Promoting a Culturally Safe Evaluation of an On-the-Land Wellness Program in the Inuvialuit Settlement Region

Mary Ollier,[1] Audrey R. Giles,[1,2] Meghan Etter,[3] Jimmy Ruttan,[3] Nellie Elanik,[4] Ruth Goose[3] and Esther Ipana[4]

ABSTRACT. In 2017, the Inuvialuit Regional Corporation partnered with a diverse research advisory team to understand how Project Jewel, a land-based program in the Inuvialuit Settlement Region, could be evaluated in a way that promotes cultural safety (i.e., in a way that addresses the social, historical, and economic contexts that shape participants' experiences). We used community-based research methodology to approach the study, through which semi-structured interviews, sharing circles, and photovoice were identified by the community advisory board and research advisory team as appropriate research methods for this project. After piloting and evaluating these methods, we then used thematic analysis to analyze the data, which included images and transcripts, to identify the components of a culturally safe evaluation: centring the land, building relationships, working with words and pictures, and promoting benefit over harms through program aftercare. Our community-based research and findings provide a template of a meaningful evaluation framework that other on-the-land programs can use if contextualized within local cultural practices and values.

Key words: on-the-land; land-based; evaluation; Inuvialuit; Inuvialuit Settlement Region; community-based; cultural safety

RÉSUMÉ. En 2017, l'Inuvialuit Regional Corporation s'est associée à une équipe de recherche consultative diversifiée pour tâcher de comprendre comment le projet Jewel, programme terrestre mené à bien dans la région désignée des Inuvialuit, pourrait être évalué de manière à favoriser la sécurité ou sécurisation culturelle (c'est-à-dire de manière à tenir compte des contextes social, historique et économique ayant façonné les expériences des participants). Nous nous sommes servis d'une méthodologie de recherche communautaire pour aborder l'étude. Grâce à cette méthodologie, le conseil consultatif communautaire et l'équipe de recherche consultative ont déterminé que des entrevues semi-structurées, des cercles de partage et des recherches par amorce photo étaient des méthodes de recherche convenant bien à ce projet. Après avoir mis ces méthodes à l'essai et les avoir évaluées, nous avons recouru à une analyse thématique pour analyser les données, comprenant des images et des transcriptions, afin d'aboutir aux composantes d'une évaluation tenant compte de la sécurité culturelle, soit : centrer la terre, nouer des relations, travailler avec des mots et des images, et mettre l'accent sur les bienfaits par opposition aux méfaits en faisant le suivi du programme. Notre recherche communautaire et les constatations qui en découlent ont permis de mener à un modèle de cadre d'évaluation utile dont d'autres programmes terrestres peuvent se servir pourvu qu'ils le contextualisent en fonction des pratiques et des valeurs culturelles locales.

Mots clés : sur la terre; terrestre; évaluation; Inuvialuit; région désignée des Inuvialuit; communautaire; sécurité ou sécurisation culturelle

Traduit pour la revue *Arctic* par Nicole Giguère.

INTRODUCTION

Program evaluation is an important tool for understanding a program's effectiveness, enhancing program development, and justifying why a program should receive support (financial and otherwise) from external agencies. While the concept and practice of evaluation have existed for millennia, approaches to evaluation will differ depending on who is conducting the evaluation because, fundamentally, evaluation is based upon a system of values that can be determined by one's culture (Cram, 1997).

Cultural safety means that when cultural differences exist between a healthcare service provider and the client, the client determines if the services are respectful and inclusive of their culture (Gerlach, 2007). Indigenous approaches to evaluation are based upon different values than those of Western approaches (Cram, 1997; Kawakami et al., 2007; LaFrance and Nichols, 2010). In a settler colonial country such as Canada, Western academic knowledge has been privileged as the dominant approach to evaluation, even for programs that focus on Indigenous values and ways of knowing. Such an approach to evaluation is culturally

[1] School of Human Kinetics, University of Ottawa, 334 Montpetit Hall, Ottawa, Ontario K1N 6N5, Canada
[2] Corresponding author: agiles@uottawa.ca
[3] Inuvialuit Regional Corporation, 107 Mackenzie Road, Inuvik, Northwest Territories X0E 0T0, Canada
[4] Inuvik Community Member, Inuvik, Northwest Territories X0E 0T0, Canada

unsafe and results in findings that are largely divorced from the context in which the program operates (Cram, 1997).

"On-the-land" or "land-based" wellness programs are founded on Indigenous worldviews (Redvers, 2016); they refer to programs that provide services outside of structures that exist in town. In Inuit Nunangat, the Inuit homeland in Canada made up of four regions—the Inuvialuit Settlement Region (Northwest Territories), Nunavut, Nunavik (Northern Québec), and Nunatsiavut (Labrador)—the demand for land-based wellness programs is growing (ITK, 2018). While a body of literature about land-based programs exists in the field of education (Ballantyne, 2014; Wildcat et al., 2014), there is a paucity of literature in the field of health and evaluation research about land-based wellness programs that is contextually specific to Inuit communities throughout Inuit Nunangat (Redvers, 2016).

Inuvialuit are Inuit of the Western Arctic in Canada. Like other Inuit, Inuvialuit life and culture are rooted in a deep and interconnected relationship to the land on which they live (Alunik et al., 2003); as such, Inuvialuit communities have expressed a desire for land-based programs (NWT On the Land Collaborative, 2018). Recently, the Government of the Northwest Territories' Department of Health and Social Services Research Agenda (2016–17:2) identified "research that provides evidence about the effectiveness of land-based healing approaches" as a research priority. To meet this research priority, land-based programs first need to be evaluated. Currently, no evaluation frameworks that reflect Inuvialuit perspectives have been developed for land-based programs.

In the Inuvialuit Settlement Region (ISR), Project Jewel is a land-based program that is run by the Inuvialuit Regional Corporation (IRC). It offers three- to 10-day on-the-land wellness programs ("camps") approximately six times a year. The programs are run by three full-time employees and supported by Elders and local knowledge holders and users. Each camp session targets a specific group of residents of the ISR who struggle with a particular issue (e.g., addiction, trauma, poverty). At the end of a camp, Project Jewel staff meet with each participant to establish an aftercare plan. Follow-up occurs over the phone, in-person, or over social media (e.g., Facebook) to maintain support, and participants are invited to a follow-up camp, if possible. Through on-the-land programming, Project Jewel aims to provide participants with culturally safe tools that they can use to address and overcome trauma and individual struggles, change behaviours or patterns, and build resilience (Gerlach, 2007). Previously, Project Jewel staff and participants have used Western approaches to program evaluation, but they found that these evaluation methods were disconnected from participants and resulted in findings that were not reflective of the program. As a result, a research advisory team was developed to answer the following research question: How can Project Jewel be evaluated in a way that promotes cultural safety?

Project Jewel staff, specifically, Meghan Etter (IRC Manager, Counselling Services) approached Dr. Audrey Giles of the University of Ottawa to apply for a Catalyst grant from the Canadian Institute for Health Research (CIHR). They recruited others to create a diverse research advisory team (Table 1). The team received CIHR funding to conduct a community-based research (CBR) project in partnership with Inuvialuit community members; the first author was then recruited to conduct her Masters research on this topic. To follow both CBR best practices and principles of the National Inuit Strategy on Research (ITK, 2018), a community advisory board was formed so that Inuvialuit perspectives would be central to the research (Table 1). The research presented in this paper was co-authored by members of both the research advisory team and the community advisory board. The purpose of this paper is twofold: (1) to present the findings of the research, and (2) to present a reflective description of our research process to inform future research that seeks to apply CBR to practice.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Cultural Safety

Cultural safety is defined by Williams (1999) as a spiritually, socially, and emotionally safe environment in which there is no assault, challenge, or denial of someone's identity and needs. Drawing upon literature in the field of health care, Gerlach (2007:2) explained: "in cultural safety terms 'culture' is defined in its broadest sense and 'safety' is defined in relation to the responsibility of health professionals to protect their clients from anything which may risk or endanger their health and well-being." Cultural safety "moves beyond the concept of cultural sensitivity to analyzing power imbalances, institutional discrimination, colonization and colonial relationships as they apply to healthcare" (National Collaborating Centre for Aboriginal Health, 2013:3). Bin-Sallik (2003:27) argued that cultural safety is a crucial concept that must be emphasized when addressing issues like designated Indigenous spaces and culturally appropriate curricula and behaviours because "it does not imply special treatment like the terms 'positive discrimination,' 'equal opportunity,' and 'culturally appropriate.'" When applied to evaluation research, cultural safety promotes the consideration of the historical, economic, and social contexts that affect an individual's experience. Culturally safe services can be promoted by healthcare providers but, ultimately, whether or not they deliver culturally safe care can only be determined by the patient or client.

For Project Jewel staff and participants, the term "culturally safe" means that the camps aim to complement unique Inuvialuit ways of living. In this context, cultural safety means that Project Jewel camps meet unique community needs and engage participants by recognizing different traditions and practices throughout communities the ISR. For example, a Project Jewel camp in a coastal

TABLE 1. Members of the research advisory team and the community advisory board.

Name	Position	Indigenous/Non-Indigenous
Research advisory team:		
Meghan Etter	IRC Manager, Counselling Services	Non-Indigenous
Jimmy Ruttan	IRC On-the-land and Support Services	Non-Indigenous
Evelyn Storr	IRC Director, Community Development, Elder	Inuvialuit
Francine Darroch	Post-doctoral Fellow, University of British Colombia	Non-Indigenous
Donald Prince	Addictions counselor; currently the Executive Director of the Arctic Indigenous Wellness Foundation	Dene
Tricia McGuire-Adams	PhD candidate, University of Ottawa; currently an assistant professor, Faculty of Kinesiology, University of Alberta	Anishinaabe
Andre Corriveau	Chief Officer of Public Health for the NWT	Non-Indigenous
Sarah Rogers	Elder	Inuvialuit
Mary Ollier	MA candidate, University of Ottawa	Non-Indigenous
Community advisory board:		
Nellie Elanik	Project Jewel past participant	Inuvialuit
Esther Ipana	Project Jewel past participant	Inuvialuit
Peggy Day	IRC Counsellor	Inuvialuit
Ruth Goose	IRC Cultural Support Worker	Inuvialuit and Gwich'in

community (i.e., Paulatuk) will engage local Elders to adjust activities and teachings to the unique lands, resources, and traditions of that area. Cultural safety also means emphasizing a connection to Inuvialuit culture in all facets of Project Jewel camps because Inuvialuit culture was suppressed through colonial practices.

Colonialism and Evaluation

Mainstream Western evaluation methods have reinforced and (re)produced colonialism by depicting Western knowledge as superior to Indigenous knowledge; they continue to do so today. Western evaluation methods have led to a dichotomy: Western settlers are constructed as the norm, while Indigenous people are positioned as the "other" (Cram, 1997). By consequence, mainstream evaluation research inappropriately compares Indigenous communities to an apparent non-Indigenous norm. In doing so, Indigenous people are seen as failing to reach the norm, are judged to be unacceptable, and thus are (re)constructed as inferior to colonizers (Cram, 1997). As described by LaFrance and Nichols (2010), this manifestation of colonialism harms Indigenous communities by fixating on constructed "failures"; furthermore, it ignores the strengths of the communities from members' own perspectives.

There are numerous ways in which mainstream Western approaches to evaluation reinforce colonialism. They do not consider, let alone prioritize, the importance of following cultural protocols within the community (Kawakami et al., 2007), including having Elders as the primary determiners of quality in the research approach and method design (LaFrance and Nichols, 2010). Consequently, there is a pressing need to address the colonial nature of mainstream approaches that dominate evaluation research. Recognizing the importance and utility of Indigenous approaches to evaluation is essential in ensuring that evaluations represent the programs that are being evaluated appropriately and bring meaningful benefits to Indigenous communities.

Indigenous Approaches to Evaluation

While there is a paucity of academic evaluation research that has been published from Inuit perspectives, there are common elements within Indigenous approaches to evaluation research that can be identified. These key elements include (1) involving the community, (2) Indigenous ownership, and (3) engaging with storytelling and oral histories (Kahakalou, 2004; Kawakami et al., 2007; Lafrance and Nichols, 2010).

Indigenous approaches to evaluation strongly emphasize the importance of involving the community in the evaluation process, which is emphasized over the product (Kahakalau, 2004; Gready, 2008; Lafrance and Nichols, 2010). Discussions and collaborative decision-making about (1) the initiation and design of the research, (2) data collection methods that are respectful and follow cultural norms, and (3) data analysis that aligns with cultural contexts and includes longstanding strategies must be done with community members (Kawakami et al., 2007). Involving the community in these ways acknowledges histories where evaluation research was instead conducted "on" Indigenous people and communities, rather than "with" and "for" their benefit (Kawakami et al., 2007). Lafrance and Nichols (2010) identified Indigenous ownership of evaluation research as another key element of Indigenous evaluation frameworks. Indigenous communities take ownership of the project through defining the standards of evaluation so that they do not convey judgement, but rather the evaluation is perceived as an opportunity for learning and self-determination. Another important element of Indigenous approaches to evaluation research is the inclusion of storytelling and oral histories. Stories are a method for understanding the lived experience of members of Indigenous communities; they need to be included in effective evaluations. Storytelling and oral histories are commonly valued across many Indigenous cultures, but they are nuanced within the unique social, historical, and cultural contexts of each community

(Kovach, 2009). Indigenous approaches to evaluation seek to use stories and oral histories to "explain evaluation from an Indigenous perspective" (LaFrance et al., 2012:67). Researchers must collaborate with the community to determine the appropriate use and place of stories and oral histories in evaluation research.

Importantly, the above elements contribute to Inuit self-determination in research, as identified in the *National Inuit Strategy on Research* (NISR) (ITK, 2018), which was published by Inuit Tapariit Kanatami (ITK), the national representational organization for Inuit in Canada. The key elements of Indigenous approaches to evaluation align with the NISR because they ensure that Inuit are partners in governing research (Priority Area 1) and that Inuit have access, ownership, and control over data and information (Priority Area 4) (ITK, 2018).

Strengths and Challenges: Indigenous approaches to evaluation possess numerous notable strengths. The literature concerning Indigenous approaches to evaluation suggests that benefits could include enhancing the validity of evaluation research because the approaches emphasize engaging in meaningful community participation. Thus, they could ensure that the research more accurately reflects the community. Indigenous evaluation approaches also could offer opportunities for community empowerment and promote opportunities for local capacity building (Anderson et al., 2012). Importantly, Indigenous approaches could also promote local ownership of knowledge and resources and self-determination in research (ITK, 2018).

Indigenous approaches to evaluation research also face some challenges. A notable challenge to Indigenous evaluation approaches is the persisting perception that Indigenous ways of knowing and methods of data collection are less valid than those from Western paradigms (Cavino, 2013). For example, Western quantitative methodologies persistently dominate evaluation research with Indigenous communities over Indigenous quantitative methodologies, such as those defined and described by Walter and Anderson (2013). Walter and Anderson (2013) presented a new paradigm for Indigenous quantitative methodologies to produce statistical data by and for Indigenous peoples. They critiqued Western approaches to quantitative methodologies that socially construct Indigenous peoples as "deficit" to a colonial standard.

Further, effective community involvement requires significant time (Johnston-Goodstar, 2012). True collaboration requires patience; adequate time must be allotted for all collaborators to make their decisions before the project advances to the next stage. In contrast to Western research norms that heavily value adherence to timelines and schedules, Indigenous approaches to research place greater value on the process (Anderson et al., 2012). Non-Indigenous stakeholders (i.e., funding agencies) sometimes express frustration at delays, but Elders and community members require time to process decisions and should not be rushed (Anderson et al., 2012).

Indigenous and Non-Indigenous Evaluation Partnerships

Inuit Nunangat lacks academic institutions that are recognized by federal research funding agencies (ITK, 2018). As such, research projects in the region often rely on collaborative partnerships between local Inuit experts and academics from southern universities to gain access to financial resources (ITK, 2018). When partnering with non-Indigenous researchers, Indigenous communities have voiced their demand for community advisory boards for any research project involving evaluation (Johnston-Goodstar, 2012). This demand is echoed in the NISR (ITK, 2018), which emphasized that forming a community advisory board is necessary in any evaluation research with Inuit that involves non-Indigenous researchers to ensure that Inuit cultural knowledge and expertise are recognized, respected, and given equal value to non-Indigenous knowledge.

A community advisory board is defined as a committee of community members that collaborates with non-community members to direct and participate in the purpose, agenda, decision-making, and processes of a research project (Israel et al., 1998). In the context of evaluation, Indigenous community advisory boards are essential because they can help ensure the relevance of the evaluation through community-based participation in the decisions and direction of the research at each stage of the project (Johnston-Goodstar, 2012). In these projects, non-Indigenous evaluators have the responsibility to maintain awareness of their own culturally biased assumptions and positionality and to uphold cultural safety. Non-Indigenous evaluation partners need to promote cultural safety in evaluation so that they can respect and centre the worldviews of Indigenous co-evaluators and participants (American Evaluation Association, 2011).

Evaluation of Project Jewel

While Project Jewel has been evaluated in the past, the previous evaluation methods used non-Indigenous approaches, and their processes and results garnered dissatisfaction from the program staff and participants. The first evaluations of Project Jewel used written questionnaires that were completed by participants at the end of a program. Project Jewel staff found this evaluation strategy to be inadequate because it failed to yield rich feedback that could be used to further develop the program. Participants had differing levels of literacy, which presented a challenge in the use of written questionnaires. Another evaluation strategy that Project Jewel staff used was encouraging participants to journal throughout the programs; the on-the-land facilitator would, with participant consent, read the journals to evaluate the program. However, journaling did not resonate with all participants, staff reported that they did not have adequate time to analyze each entry, and varying levels of literacy across participants again served as a barrier to

this evaluation approach. In 2016, Project Jewel received funding from a non-Indigenous external agency, which included a requirement to complete the agency's evaluation framework. Despite consulting with Project Jewel staff, the evaluation framework nonetheless lacked cultural safety. Prior to starting a camp, the evaluation framework required staff to ask participants personal questions about mental health and trauma, without regard for respecting cultural mores; Project Jewel staff had concerns of about its use with program participants. Therefore, in light of previous evaluation challenges, Project Jewel staff sought to pursue the development of a culturally safe evaluation framework that would be relevant to the program and would promote meaningful program monitoring, evaluation, and development. They further hoped that the evaluation results could be used to achieve recognition from external agencies and also improve the chances for further funding. The information provided below offers insight into how the collaborative efforts of our team created a culturally safe evaluation tool with Project Jewel.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

A postcolonial theoretical lens, informed by a decolonization framework and critical Inuit studies, was determined by the research advisory team and community advisory board to be the most appropriate theoretical approach for this project. We sought to contextualize how legacies of colonization have affected and shaped Western evaluation methods and to better understand how to create an evaluation approach that would engage with Inuvialuit ways of knowing. Postcolonial theory is, however, rooted in Western research, which, from an Indigenous perspective, is a profound site of colonization (Smith, 1999; Battiste, 2000). To respect this perspective, we informed our use of postcolonial theory with a decolonization framework.

A decolonization framework is used by scholars to better understand the effects of colonialism from an Indigenous perspective. Importantly, a decolonization framework is used to address the complexities of postcolonial theory and its assumptions (Battiste, 2000). Decolonization frameworks have been situated in the decolonization politics of Indigenous peoples' movements to enact change towards a better future (Smith, 1999; Battiste, 2000). Through engaging with a decolonization framework, we placed Inuvialuit perspectives, values, ways of knowing, and social agendas at the forefront of this research.

We also determined that this research must be informed by critical Inuit studies, which place oral traditions at the forefront of knowledge acquisition to convey Inuit ideologies (Martin, 2009). Oral traditions have been used throughout Inuit Nunangat for time immemorial to share histories, knowledge, and teachings (Karetak et al., 2017). They are used to share Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit (IQ), an intellectual tradition that encompasses "a set of values and practices, the relevance and importance of these, and the ways of being and looking at things that are timeless" (Karetak et al., 2017:1). Through engaging with critical Inuit studies, we emphasized oral traditions as the primary means of understanding the social and historical contexts that shaped this research.

PROCESS

When crafting the grant application, the research advisory team strongly felt that CBR was the most appropriate approach to address all research objectives detailed in the project. Importantly, the key tenets and strengths of CBR enabled meaningful and reciprocal partnerships to form between the Indigenous and non-Indigenous members of the research advisory team so that we could pursue a process of research that in and of itself was culturally safe. In CBR, community members are meaningfully integrated into the project so that they can co-create, co-determine, and participate in the research. In this approach, discussions of power and privilege between academics and communities can be more openly addressed (Israel et al., 1998). The key tenets of CBR are to facilitate collaborative partnerships in all steps of the research process, integrate knowledge and action for mutual benefit of all partners, promote a co-learning and empowering process that attends to social inequalities, address health from a positive and ecological perspective, and disseminate findings and knowledge gained equally to all partners (Israel et al., 1998). Importantly, CBR enables power sharing throughout the research process, a practice emphasized by ITK (2018). CBR best practices with Indigenous communities are also rooted in the principles of Ownership, Control, Access and Possession (OCAPä) for data management (First Nations Information Governance Centre, 2014).

After the initial grant application was successful and the community advisory board was formed, the decisions and processes throughout the research project were determined by the community advisory board and the research advisory team. The community advisory board included two past participants in Project Jewel programs, Nellie Elanik and Esther Ipana (both Inuvialuit), and two Project Jewel employees, Peggy Day (counsellor, Inuvialuit), and Ruth Goose (cultural support worker, Inuvialuit and Gwich'in). Honoraria were provided to members of the community advisory board for whom this research was not a part of their job. Meetings between the community advisory board and the research advisory team took place in person (with several people attending over Skype) at the IRC headquarters in Inuvik with meetings of smaller subgroups occurring either in person or over Skype. Our first meeting together took place in May 2017; at this time, we further built relationships with each other and refined our plan for data collection. We then sought and received approval for this project from the Research Ethics Board at the University of Ottawa and the Aurora Research Institute,

which is responsible for issuing research licenses for the NWT on behalf of the Government of the NWT.

METHODS

Data for this study were collected at on-the-land programs between 2017 and 2019. The first author and Giles attended five on-the-land programs with Project Jewel, where they and two members of the community advisory board, Rogers and Elanik, piloted three evaluation methods: sharing circles, semi-structured interviews, and photovoice. Our intention was to expose research participants to a variety of evaluation methods so that they could identify those that were the most or least suitable for the evaluation of Project Jewel. In turn, these evaluation methods constituted our research methods.

Sharing Circles

As a research method, sharing circles are rooted in Indigenous culture and generate rich data through group interactions that enable participants to share experiences and reflections through group conversation (Berg, 1995; Parker and Tritter, 2006; Lavallée, 2009). The first author and Giles co-facilitated two sharing circles with the help and guidance of Sarah Rogers, the Inuvialuit Elder on the community advisory board. The first sharing circle was with three Project Jewel participants during a fish camp in Paulatuk. We conducted the second sharing circle with the support of Rogers and Elanik (who was in a dual role as a participant and research assistant) at a weekend on-the-land gathering with nine individuals who had previously participated in Project Jewel programs. Some examples of prompt questions included, "Why did you attend Project Jewel?" and "What role (if any) does this program play in connecting you to the land?" Sharing circles were audio recorded and transcribed verbatim.

Semi-structured Interviews

Semi-structured interviews make use of a flexible interview guide and prompts; they promote organic one-on-one dialogue between the researcher and the participant (Spencer et al., 2003). We deemed this method to be an important data collection technique for those who did not want to share their thoughts and feelings with other participants. Sample questions included the following: "What role does having an Elder at camp play in connecting participants to the land?" "How does being on the land make you feel?" "If you were to evaluate Project Jewel, how would you do it?" and "What did you think about the sharing circle/photovoice/this interview as a way to evaluate your experience with Project Jewel?"

The first author, with occasional help from Giles, conducted semi-structured interviews with 14 Project Jewel stakeholders (10 women, four men), 13 Project Jewel participants (10 women, three men), and three past Project Jewel participants (three women). Stakeholders included five Project Jewel and IRC staff members, three Inuvialuit Elders, three professionals who reside in Inuvik, and two other professionals (experts in forgiveness), all of whom had previously collaborated with Project Jewel. The first author transcribed the audio-recorded interviews verbatim. All participants received copies of their transcripts and were invited to make clarifications and edits as they deemed necessary before their data were included in the analysis. Only one participant made changes to the transcript.

Photovoice

Photovoice is an innovative arts-based method that blends photography and words to enable participants to share their perspectives. Researchers who use photovoice seek to achieve three goals: (1) Enable people to record and reflect on their community's strengths and concerns, (2) promote critical dialogue and knowledge about important issues through large and small group discussion, and (3) reach an audience of policy makers (Wang and Burris, 1997). The community advisory board determined that photovoice presented a valuable evaluation approach because it would enable Project Jewel participants to use their perspectives and experiences to direct discussion during data collection and broaden our data collection to include images.

We conducted photovoice with 13 Project Jewel participants, one research assistant, and one Elder, all of whom had access to a digital camera throughout their participation in a program. At the end of each program, Ollier and Giles met one-on-one with all participants in an audio-recorded interview to ask which photos that they felt were most important; the interviews were then transcribed and used to identify captions. After each program, we compiled a book of participant photos and captions shared by participants during interviews. We gave copies of the photo books to all participants, and the IRC kept additional copies.

All research participants were informed that the IRC would own, control, possess, and determine who had access to the data prior to giving their consent to participate in the research. Audio files of recorded interviews, transcripts, and photos were temporarily stored by Ollier and Giles on their computers for the purposes of working on the research reports while at their university; all data will be transferred to the IRC upon the completion of the research.

Ethical Considerations and Methodological Complications

We encountered ethical considerations and methodological complications that led to a process of data collection that was iterative and cyclical. Each time we piloted our evaluation methods, we reflected on how they were received by the participants. We experienced bi-directional learning throughout this process; skills and knowledge were shared between members of the research

advisory team and community advisory board. For example, the Inuvialuit members of the research advisory team and community advisory board taught non-Inuvialuit team members about Inuvialuit ways of living, culture, and history so that they could better engage with participants. Team members from Inuvik taught Ollier and Giles, who grew up in southern Canada, on-the-land skills such as driving a snow machine and sewing so that they could better engage with activities during Project Jewel programs.

Paulatuk: We began piloting our evaluation methods during a five-day program outside of Paulatuk at a fish camp in the summer of 2017. Ollier, Giles, and two members of the community advisory board, Ruttan (who planned and supported the program) and Rogers (Elder), attended and participated in the program. This particular camp focused on forgiveness and healing from trauma. Following ethical guidance of the community advisory board, the southern-based researchers did not sit on the sidelines of the camp. Instead, they were full participants. They introduced themselves at the beginning of the camp to explain their roles as researchers and participants and distributed cameras for photovoice. It was important that Ollier and Giles participated in the program so that they could better understand the experience of participating in Project Jewel, and so that participants could develop relationships with them prior to engaging in research.

Following ethical guidance from the community advisory board, we did not collect data until the final day of the camp. Overall, our pilot methods of photovoice and sharing circle were met with enthusiasm: participants expressed that they enjoyed using photovoice and, with Rogers' guidance, the sharing circle facilitated rich dialogue about Project Jewel. Interestingly, photovoice in particular facilitated an opportunity for some participants to initiate a dialogue about painful or traumatic past experiences.

We did encounter challenges during our first pilot experience; we had a small sample size, and those who did participate were wary of negative connotations associated with research. Initially, nine participants from Paulatuk expressed interest and signed up for the program, however, only three attended the camp. While this small sample size generated rich data, we recognized that factors such as unexpectedly low participation must be considered in future planning. When Ollier and Giles introduced the research project to the program participants in greater depth (they had been told about it by Project Jewel staff prior to registration), the participants expressed uneasiness about being involved in any form of research. Notably, residents of the ISR have experienced a history fraught with exploitative researchers who have taken advantage of their knowledge, expertise, and resources while returning little, if any, benefits back to the communities. After this experience, Ollier and Giles learned how to better introduce the project; they needed to emphasize that they were invited to do the research for and with the IRC (who would own the data), that an Elder would be involved in data collection, and how the data would be used to benefit ISR communities.

These difficulties provided the research advisory team and community advisory board with useful lessons, which, in addition to the successful elements of our piloted methods, helped us to refine our approach for the next Project Jewel program at which data collection occurred, which happened at Reindeer Station in September 2017.

Reindeer Station: In September 2017, Ollier, Giles, Ruttan, Day, and Rogers attended a three-day weekend camp with participants who had all previously participated in a Project Jewel program. The purpose of this camp was to pilot our evaluation methods with people who could draw upon their past experiences with the program. In comparison to our first pilot in Paulatuk, nine participants were able to attend the Project Jewel camp. Further, the lessons learned in Reindeer Station and the participants' understanding of the unique purpose of the camp (i.e., to gather past participants for their feedback), promoted a greater sense of ease and comfort during data collection. Challenges did arise—Ollier was reminded to use non-technical language when explaining photovoice to participants. Participants also emphasized that sharing circles needed to be held in private spaces. As we were in one large cabin with no breakout rooms, the sharing circle unfortunately occurred in a space where cooks and maintenance staff were able to listen, an event for which the research advisory team issued profound apologies afterwards, but nevertheless should have anticipated and avoided.

In the context of the research project, it was becoming clear that the pilot evaluation methods could indeed be useful for Project Jewel. Participants at both Paulatuk and Reindeer Station camps expressed positive feedback about using photovoice and participating in a sharing circle. Further, Project Jewel staff noted that these methods were already promoting richer feedback than previous evaluation methods used by Project Jewel. However, we still felt that our sample size remained small. As a result, the first author continued to pilot the evaluation methods at day camps with Project Jewel over the following summer.

Interviews with Past Participants and Staff: We conducted semi-structured interviews with past Project Jewel participants who had not attended a program in more than two years. We felt that participants with whom we engaged at a Project Jewel camp might be more inclined to focus on the positive aspects of the program, while other past participants interviewed outside of the program setting might be more inclined to share their critiques. Further, as they had disengaged with the program, they might have had different experiences than those who continued to be engaged with it. These individuals, however, were hard to find because, being disengaged from the program, Project Jewel staff did not have reliable contact information. Over the summer of 2018, Ollier conducted semi-structured interviews with three female past participants: two interviews were conducted in person in Inuvik, and one was completed over the phone with a past participant who lived in Uluhaktok. We also conducted semi-structured interviews with four Project Jewel staff and Rogers,

an Elder who supports the program. They contributed important perspectives to the evaluation due to their expert knowledge and experiences with Project Jewel.

ANALYSIS

While we recognized that it would require patience and hard work, we were committed to meaningful collaboration in every stage of the project, including data analysis. As such, over the course of her summer in Inuvik, Ollier worked very closely with three members of the community advisory board, Elanik, Goose, and Ipana, to analyze data collected for this study. Elanik's, Goose's, and Ipana's perspectives as Inuvialuit community members with meaningful relationships with Project Jewel were essential to approaching research analysis in a way that upheld CBR best practices and that prioritized local perspectives. From July to September, Elanik, Goose, Ipana, and Ollier met for two hours on a weekly basis to analyze the data. The four individuals engaged in the line-by-line analysis of each transcript using Braun and Clarke's (2006) six-step thematic analysis. We used our understanding of cultural safety, which was informed by Project Jewel staff and participants and the relevant literature, as a lens to analyze the data. We thoroughly discussed each transcript, with the three community advisor board members Elanik, Goose, and Ipana identifying relevant codes inductively. We used the lens of cultural safety to better understand which aspects of Project Jewel camps and evaluation methods centre Inuvialuit values, practices, and ways of living, and how these aspects dynamically respond to the unique communities of the ISR. Ollier recorded and organized the codes in an NVivo software file during each meeting. At the end of each meeting, a discussion between the four team members confirmed the codes and patterns that were recorded in NVivo to ensure they were reflective of the meeting's discussion.

We recognize that Braun and Clarke (2006) did not develop their approach to thematic analysis to reflect Indigenous ways of making meaning from other people's stories and experiences. But the community advisory board and research team agreed to use this approach for the project because it offers a robust, reflective, systematic, and flexible approach to analyzing applied research data (Braun and Clarke, 2006). Our approach recognizes that knowledge is culturally situated and is possessed by a group, not just an individual. By engaging Inuvialuit members of the community advisory board in a group setting, our approach was consistent with CBR best practices and critical Inuit studies. It enabled us to make modest attempts to decolonize and Indigenize this approach to data analysis.

In November 2018, the research advisory team and community advisory board met in Inuvik to finalize the themes, which are outlined below.

RESULTS

We identified four themes that comprise an evaluation framework that promotes cultural safety for Project Jewel: centring the land, building relationships, working with words and pictures, and promoting benefits by minimizing harms through aftercare.

Centring the Land

Elders, staff, and participants strongly emphasized the importance of the land as the foundational core of Project Jewel and its evaluation. This is a key element that distinguishes Project Jewel from other health and wellness programs offered in the region. To promote a culturally safe approach, the evaluation of Project Jewel needs to recognize the depth, complexity, and specificity of participants' relationships to the land, and the role that these relationships play in healing and wellness. One participant at the camp in Paulatuk used photovoice to emphasize the importance of being out on the land during the program to heal from past trauma: "To be out on the land, it is the best place to heal." During a sharing circle at Reindeer Station, Keith, a Project Jewel participant, explained the importance of holding Project Jewel programs on the land versus in town:

> In town and out on the land are two different things, two different worlds. If you're in town, you can't go setting nets, for example, with people. You can't hold group sessions, well I guess you can hold [a] group session, but then you're going to have interruptions. Out here, there's no interruption.

Jimmy, the On-the-land Coordinator for Project Jewel, described being on the land as the primary reason why people decide to attend Project Jewel: "I think people get enticed because of the draw that there is to the land."

The land is at the centre of Project Jewel and being on the land is a key motivating factor for participants to attend the program. A culturally safe evaluation framework for Project Jewel should be guided by discussions of participants' relationship to the land, their needs on the land, and their comfort level on the land. Like other Inuit and First Nations in the Northwest Territories, Inuvialuit recognize that human and natural systems are fundamentally coupled together (Rowe, 2019). This worldview must guide the evaluation of Project Jewel by connecting participants' healing and wellness directly to their relationship to the land and needs and comfort on the land. Further, the timing and delivery of the evaluation methods should not interfere with or take away from the activities or pace of life that makes being on the land so important for participants.

Building Relationships

Staff emphasized that it was important to build meaningful relationships with participants throughout the

program before engaging in evaluation. Ruttan described how previous evaluation frameworks for the program lacked appropriate regard for relationships, with intrusive questions being asked very soon after meeting participants: "[There was] no real consideration for first impression, for establishing a relationship. [There was] just no real regard for establishing a relationship between two people." Goose, an Indigenous staff member for Project Jewel, elaborated:

> Relationship-building is one of the first things that needs to happen, and that happens really good on the land…you take somebody out that's not really talkative, by the time you get them back you would have learned a few things about that person.

In an Inuvialuit cultural context, strong relationships are built when engaging in on-the-land activities. Members of the research advisory team and community advisory board were able to share experiences with participants on the land, which built bidirectional trust; for instance, by sharing a cabin, tent, or early morning coffee and exchanging personal stories of their own experiences with trauma through the program activities and later spontaneously. Indeed, it was not only the participants in the research who were asked to be vulnerable, which is so often the case in research; instead, the members of the research advisory team and the community advisory board also made themselves vulnerable to the participants. As a result, when they engaged in the evaluation activities, participants felt more comfortable with sharing rich information about their experiences.

Working with Words and Pictures

Project Jewel staff identified words and pictures as better forms of evaluation than numbers. Evelyn (IRC Director of Community Development and Inuvialuit Elder) described the value of developing an evaluation framework that enables a richer description of participants' experiences than statistics:

> I don't react to huge numbers, a lot of people will – and I think that's what [external funders] look for. But that's why this project is important, so that we evaluate not on, "so we had 50 people, we have 50 responses." We need to expand that evaluation tool… But, when you can get information, or see the results in somebody's life that brought them from here to here, and you're helping them, that's more important.

Participants in this research had the opportunity to talk about their personal stories and experiences by taking photos and discussing them during photovoice one-on-one interviews and also in sharing circles. The pictures and words that resulted from these methods conveyed information that could not have been captured by numbers. For example, Daniel, a Project Jewel participant at a camp at Reindeer Station, expressed the benefits that he experienced

from attending Project Jewel programs while describing a photo that he took of Reindeer Station for photovoice (Fig. 1):

> Coming back to Reindeer Station [depicted], bringing us close to each other, me and my wife, it sure helped me and my wife in our marriage, in our marriage we were having a bit of a falling out, and it is why we decided to come out, to help us in our marriage and in our family, [Project Jewel] gets our family closer together.

Barbara, a Project Jewel participant at Reindeer Station, said that she preferred to share her experiences through discussion rather than through surveys: "Interviews, talking…it is really good this way because everyone gets to come and say what they need to say and just try to help others." Enabling a space for personal stories to be shared helped Project Jewel to be respectful of Inuvialuit oral traditions (Alunik et al., 2003).

Furthermore, meaningful discussions with participants resulted in what we believed to be honest feedback about the strengths and weaknesses of the program. This honesty was strongly valued by Project Jewel staff for program development. Etter elaborated:

> [In the past,] we would have a survey at the end, you know trying to get at, "What did you get out of it," but also, "What are ways that we could improve" and you know different things like that? And the feedback was always positive…if there was ever something negative, it had to do with maybe the food, or the weather…it was that kind of stuff that really didn't develop the program.

Overall, the feedback garnered from words and photos was able to elicit a range of positive and negative critique. We identified that a crucial component to promoting a culturally safe evaluation for Project Jewel was providing participants with opportunities to share personal stories, perspectives, feedback, and experiences through both verbal and visual ways.

Promoting Benefits While Minimizing Harms through Aftercare

Staff and participants expressed that it was important that Project Jewel promoted benefits for participants while minimizing harms. Aftercare programming was identified as being a critical component to promoting benefits among participants. Project Jewel seeks to use a holistic approach to healing and wellness that extends beyond camps to include opportunities for follow-up support. As Project Jewel programming focuses on sensitive issues, it is important that participants have the option of receiving support from a Project Jewel counsellor when they return home from their on-the-land experience. Leanne, a past Project Jewel participant, described her experience of aftercare or lack thereof:

FIG. 1. Photo taken by Daniel, a participant at a Reindeer Station camp, which he used to express the benefit he received by attending the Project Jewel program.

I didn't get a call from the person who was supposed to give me a call or see how I was doing, not sure that happened there…I was looking forward to the phone call [for the counsellor] to see how I was doing. But I kind of felt like I was—I don't know—I wouldn't say neglected, more like just forgotten I guess.

During a sharing circle at Reindeer Station, one participant expressed a desire for more formal aftercare programming:

I am kind of confused about [aftercare]… I believe, if I understood correctly, that we could arrange to have them call us or to have a home visit, or you know that the office was there and quite often we could just go in. But, personally, I would have liked to have seen something a little bit more formal and really a genuine effort to organize something to bring us together so that we could let each other know how we were doing as well.

Eva, a past Project Jewel participant, expressed how her experience with aftercare enhanced the benefits that she gained from participating in Project Jewel:

It was actually quite easy for me [to have aftercare] because, well, I work in the IRC. So, it was more easily accessible for me I found because [the counsellor] was here, [the on-the-land facilitator] was here—if I wasn't feeling quite right—I don't know how to word it, I'll just go to them. But yeah, they've helped me … occasionally I will come to them for something. Just to either talk with them or even just to sit and cry.

Aftercare can help participants to continue to feel supported by Project Jewel; however, if aftercare is lacking or perceived to be lacking, participants are at risk of experiencing harm. The participants' strong feelings about the need for and benefit of aftercare illustrated the importance of including it as an element of Project Jewel's evaluation. Promoting benefit while minimizing harm ought to be an ethical component of any evaluation research. Importantly, evaluation research can bring up memories and feelings that may further contribute to the need for aftercare for participants, which makes aftercare an especially important theme of the program.

DISCUSSION

The research advisory team and community advisory board met in November 2018 to discuss the research process thus far and resulting themes. Together, we drew upon our results, reflections, and experiences over the course of data collection and the literature on Indigenous approaches to evaluation to further refine the evaluation framework.

Who Should Be Involved in the Evaluation?

A key element of Indigenous approaches to evaluation is meaningful community involvement (Lafrance and Nichols, 2010; Lafrance et al., 2012). As such, program participants, staff, and program stakeholders of Project Jewel were engaged in this evaluation research; any evaluation of Project Jewel programs must continue to engage these groups to promote a culturally safe evaluation approach. These groups should be represented on a community advisory board that remains involved in executing, reviewing, and refining the evaluation. Thus, Project Jewel's evaluation will be guided by the unique needs, values, and perspectives of the Inuvialuit communities that it serves. Without involving community groups, an evaluation of Project Jewel will risk reinforcing colonial evaluation practices that fail to respect community perspectives and values (Kawakami et al., 2007; LaFrance and Nichols, 2010).

When Should the Evaluation Happen?

The evaluation of Project Jewel's programs should not be limited to the duration of a camp, but rather be an on-going, longitudinal effort that aligns Project Jewel's services. Project Jewel completes a general intake form with all participants before programs begin and concludes programs with one-on-one aftercare planning sessions between each participant and a counselor. Aftercare meetings occur on a case-specific basis over the following two years, with an opportunity for one or more possible follow-up camps. Together, we decided that evaluation should begin at the start of a Project Jewel camp, at the end of a camp, and during at least one point in time during aftercare to follow the course of a participant's experience with Project Jewel. This third evaluation could occur during a possible follow-up camp. Evaluation through interviews with past and disengaged participants, staff, and stakeholders should happen continuously throughout the year. Analysis of the data collected from the evaluation should occur on an annual basis.

How Should the Evaluation Be Conducted?

The research community advisory board determined that the evaluation methods we had piloted—sharing circles, semi-structured interviews, and photovoice—should continue to be used to evaluate Project Jewel. We felt satisfied that these methods addressed the colonial nature of previous Western evaluation methods that had been used by Project Jewel, particularly because they enabled opportunities to engage in storytelling and oral histories (LaFrance and Nichols, 2010). We noted that using all three methods will increase the time investment required for evaluation, in comparison to using only one method. Staff responsible for future evaluations will face the challenge of a large workload; however, the value of using all three methods was deemed to be worth the time and effort, as they would provide participants with a variety of ways to share their thoughts.

Semi-structured interviews with participants should be used prior to and following camps and during aftercare, Project Jewel participants should continue to have the opportunity to use photovoice to engage in evaluation, and sharing circles should be used at the end of camps. Specific to Project Jewel, we determined that a wireless iPad would be the most appropriate tool to organize and store the interview guides and evaluation data. iPads can be transported easily on-the-land, recharged with a generator, capture and store audio and photographic data, and consolidate information into one comprehensive location (i.e., IRC server). It is important to note that Project Jewel currently does not have the staff resource capacity to deliver all three evaluation methods.

What Are the Components of the Evaluation?

We wanted the evaluation framework to reflect Inuvialuit ownership and self-determination in the evaluation. One way in which non-Indigenous standards that are rooted in a colonial perspective harm Indigenous people is by making them feel pressured to prove their "Indigeneity" (Smith, 1999). We wanted to ensure that the interview and sharing circle questions would not reinforce these colonial standards by pressuring participants to feel they had to prove "Inuvialuitness." We wanted the semi-structured interview guide used with current participants to reflect the components of a culturally safe evaluation framework that we had identified through research. We created new pre-camp and post-camp interview guides (Table 2). The questions in the pre-camp guide are meant to learn more about participants' motivations for attending and expectations of Project Jewel so that the evaluator(s) can begin to build a relationship with them. The pre-camp questions also help the evaluator(s) better understand the participants' relationship to and comfort on the land. The post-camp guide was designed to create opportunities for personal stories about the participants' experiences of the program. Their comfort on the land during the program and their feelings about going on the land again are specifically addressed to centre the land. Questions about aftercare and the participants' readiness to return home were designed to promote participant safety immediately after a camp and throughout aftercare. Notably, we included questions probing the participants' overall experience and how it

TABLE 2. Guide for the pre-camp and post-camp semi-structured interview prompt questions and corresponding themes.

Prompt questions	Theme evaluated
Pre-camp:	
1. What do you want to get out of this program?	Building relationships
2. Why are you here?	Building relationships, working with words and pictures
3. How do you feel about going on the land?	Centering the land, working with words and pictures
Post-camp:	
1. What were the highlights of the camp?	Working with words and pictures
2. What helped you the most during this camp?	Building relationships, working with words and pictures
3. How would you feel about going on the land again?	Centering the land
4. What would make you feel more comfortable if you come back?	Centering the land, working with words and pictures
5. What do you expect to get out of the next follow-up camp?	Promoting benefits while minimizing harms through aftercare
6. What was the most difficult part for you?	Working with words and pictures, building relationships
7. How do you feel about going home today? What do you need to feel comfortable going home?	Promoting benefits while minimizing harms through aftercare
8. Did the program meet your expectations? What was missing?	Building relationships, working with words and pictures

TABLE 3. Guide for the sharing circles and photovoice prompt questions and corresponding themes.

Prompt questions	Theme evaluated
Sharing circles:	
1. Why did you attend Project Jewel?	Building relationships, working with words and pictures
2. What were your expectations and desired outcomes of attending a Project Jewel workshop?	Building relationships, working with words and pictures
3. Do you think the land plays a role in the healing process for people?	Centering the land, building relationships, working with words and pictures
4. Is it important to reconnect with the land to learn? Why?	Centering the land, building relationships, working with words and pictures
5. Does being on the land connect you to your culture?	Centering the land, building relationships, working with words and pictures
6. What role does this program play in connecting you to the land?	Centering the land, building relationships, working with words and pictures
7. What challenges do you have to access land-based programs?	Centering the land
8. How does being on the land make you feel? How does it help you think through problems you may be having in your daily life?	Centering the land, building relationships, working with words and pictures
9. How would this program be different if it were offered in a community centre or another location (not out on the land)?	Centering the land, building relationships, working with words and pictures
10. What was the best part about the program for you?	Working with words and pictures
11. What changes would you like to see in the program?	Working with words and pictures
12. What is/are the best way/ways to capture this experience?	Working with words and pictures
13. Did Project Jewel impact your wellness long-term, if at all?[1]	Promoting benefits while minimizing harms through aftercare
14. Did you receive aftercare?[1]	Promoting benefits while minimizing harms through aftercare
Photovoice:	
1. Can you describe the photos that you took that are most important to you? Why are they important to you?	Working with words and pictures

[1] Indicates prompt questions to be asked during a sharing circle at a follow-up camp (participants have already attended one or more camps with Project Jewel).

compared to their expectations of the program to enable opportunities for rich critique with words.

Guides for the sharing circle and photovoice prompt questions are given in Table 3. Like the semi-structured interview guides, these guides were designed to promote the themes of a culturally safe evaluation framework for Project Jewel. Photovoice should be introduced and described at the beginning of a camp, when cameras are distributed to participants, and one-on-one photovoice interviews should be conducted at the end of the camp. Sharing circles should also occur at the end of a Project Jewel camp. Specifically, we recommend that themes of this new evaluation framework for Project Jewel should be conducted by a staff member designated to program evaluation who attends Project Jewel camps.

Evaluation Dry Run, Reindeer Station, March 2019: Five previous Project Jewel participants (one male, four females) attended a three-day camp held at Reindeer Station and participated in semi-structured interviews and photovoice (a sharing circle was planned but not completed). Initially, seven participants expressed interest in attending the camp, however, two participants from Inuvik were unable to attend. Like the first camp at Reindeer Station discussed above, participants understood that this camp was held for the purposes of the research, but would also include programming. Ruttan, Ollier, and Giles represented the research advisory team, and Day represented the community advisory board at this final camp, and two female Elders, one from Inuvik and another from Uluhaktok, were included for cultural support of

participants. Prior to the camp, Ruttan, Ollier, Giles, and Day practiced implementing the evaluation with iPads that we had purchased for this purpose. Despite our successful practice, during the interviews, we found that the audio recording-transcription feature on the iPad was not reliable. The iPad seemed to have difficulty understanding local accents and some individuals' use of non-standard sentence structure. We thus disabled the transcription feature and decided that transcription would have to occur post-camp. We also were unable to conduct a sharing circle at the end of the program because of the unfortunately timed onset of stomach virus in members of the community advisory board and research advisory team and a desire to limit its spread amongst participants and Elders. We learned from the dry run that future staff in charge of evaluation should practice using the iPad until they are comfortable, and that extra time must be allocated post-camp to transcribe the interviews before they can be analyzed. Overall, the dry run reinforced our research findings. Participants responded with positive feedback to the semi-structured interview guide and photovoice method to evaluate the camp. The research team and community advisory board felt affirmed that our new evaluation framework for Project Jewel better promoted cultural safety.

CONCLUSIONS

The research presented in this paper addressed a need to learn how to better evaluate the IRC's land-based program, Project Jewel. In doing so, this research also addressed a research priority of the GNWT, which was to provide more knowledge about the evaluation of land-based programs throughout the territory. To better understand the effectiveness and benefits of a land-based program for Inuvialuit, it is important to create an evaluation framework that reflects Inuvialuit culture and values to enhance the likelihood that participants will experience the evaluation as culturally safe.

We identified four themes that promoted a more culturally safe evaluation framework for Project Jewel: centring the land, building relationships, using words and pictures rather than numbers, and promoting benefits over harms through aftercare. Based upon these themes, we created a refined evaluation framework for Project Jewel, which we were able to pilot at the end of the research process. This research allowed the Project Jewel staff to evaluate its programs in a way that reflects Inuvialuit values and could serve as a template for future on-the-land program evaluation.

Our research demonstrates that Inuvialuit approaches to evaluation are grounded in the land, relationality, and oral culture. We learned through this research that, put simply, context is everything; those who seek to understand, and subsequently evaluate, land-based programs need to contextualize their approach within the cultural practices and values of the community or communities the program

serves. In this regard, while we reported on an evaluation framework developed for Project Jewel and believe it can be used as an example of CBR and a resource for similar land-based programs, we implore other programs and future evaluators to consider it only as a template to inform their approach to evaluating land-based programs. Future research should continue to examine approaches to the evaluation of land-based programs that are contextualized within the cultures and lands of other communities throughout Inuit Nunangat to further support, develop, and evaluate these programs.

REFERENCES

Alunik, I., Kolausok, E., and Morrison, D. 2003. Across time and tundra: The Inuvialuit of the western Arctic. Gatineau, Quebec: Canadian Museum of History.

American Evaluation Association. 2011. Public statement on cultural competence in evaluation.
https://www.eval.org/ccstatement

Anderson, C., Chase, M., Johnson, J., III, Mekiana, D., McIntyre, D., Ruerup, A., and Kerr, S. 2012. It is only new because it has been missing for so long: Indigenous evaluation capacity building. American Journal of Evaluation 33(4):566–582.
https://doi.org/10.1177/1098214012449686

Ballantyne, E.F. 2014. Dechinta Bush University: Mobilizing a knowledge economy of reciprocity, resurgence and decolonization. Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society 3(3):67–85.

Battiste, M.A. 2000. Reclaiming Indigenous voice and vision. Vancouver, British Columbia: UBC Press.

Berg, B.L. 1995. Qualitative research methods for the social sciences, 2nd ed. Boston, Massachusetts: Allyn & Bacon.

Bin-Sallik, M. 2003. Cultural safety: Let's name it! The Australian Journal of Indigenous Education 32:21–28.
https://doi.org/10.1017/S1326011100003793

Braun, V., and Clarke, V. 2006. Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qualitative Research in Psychology 3(2):77–101.
https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Cavino, H.M. 2013. Across the colonial divide: Conversations about evaluation in Indigenous contexts. American Journal of Evaluation 34(3):339–355.
https://doi.org/10.1177/1098214013489338

Cram, F. 1997. Developing partnerships in research: Māori research and Pākehā researchers. Sites 35(1):44–63.

First Nations Information Governance Centre. 2014. Ownership, control, access and possession (OCAP™): The path to First Nations information governance.
https://fnigc.ca/sites/default/files/docs/ocap_path_to_fn_information_governance_en_final.pdf

Gerlach, A. 2007. Steps in the right direction: Connecting and collaborating in early intervention therapy with Aboriginal families and communities in British Columbia. Vancouver, Canada: BC Aboriginal Child Care Society. https://www.acc-society.bc.ca/resource/steps-in-the-right-direction-connecting-collaborating-in-early-intervention-therapy-with-aboriginal-families-communities-in-british-columbia-by-a-lison-gerlach-for-bc-aboriginal-child-car/

Government of the Northwest Territories. 2016–17. Health and social sciences research agenda. Improving health, care, and sustainability through innovation: A road map for wellness research in the NWT.
https://www.hss.gov.nt.ca/sites/hss/files/resources/gnwt-health-and-social-services-research-agenda.pdf

Gready, P. 2008. The public life of narratives: Ethics, politics, methods. In: Andrews, M., Squire, C., and Tomboukou, M., eds. Doing narrative research, 1st ed. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage. 137–150.
https://doi.org/10.4135/9780857024992.d10

ITK (Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami). 2018. National Inuit strategy on research.
https://www.itk.ca/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/National-Inuit-Strategy-on-Research.pdf

Israel, B.A., Schulz, A.J., Parker, E.A., and Becker, A.B. 1998. Review of community-based research: Assessing partnership approaches to improve public health. Annual Review of Public Health 19(1):173–202.
https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.publhealth.19.1.173

Johnston-Goodstar, K. 2012. Decolonizing evaluation: The necessity of evaluation advisory groups in Indigenous evaluation. New Directions for Evaluation 2012(136):109–117.
https://doi.org/10.1002/ev.20038

Kahakalau, K. 2004. Indigenous heuristic action research: Bridging western and Indigenous research methodologies. Hūlili: Multidisciplinary Research on Hawaiian Well-Being 1(1):19–33.

Karetak, J., Tester, F., and Tagalik, S., eds. 2017. Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit: What Inuit have always known to be true. Halifax, Nova Scotia: Fernwood Publishing.

Kawakami, A.J., Aton, K., Cram, F., Lai, M.K., and Porima, L. 2007. Improving the practice of evaluation through Indigenous values and methods: Decolonizing evaluation practice—returning the gaze from Hawai'i and Aotearoa. Hūlili: Multidisciplinary Research on Hawaiian Well-Being 4(1):319–348.

Kovach, M. 2009. Indigenous methodologies: Characteristics, conversations, and contexts. Toronto, Ontario: University of Toronto Press.

LaFrance, J., and Nichols, R. 2010. Reframing evaluation: Defining an Indigenous evaluation framework. The Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation 23(2):13–31.

LaFrance, J., Nichols, R., and Kirkhart, K.E. 2012. Culture writes the script: On the centrality of context in Indigenous evaluation. New Directions for Evaluation 2012(135):59–74.
https://doi.org/10.1002/ev.20027

Lavallée, L.F. 2009. Practical application of an Indigenous research framework and two qualitative Indigenous research methods: Sharing circles and Anishinaabe symbol-based reflection. International Journal of Qualitative Methods 8(1):21–40.
https://doi.org/10.1177/160940690900800103

Martin, K. 2009. "Are we also here for that?": Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit – Traditional knowledge, or critical theory? The Canadian Journal of Native Studies 29(1/2):183–202.

National Collaborating Centre for Aboriginal Health. 2013. Cultural safety in First Nations, Inuit, and Métis public health: Environmental scan of cultural competency and safety in education, training and health services.
https://www.nccih.ca/495/Cultural_Safety_in_First_Nations,_Inuit_and_M%C3%A9tis_Public_Health.nccih?id=88

NWT On the Land Collaborative. 2018. 2018 Report.
http://www.nwtontheland.ca/uploads/8/6/5/1/86514372/final_collaborative_final_report_2018.pdf

Parker, A., and Tritter, J. 2006. Focus group method and methodology: Current practice and recent debate. International Journal of Research & Method in Education 29(1):23–37.
https://doi.org/10.1080/01406720500537304

Redvers, J. 2016. Land-based practice for Indigenous health and wellness in Yukon, Nunavut, and the Northwest Territories. MA thesis, University of Calgary, Calgary, Alberta.

Rowe, A. 2019. Sustainability-ready evaluation: A call to action. New Directions in Evaluation 2019(162):29–48.
https://doi.org/10.1002/ev.20365

Smith, L.T. 1999. Decolonizing methodologies: Research and Indigenous peoples. New York: Palgrave.

Spencer, L., Ritchie, J., Lewis, J., and Dillon, L. 2003. Quality in qualitative evaluation: A framework for assessing evidence. London: Cabinet Office.

Walter, M., and Anderson, C. 2013. Indigenous statistics: A quantitative research methodology. Walnut Creek, California: Left Coast Press.

Wang, C., and Burris, M.A. 1997. Photovoice: Concept, methodology, and use for participatory needs assessment. Health Education & Behaviour 24(3):369–387.
https://doi.org/10.1177/109019819702400309

Wildcat, M., McDonald, M., Irlbacher-Fox, S., and Coulthard, G. 2014. Learning from the land: Indigenous land-based pedagogy and decolonization. Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society 3(3):I–XV.

Williams, R. 1999. Cultural safety – what does it mean for our work practice? Australian and New Zealand Journal of Public Health 23(2):213–214.
https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-842X.1999.tb01240.x