital support of CSSWs in all Nunavut communities, important information such as data is neglected or ignored and there is no accountability in ensuring services are consistent and preventative. Additionally, a lack of supervisors or regional managers in Nunavut exists, further exacerbating a lack in the continuity of child and family services and impacting outcomes for Inuit children, youth and families.

Overall, there is also a lack of training at all levels, ranging from CSSW's to regional managers, which has resulted in inconsistencies in the ways that information and data are collected. More than one government expressed challenges or limitations that exist as a result of their data collection tool or reporting system. The Government of Nunavut reported that their reporting tool does not identify by ancestry or disaggregate the associated LCA, specific identifiers are only listed in the client file. The Government of Newfoundland and Labrador reported that they updated their system in 2022 to allow for the collection of beneficiary information. Additionally, the Government of Northwest Territories also reported that they updated their system in 2023 to allow for the collection of beneficiary information.

The Government of Ontario is in a unique circumstance as Children's Aid Societies in the province hold the legal responsibility to deliver child protection services and are provincially funded. Given their governance and structure, they collect and hold child welfare data in their administrative systems which may not be reflected in the data Ontario can access.<sup>29</sup> Alongside this, in Ontario there are 51 Children's Aid Societies, including 38 non-Indigenous societies and 13 Indigenous societies. Indigenous societies may serve some non-Indigenous children and non-Indigenous societies may serve Indigenous children. For this reason, the Ontario Ministry of Children, Communities and Social Services (MCCSS) is unable to provide data specific to Indigenous children and families involved with child welfare. Ontario has reported that independent societies and Indigenous governing bodies can enter into their own information-sharing or data governance agreements, which is separate from the Ontario Ministry; however, they are also interested in exploring similar options. Currently the Business Intelligence and Practice Division (BIPD) of MCCSS is taking the lead on this work as part of its mandate to work with ministry partners on data integration, information management and evidence-based metrics.

In addition to the Data Inventory Scan in 2021, ITK held engagement sessions with Inuit rights holders and partners on the development of the CCWIS on behalf of PHAC. PHAC sought guidance from Inuit rights holders and partners to ensure their approach would meet the needs of the Inuit populations in Inuit Nunangat as well as Inuit living in urban centers. In terms of CCWIS and Inuit-specific data management, there were a number of key features that the Inuit rights holders and partners involved in the initial engagement sessions

---

28 Government of Nunavut. Community Social Services Worker. Accessed March 18, 2022. <https://www.gov.nu.ca/jobs/community-social-services-worker-cssw-casual>.

29 Government of Ontario. Collection and Reporting of Identity-Based Data, Policy Directive: CW 005-17. <https://www.ontario.ca/document/child-protection-service-directives-forms-and-guidelines/policy-directive-cw-005-17-collection-and-reporting-identity-based-data>.

indicated must be present in order to effectively have Inuit be in control of the data pertaining to Inuit communities. Some of the features indicated in the responses from Inuit rights holders and partners included specific actions items such as: CCWIS partners are clear about their purposes for compiling the data; that partners commit to acting on the data; that the data is used, shared and reported in appropriate ways; and that Inuit have full access to the data. It will be especially difficult outside of provinces and territories with land claim areas to attempt to identify Inuit children in care in the datasets that will be used for CCWIS. Because PHAC is situated in public health, with a long history of working with child welfare ministries, it is well suited to contribute to the work that would be needed to improve data quality to help identify Inuit children. Related to this, the CCWIS project could contribute to the quarterly or annual reporting function, as this regular reporting is integral to public health epidemiology.

Inuit rights holders and partners also identified several potential barriers to national child welfare data reporting about Inuit, one of which is a concern about the *quality* of data produced by service providers. Inuit communities have the right to transparent data collection, respecting their experiences of marginalization and as stated by the Ontario Human Rights Commission, “the best and most complete data is collected by agencies that have a deliberate, holistic approach to data collection, grounded in attempting to understand the needs of the marginalized communities they serve.”<sup>30</sup> In an effort to serve Inuit communities while understanding past Inuit experiences of disempowerment and disenfranchisement, while also being grounded in respect and Inuit self-determination, data-collection agencies have a responsibility to Inuit communities in providing comprehensive and complete information in a culturally-safe manner that incorporates Inuit worldviews and ways of knowing.

Furthermore, the quality of Inuit-specific data in relation to child welfare was noted to be significantly negatively affected by inaccurate assessments by child welfare workers in certain Inuit communities. One of the reasons for these inaccuracies is the systemic racism and biases faced by Inuit, where, “the structural realities that impact upon [the Inuit] collective ability to integrate a diversity of knowledges and ways of doing within [their] systems of care, impacting [their] ability to offer quality and culturally safe care to a diversity of peoples.”<sup>31</sup> Long term transformations are then needed in Inuit communities, including Inuit-specific child welfare policies and funding opportunities to overcome the systemic racism that has disproportionately affected Inuit in Canada. Systemic racism operates with or without intention and with or without awareness within the child welfare systems today, therefore Inuit communities need to feel empowered to make their own decisions in overcoming the barriers that are hindering their ability to ensure Inuit children are staying within their communities.<sup>32</sup> Moreover, the communities must be safe places for Inuit children to thrive. Inuit Children and their families deserve to live with dignity and in environments that focus on holistic health- from birth until adulthood.

---

30 Ontario Human Rights Commission. Interrupted Childhoods: Over-Representation of Indigenous and Black Children in Ontario Child Welfare. February, 2018. <https://www.ohrc.on.ca/en/interrupted-childhoods>.

31 Fraser, Sarah Louise, Dominique Gaulin, and William Daibhid Fraser. “Dissecting Systemic Racism: Policies, Practices and Epistemologies Creating Racialized Systems of Care for Indigenous Peoples.” *International Journal for Equity in Health* 20, no. 1 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12939-021-01500-8>.



Finally, at a high-level, PTs have different legislation, policies, and data systems which continue to pose challenges for comparing data across jurisdictions. As a result of their differences, PTs have evolved uniquely — at different speeds, with varying capacities, and by collecting different information. There is therefore a continuing need to bridge differences created by diverse policies, systems, language, and terminology. In addition to these structural and capacity-related challenges, there are also procedural barriers and institutional barriers to information-sharing that need to be addressed. The role of managing inter-governmental relations and prioritizing Indigenous data sovereignty will be crucial to dismantling the barriers created by a colonial system.

## 5.0 Conclusion

Through the environmental scan and data inventory, we were able to target the goal of obtaining a sense of what Inuit-specific child welfare data is available across the country, identify the gaps in data, identify barriers and limitations to obtaining the data, identify who holds the data and who can and is accessing it. The environmental scan has highlighted the significant lack of Indigenous-specific child welfare data but more so, the significant lack of Inuit-specific data. As ITOs move forward with exercising jurisdiction, they lack the information required to make informed decisions regarding the development of programs and services, funding frameworks for preventative practices and strategies for effective and meaningful reunification, as examples.

As observed in the “Report on Indigenous Children and Youth in Care, August 2020” from the Provincial-Territorial Indigenous Children and Youth in Care Working Group and highlighted during the environmental scan, common reporting across jurisdictions is challenging for a number of reasons, mainly stemming from differences in legislation and regulations, administrative structures, and supporting data systems. These challenges not only make comparison difficult, but they also create obstacles when linking existing research to available provincial and territorial data. The varying choice of indicators for which data are compiled is problematic. They can serve as barriers for coherent management and improvement of a child welfare system. Of concern are the jurisdictions that do not collect identity-based data specific to distinctions-based Indigeneity as well as the jurisdictions that do not collect or have access to point-in-time data indicating who is in contact with their system or in their care. Recording data with distinctions-based information is a limitation that rests in the governance, not the service delivery side of child and family services. The reliance on multiple stakeholders to collect and manage the data ultimately influences access to accurate data, timely preparation of policy and importantly, the programming design concerns Inuit have, such as child health and well-being, remain unobtainable under the current conditions. This further exemplifies the worries of not knowing where Inuit children are across the country.

What the scan does indicate is while there are some practices and procedures in place, although limited, for the sharing of information; however, without the collection of Inuit-specific data, they do not serve their full purpose. The inability to obtain and thus share adequate data with respect to Inuit children impedes the ability to identify where Inuit children are across the country, who is caring for them, their quality of care as well as informing policies and practices that will ultimately impact their well-being. Without Inuit-specific data, all parties lack robust information required to inform policy and practice and to better the outcomes for Inuit children and families who come in to contact with the child welfare system across the country.

The significant gaps and lack of Inuit-specific data and multiple barriers and challenges faced by all participants, highlights and demonstrates the need to prioritize the urgent work that has been both called upon and legislated. The point from which ITOs and provinces and territories are starting is of concern. Thus, entering into information-sharing agreements among ITOs and provincial and territorial governments may be required to improve child and family services in relation to Inuit children. Increasing and creating data collection for ITOs will provide evidence and resources to support Inuit child welfare sovereignty.



## 6.0 Supporting Actions

The following considerations are not listed in any particular order reflective of importance. There are multiple points by which one can begin the work to address the Inuit-specific data gaps. In the spirit of co-development and collaboration, building on work that currently exists, the following *Supporting Actions* have been proposed to improve the current state of child and family services as it relates to Inuit data.

### 6.1 For all Working Group Members

#### Supporting Action #1 - Identification

Provinces and territories should, at minimum, identify all Inuit children and youth connected to their child welfare systems including ITOs as standard practice moving forward.

#### Supporting Action #2 – Training and Skills

Provinces, territories and ITOs should deliver child welfare services that ensure all staff have the knowledge and skills to gather Inuit-specific data from children, youth and families.

- **7.17:** In order to help improve monitoring of the health status of Inuit children and youth, ITOs must advocate with provincial and territorial governments to collect, document, monitor, and share data and information. The ITOs must collaborate with service delivery organizations to support the children and youth who are accessing services.
  - *National Inuit Action Plan on Missing and Murdered Inuit Women, Girls and 2SLGBTQIA+ People*
- ITK has already begun a discussion on providing crucial knowledge and training to PTs and other partners covering topics like service provision, collection of data, and upholding the Act.

#### Supporting Action #3 – Information-sharing Agreements

Provinces and territories should consider information-sharing agreements with ITOs to improve data collection, reporting, and sharing.

- **7.7:** In order to ensure that ITOs have access to data and information about the placement of members who are taken into care, provincial and territorial governments must commit to prioritizing on an urgent basis the work of entering into information-sharing agreements with ITOs and provincial governments respecting the child and family services that are provided in relation to Inuit children.
  - *National Inuit Action Plan on Missing and Murdered Inuit Women, Girls and 2SLGBTQIA+ People*

- **7.13:** In order to close data and information gaps about service delivery to children and youth, provincial and territorial governments must compile, document, monitor, and share certain Inuit-specific data with ITOs as well as with child and youth advocates. These data should include detailed information about the types of services being provided to Inuit children and youth, duration and location of service delivery, and background information about children and youth receiving services.
  - *National Inuit Action Plan on Missing and Murdered Inuit Women, Girls and 2SLGBTQQIA+ People*

### **Supporting Action #4 – Notice of Significant Measure**

When a child is identified as Inuit, the ITO must be notified, provided an opportunity to exercise their legislative authority over Inuit child welfare and child services, and/or provide support/services.

- There must be a notice of measure provided to the Indigenous governing body that acts on behalf of the Indigenous group, community or people to which the child belongs and that has informed the service provider that they are acting on behalf of that Indigenous group, community or people.
  - *An Act respecting First Nations, Inuit and Métis children, youth and families*
- ISC houses a publicly available list of contact information for Indigenous governing bodies that have informed ISC directly that they are authorized by an Indigenous group, community or people to receive notice from service providers for the purposes of section 12 of the Act — found here.
- **7.18:** In order to exercise self-determination over Inuit child welfare, ITOs must prioritize developing and exercising their legislative authority over Inuit child welfare and child and family services under section 20 of the Act Respecting First Nations, Inuit, and Métis children, youth and families, and/or through other legislative and policy mechanisms of application in their respective regions.
  - *National Inuit Action Plan on Missing and Murdered Inuit Women, Girls and 2SLGBTQQIA+ People*



## 6.2 Tiered Supporting Actions for All Provinces and Territories

Given that the number of Inuit children in contact with child welfare varies across each province and territory, a tiered approach was developed to reflect the varying capacity and resources available across jurisdictions to implement certain Supporting Actions. The methodology for this approach was developed using the 2021 census data of children in care as a benchmark for creating tiers. First, the PTs with the highest population of Inuit people were identified based on the census data. Next, the number of Inuit children in care was compared to the total child population to determine the incidence rate. A multiplier of 2.2 was applied, as children of colour are 2.2 times more likely to be investigated by a CFS agency.<sup>33</sup> Finally, the numbers calculated were trifurcated into percentage ranges that reflect the proportionality of Inuit children.

The following actions are applicable to each province and territory based on the percentage of Inuit children “in contact with child welfare.” This can be defined as “any child or youth whose information has been collected for the purpose of investigation or service provisions by a mandated CFS agency.” According to Statistics Canada, and for the purposes of this report, a child is defined as being aged 0-14 and a youth is defined as being aged 15-24.<sup>34</sup>

### Tier 1: Fewer than 12% of Inuit Children in Contact with Child Welfare

- Annually, provinces and territories should share point-in-time reports with ITOs.
- With lower populations of Inuit children in contact with child welfare in tier 1, it may not be possible to extract the same quality data as in other jurisdictions, so there may need to be adjustments to the reporting requirements. PTs should determine tailored outcome indicators to enable outcome monitoring, progress reporting, and evidence-based decision-making (regions will determine how they will be involved, intent of use, etc.).

### Tier 2: Between 12 – 24% of Inuit Children in Contact with Child Welfare

- On a bi-annual basis or upon request for data, provinces and territories should provide and share point-in-time reports with ITOs.

### Tier 3: More than 25% of Inuit Children in Contact with Child Welfare

- Territories and provinces should maintain information systems usable in both English and Inuktitut, and to conduct regular performance audits to ensure and maintain data quality.
- On a bi-annual basis or upon request for data, provinces and territories should provide and share point-in-time reports with ITOs.

---

<sup>33</sup> Fallon, Barbara. “Ontario Incidence Study of Reported Child Abuse and Neglect 2023 (OIS-2023).” PowerPoint presented at the OACAS Webinar, 2023.

[https://cwrp.ca/sites/default/files/publications/OACAS%20webinar\\_final%20final.pdf](https://cwrp.ca/sites/default/files/publications/OACAS%20webinar_final%20final.pdf)

<sup>34</sup> Statistics Canada. Age Categories, Life Cycle Groupings. October 25, 2023.

<https://www.statcan.gc.ca/en/concepts/definitions/age2>.

## 7.0 Next Steps

Subsequent to this paper, future initiatives for consideration by the Working Group could include:

- Supporting ITOs to adopt the aforementioned Supporting Actions, such as through the development of information-sharing agreements.
- Supporting and advising on implementation strategies to deploy training to staff on standards and approaches for the intersectional collection of identity-based data. This may include engaging with child and family service (CFS) providers to better understand their unique service delivery dynamics.
- Identifying minimum data requirements and consensus-based definitions to better identify and obtain standardized information related to Inuit children in care. In addition to exploring the standardization of data and definitions, further initiatives could look to how data is collected, the comfort of staff in collecting identity-based data, inclusive and/or intersectional intake and investigation practices, and self-identification reporting hesitancy of individuals interacting with service providers. This may include engaging with service providers to better understand the types of data collected and existing data-sharing barriers.
- Developing an Inuit Child Welfare Indicators Matrix (possibly along the lines of the National Child Welfare Outcomes Matrix or another model) to guide the creation of culturally appropriate and specific indicators for child welfare.
- Providing guidance on how federal, provincial and territorial governments might advance conversations regarding Indigenous data governance/sovereignty in a way that meets the critical need for Inuit-specific data. Balancing distinctions-based approaches and considering the challenge of data hesitancy (distrust by Inuit communities in providing data due to fear of data mismanagement) and pursuit of addressing the TRC's Calls to Action and/or MMIWG Calls for Justice related to child welfare.
- Developing deliverables, milestones indicators, and timelines to track the development and implementation of the Supporting Actions.



## 8.0 Appendices

### Appendix A: Data Inventory Template (PTs)

National Inuit Working Group Data Inventory	
Indicator	Data Required
Identity-Based Data	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Name</li> <li>Age</li> <li>Gender / gender expression</li> <li>Sex</li> <li>Address</li> <li>Indigenous vs. non-Indigenous identification</li> <li>Métis, Inuit, First Nation and/or multi-identities (i.e., distinction based)</li> <li>Indigenous registration or membership/ITO, beneficiary/IGB information</li> <li>Home community or region</li> <li>Communities in which reports of maltreatment originate</li> </ul>
Built Environment & Social Determinants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Household information and family structure (i.e., home type, # of caregivers in home, size of home/ overcrowding, number of children/youth in home)</li> <li>Household Income information (i.e., full time, part time, multiple jobs, employment insurance, social assistance, none, unknown or other)</li> <li>Education level of parent</li> <li>Case or record identifier (track children/youth and families involved in services)</li> </ul>
Placement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li># of children/youth receiving child and family services by location</li> <li># of children/youth in each type of care                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additional information or clarity regarding out-of-home placement can be found here: <a href="https://cwrp.ca/out-home-care">https://cwrp.ca/out-home-care</a></li> </ul> </li> <li>Type of order and placement (i.e., OOT or in-territory)</li> <li>Children/youth placed with kin, foster family, or staffed placement</li> <li>Locations of children/youth placed (i.e., home community or elsewhere).</li> <li># of foster homes (Inuit and non-Inuit)</li> <li># of children/youth in out of care placements</li> <li># of extended family caregivers</li> </ul>
Cultural Continuity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li># of cultural connection plans developed</li> <li># of cultural connection plans being followed</li> <li># of children/youth with completed cultural plans</li> <li># of children/youth in contact with immediate and extended family</li> </ul>
Maltreatment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Maltreatment data based on the following categories                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Maltreatment categories as defined by PHAC include physical abuse, sexual abuse, neglect, emotional maltreatment and exposure to intimate partner violence. Additional information can be found here: <a href="https://www.canada.ca/en/public-health/services/health-promotion/stop-family-violence/prevention-resource-centre/children/child-maltreatment-canada.html#Typ">https://www.canada.ca/en/public-health/services/health-promotion/stop-family-violence/prevention-resource-centre/children/child-maltreatment-canada.html#Typ</a></li> </ul> </li> <li>Characteristics of individuals who have caused potential harm (reports of maltreatment)</li> <li>Recurrence of protection concerns in a family after investigation</li> <li>Recurrence of protection concerns in a family after ongoing protection services were provided</li> <li>Time to permanency</li> <li>Characteristics of children/youth in maltreatment reports</li> </ul>



Indicator	Data Required
<b>Children in Need of Protection</b>	# Of Adoptions and by type (i.e., departmental, private, registered custom adoption) Previous investigations, previous open cases # of children/youth under supervision orders # of children/ youth in an out of court agreement (i.e., plans of care, voluntary service agreement, temporary care agreement) # of children/youth engaged in Youth Agreements/Youth Support Services (i.e., out of court order) # of youth who have aged out of care # of youth who have aged out of care that are accessing transition to adulthood services Type of order and placement (i.e., OOT or in-territory)
<b>Service Delivery or Case Management Standards</b>	Inuit Treaty Organization (ITO) Reasons for removal Maltreatment categories as defined by PHAC include physical abuse, sexual abuse, neglect, emotional maltreatment and exposure to intimate partner violence. Additional information can be found here: <a href="https://www.canada.ca/en/public-health/services/health-promotion/stop-family-violence/prevention-resource-centre/children/child-maltreatment-canada.html#Typ">https://www.canada.ca/en/public-health/services/health-promotion/stop-family-violence/prevention-resource-centre/children/child-maltreatment-canada.html#Typ</a> Reasons for requests of prevention services Status maltreatment report (i.e., screened in, screened out) Removals by Indigenous identity (i.e., First Nation, Inuit, Métis, multiple identities) # of family files # of referrals and reasons
<b>Service Length</b>	Duration (days) of preventative services Duration (days) of protective services Duration of investigation Duration of ongoing service delivery
<b>Serious Occurrences</b>	# Of deaths amongst children/youth receiving services up to one year prior to death. # Of critical injuries to children/youth receiving services # Of deaths by suicide amongst children/youth in care #Of children and youth that have voluntarily left placement
<b>Quality Standards</b>	Quality of caregiver-children/youth relationship for children in care Type of contact children/ youth in care experience with immediate and extended family (i.e., face to face, virtual) Frequency of contact/access between children/youth in care and immediate/extended family Barriers to immediate and extended family contact with children/youth in care Frequency of home community visits for children/youth in care Frequency of meaningful sibling access Time to permanency Total days in care Date of adoption Date of file open Date of reassessment/ development of transition plans Date of file close # of files reopened after closure



Indicator	Data Required
Quality Standards (cont'd)	# of departures from service delivery standards
	# of days beyond service delivery standard
	# of subsequent investigations identified within the departure from service delivery standards
	Rate of family or community reunification
	Number of referrals before intervention
	Number of complaints against case workers
	Rate of response to case worker complaints

## Appendix B: ITO Data Input Template

Referral Data
# of intakes
# of referrals
# of at-risk mothers referred for services
Intakes by land claim region or community
Response time
Reasons for child welfare act incidents
Reason for initial child welfare involvement for families with at least one Indigenous child
Reason for contact with the system
Placement of Indigenous kinship children and youth
Date of intake
Child protections agency
Notable monthly achievements as Inuit representative
Service Delivery
Gaps identified in available services
Types of significant measures
Types of available preventative measures
How often preventative services are accessed
Types of services accessed by at-risk mothers
Notifications about apprehensions
# of interactions with children, youth and families
# of children in non-Indigenous foster home care who are provided care in accordance with Inuit customs/traditions
# of notices of significant measures
# of at-risk mothers accessing services
# of children/youth receiving direct support
# of families receiving direct support
Service delivery statistics (e.g., supervision orders, intakes, VSAs)
Actions taken
Child and family services outcomes (i.e., aging out of care, reunification, exiting care, adoption)
Total proportion of Indigenous and non-Indigenous youth services clients



**Children in Need of Protection**

- # of children placed with one parent
- # of cases where immediate and extended family was contacted
- # of children placed with one parent or stepparent
- # of children placed in an Inuit community
- # of children placed with a member of another Indigenous group
- # of children placed in care with siblings
- # of children placed near siblings
- # of children receiving regular visits with siblings

**Children in Care**

- # of enrollments/registrations
- # of cultural connections
- # of cultural connection plans being followed
- # of children with completed cultural plans
- # of children in contact with immediate and extended family
- # of children accessing services
- # of children in care who visit their home community
- # of days in care
- Type of contact children in care experience with immediate and extended family (i.e., face to face, virtual)
- Those involved in cultural connection plan development
- Identified physical, mental, cultural, social and psychological needs of children
- Indigenous and non-Indigenous children/youth in care trend (5 Years)
- How often children in care are in contact with immediate and extended family
- Barriers to immediate and extended family contact with children in care
- Frequency of home community visits for children in care
- Types of services accessed by children in care
- How often siblings celebrate special occasions together
- Reasons why cultural connection plans are not followed

**Placement**

- Proportion of Indigenous children/Youth in care by placement type
- Placement of Indigenous kinship children and youth
- # of foster parent placements available (Inuit and non-Inuit)
- Proportion of Indigenous children/youth in kinship and foster home placements

**Categories of Maltreatment**

- Types of maltreatment for Indigenous and non-Indigenous files
- Allegations of Neglect by Subtype for Indigenous and Non-Indigenous Families
- Proportion of top 6 removal reasons for Indigenous children/youth in care



### Identity-Based Data

Beneficiary enrollment data base

Current residence

Distribution of families by Indigenous identity

Distribution of kinship children/youth by Indigenous identity

Breakdown of # of children by community

Proportion of families with at least one Indigenous child in care vs families without an Indigenous child in care

Proportion of families with at least one Indigenous child in care out of total families by region

Total proportion of Indigenous and non-Indigenous kinship children/youth

Proportion of Indigenous and non-Indigenous kinship children/youth by region

Proportion of Indigenous and non-Indigenous children/youth in care by region of placement

# of Nunavummiut children in care within each P/T

Ages of children receiving any level of child welfare services

Location of placement within and outside of Nunavut (province)

Proportion of Indigenous and non-Indigenous youth services clients by region

### NOTES:

The 2nd draft of the Discussion Paper represents changes received and incorporated based on the initial draft presented at the Working Group's meeting on August 26, 2022. Based on additional comments, submissions, and feedback from subsequent Working Group meetings, a third draft was prepared and circulated for review on December 19, 2023. All members of the Working Group were urged to continue to address comments, provide suggestions, and submit updates related to the data, observations, conclusions, and next steps leading up to this 4th draft. Its dissemination is projected for the fall of 2024.

**\*\*Section 3** distinguishes data provided by members of the Working Group and content that ISC has populated from data publicly available on websites of provincial governments. We especially request that representatives of this latter category correct, revise and/or provide additional information.

## 9.0 Bibliography

- Canada. Forum of Ministers Responsible for Social Services Indigenous Children and Youth in Care Working Group. *Report on Indigenous Children and Youth in Care*. August, 2020.
- Canada. Office of the Auditor General. *Many Services Provided to Children and Families Have Worsened Since 2014*. October 23, 2018. [https://www.oag-bvg.gc.ca/internet/English/mr\\_20181023\\_e\\_43175.html](https://www.oag-bvg.gc.ca/internet/English/mr_20181023_e_43175.html).
- Canada. Office of the Auditor General of Canada. *Report of the Auditor General of Canada to the Legislative Assembly of Nunavut Child and Family Services in Nunavut, 2023*. Accessed January 10, 2024. <http://www.oag-bvg.gc.ca/>.
- "Corporate Structure." Inuvialuit Regional Corporation. Accessed February 17, 2022. <https://www.irc.inuvialuit.com/about-irc/corporate-structure>.
- Fallon, Barbara. "Ontario Incidence Study of Reported Child Abuse and Neglect 2023 (OIS-2023)." PowerPoint presented at the OACAS Webinar, 2023. [https://cwrp.ca/sites/default/files/publications/OACAS%20webinar\\_final%20final.pdf](https://cwrp.ca/sites/default/files/publications/OACAS%20webinar_final%20final.pdf)
- Fraser, Sarah Louise, Dominique Gaulin, and William Daibhid Fraser. "Dissecting Systemic Racism: Policies, Practices and Epistemologies Creating Racialized Systems of Care for Indigenous Peoples." *International Journal for Equity in Health* 20, no. 1 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12939-021-01500-8>.
- Government du Québec. *Profiles of the Nation: Inuit*. Accessed November 2023. <https://www.quebec.ca/en/government/quebec-at-a-glance/first-nations-and-inuit/profile-of-the-nations/inuit>
- Government of Ontario. *Collection and Reporting of Identity-Based Data, Policy Directive: CW 005-17*. <https://www.ontario.ca/document/child-protection-service-directives-forms-and-guidelines/policy-directive-cw-005-17-collection-and-reporting-identity-based-data>.
- Government of Northwest Territories. *Child, Youth and Family Services Strategic Direction and Action Plan (2023-2028)*. <https://www.hss.gov.nt.ca/sites/hss/files/resources/cfs-strategic-direction-action-plan-2023-2028.pdf>
- Government of Nunavut. *Community Social Services Worker*. Accessed March 18, 2022. <https://www.gov.nu.ca/jobs/community-social-services-worker-cssw-casual>.
- Government of Canada. *What We Heard Report*. October 4, 2022. <https://www.canada.ca/en/impact-assessment-agency/programs/aboriginal-consultation-federal-environmental-assessment/Indigenous-knowledge-policy-framework-initiative/what-we-heard-report.html>
- Indigenous Services Canada. *Governance Engagement Mechanisms: Topic 8 – Development of a Data and Reporting Strategy*. Presentation. September 22, 2021.
- Indigenous Services Canada. *Act respecting First Nations, Inuit and Métis children, youth and families: Policy Intent*. Presentation, Ottawa, ON, December 17, 2019.
- "Introduction." About Inuit, Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami. Accessed February 17, 2022. <https://www.itk.ca/about-canadian-inuit/>.
- "Inuit Regions in Canada." About Inuit, Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami. Accessed February 17, 2022. <https://www.itk.ca/about-canadian-inuit/>.
- "Inuvialuit family way of living law (Inuvialuit qitunrariit inuuniarnikkun maligaksat) passe after community consultation." Inuvialuit Regional Corporation. November 24, 2021. <https://irc.inuvialuit.com/news/inuvialuit-family-way-living-law-inuvialuit-qitunrariit-inuuniarnikkun-maligaksat-passes-after>.
- "Makivvik." Makivvik Corporation. Accessed February 17, 2022. [www.makivvik.ca](http://www.makivvik.ca).
- McKenzie, Brad, and Pete Hudson. "Native Children, Child Welfare, and the Colonization of Native People." In *The Challenge of Child Welfare*, edited by Ken Levitt and Brian Wharf, 125–141. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1985
- "National Inuit Action Plan on Missing and Murdered Inuit Women, Girls and 2SLGBTQQIA+ People." Pauktuutit. Accessed February 17, 2022. [https://pauktuutit.ca/wp-content/uploads/Pauktuutit\\_MMIWG\\_Action-Plan\\_English\\_PDF-Version.pdf](https://pauktuutit.ca/wp-content/uploads/Pauktuutit_MMIWG_Action-Plan_English_PDF-Version.pdf)



Northwest Territories. Department of Child and Family Services. *2022-2023 Annual Report of the Director of Child and Family Services*. October 5, 2023. <https://www.hss.gov.nt.ca/sites/hss/files/resources/2022-2023-cfs-director-report.pdf>.

Ontario Human Rights Commission. *Interrupted Childhoods: Over-Representation of Indigenous and Black Children in Ontario Child Welfare*. February, 2018. <https://www.ohrc.on.ca/en/interrupted-childhoods>.

"Organizational Chart," About NTI, Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated. Accessed February 17, 2022. <https://www.tunngavik.com/about/nti-organizational-chartnti-timiup-havaktut-naunaitku-taat/>.

"Our Communities." Nunavik Communities, Makivvik Corporation. Accessed February 17, 2022. <https://www.Makivvik.org/our-communities/>.

Pollock J., Nathaniel J., Alexandra M. Ouédraogo, Nico Trocmé, Wendy Hovdestad, Amy Miskie, Lindsay Crompton, Aimée Campeau, Masako Tanaka, Cindy Zhang, Claudie Laprise, and Lil Tonmyr. "Estimating rates of out-of-home care among children in Canada: An analysis of national administrative child welfare data." *Health Promotion and Chronic Disease Prevention* 44, no. 4 (2024). <https://www.canada.ca/en/public-health/services/reports-publications/health-promotion-chronic-disease-prevention-canada-research-policy-practice/vol-44-no-4-2024/rates-out-of-home-care-children-canada-analysis-national-administrative-child-welfare-dat.html>

"Process under way to take over child welfare services." Nunatsiavut Government. June 17, 2021. <https://nunatsiavut.com/process-under-way-to-take-over-child-welfare-services/>.

Sinha, Vanda, and Anna Kozlowski. "The Structure of Aboriginal Child Welfare in Canada," *International Indigenous Policy Journal* 2, no. 4 (2014). <https://ojs.lib.uwo.ca/index.php/iipj/article/download/7405/6049>

Statistics Canada. *Age Categories, Life Cycle Groupings*. October 25, 2023. <https://www.statcan.gc.ca/en/concepts/definitions/age2>.

Statistics Canada. *Census Profile: Nunavut, 2016 Census*. Accessed May 18, 2022. <https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2016/dp-pd/prof/details/Page.cfm?Lang=E&Geo1=PR&Code1=62&Geo2=&Code2=&Data=Count&Search-Text=Nunavut&SearchType=Begins&SearchPR=01&B1=All&GeoLevel=PR&GeoCode=62>.

"Tunngavik." Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated. Accessed February 17, 2022. [www.tuungavik.com](http://www.tuungavik.com).

The Provincial-Territorial members of the Indigenous Children and Youth in Care (ICYC) Working Group. *Report on Indigenous Children and Youth in Care*. August, 2020.

"The Importance of Disaggregated Data," *National Collaborating Centre for Aboriginal Health*, Accessed June 14, 2022. <https://www.nccih.ca/docs/context/FS-ImportanceDisaggregatedData-EN.pdf>.

Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada. *Canada's Residential Schools: The Inuit and Northern Experience*. Accessed April 26, 2022, [https://Indigenous.usask.ca/images/resoures-images/aVolume\\_2\\_Inuit\\_and\\_Northern\\_English\\_Web.pdf](https://Indigenous.usask.ca/images/resoures-images/aVolume_2_Inuit_and_Northern_English_Web.pdf)

Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada. *Calls to Action*. December, 2015, [https://ehprnh2mwo3.exactdn.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/Calls\\_to\\_Action\\_English2.pdf](https://ehprnh2mwo3.exactdn.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/Calls_to_Action_English2.pdf)







Indigenous Services  
Canada

Services aux  
Autochtones Canada



ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᑕᐱᓃᑦ ᑲᓄᑕᑦ  
INUIT TAPIRIIT KANATAMI



75 Albert St., Suite 1101  
Ottawa, ON Canada K1P 5E7



613-238-8181



@ITK\_CanadaInuit



InuitTapiriitKanatami



@InuitTapiriitKanatami



[www.itk.ca](http://www.itk.ca)

