

**Innu Child Youth and Family Services Committee Meeting
October 22, 2010**

Participants

Kimberley Mitchell – Province of NL (CYFS)
Jennifer Jeans – Province of NL (CYFS)
Taracetta Butt – Province of NL (AA)
Mary Jane Nui – SIFN
Gregory Pastitshi – SIFN
Bernard Green – MIFN
Antuan Jacobich – MIFN
Stella Rich – SIFN
Donna Paddon – Innu Main Table
Lyla Andrew – Labrador Grenfell Health
Jack Penashue - Co-Chair (Innu)
Barbara Robinson – Co-Chair (INAC)
Steve Joudry – (HC/INAC)
John Higham – Chignecto Consulting

Context

Following the August 11th / 12th Main Table meeting, a meeting of the Child Youth and Family Services (CYFS) committee was held to discuss the history, mandate, and work objectives of the committee. While no formal minutes of the previous meeting were available, products developed by the committee (including the June 2010 version of the work plan and a 2007 version of the committee's Terms of Reference) were circulated.

Jack explained that the committee has struggled to coordinate meetings and ensure that there was a quorum. Barbara noted that INAC is willing to undertake responsibility for secretariat type services (including coordinating meetings and taking minutes), and proposed that Marilyn Winsor, Junior Intergovernmental Officer for NL, sit on the committee to fulfill this role. Committee members agreed.

John provided an overview of the history of the committee, and of child youth and family services delivery in the Innu communities more generally. There was some discussion on the broader history of the Main Table, and of the service delivery model currently in place. John noted that the Innu have determined that the CFS program should devolve directly under an enhanced prevention service delivery model, with a view to bringing the program under a self-government agreement in the longer term. The Innu have no desire to devolve the program under Directive 20-1. While progress over the last two years has stalled

somewhat due to the Main Table's focus on the devolution of Education, it was confirmed following the recent elections that Innu leaders have identified CYFS as a key priority and have indicated that they wish to see progress made on CYFS devolution.

In discussing the current service delivery model (federal funding / provincial jurisdiction / local delivery) Bernard asked whether or not there are any other jurisdictions where First Nations have taken over jurisdictional responsibility from the province. Barbara and Jennifer both explained that CYFS is a provincial jurisdiction, and that while the program delivery can be devolved the legislative and jurisdictional responsibility cannot.

Jennifer noted that the EPFA model is just a costing model, but the committee needs to identify what the service delivery model looks like (particularly within the broader context of the province's pending structural changes). Barbara agreed that the service delivery model must be clearly identified prior to going forward to Treasury Board with a submission for Enhanced Prevention, as a business plan and framework agreement must be in place. She further explained that the timelines in the existing work plan are not realistic, as the deadline for fall 2010 submissions has already passed. The earliest date for implementation of an Enhanced Prevention Focussed Approach would be April 2012, assuming that an approved framework agreement and all other supporting documents were in place in time for a fall 2011 Treasury Board submission. A discussion ensued about whether or not it would be necessary to go to Treasury Board if the existing funding in the A-Base for CYFS was sufficient to cover the cost of the service delivery model proposed, and Barbara stated that she will pose this question to HQ as it has not come up in any other jurisdiction.

The committee discussed the best way to move forward with developing a service delivery structure. It was decided that it would be helpful to review EPFA framework agreements from other jurisdictions, as well as passages relating to the treatment of CYFS services in the self-government agreements for self-governing First Nations. Barbara agreed to take the lead on gathering this information for the committee's review.

Jennifer Jeans delivered a presentation on the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador's (NL) new line department for CYFS. The model will include more social work assistants, more social workers, more clinical supervisors, and smaller caseloads, helping the Department ensure that front line staff have the tools they need. The number of Directors will increase from 5 to 13, with a total of 3 Directors in Labrador. The province's service delivery model will be adjusted to deal with Labrador and aboriginal issues, and it does not have to look the same in Labrador as it does in the rest of the province. A steering committee has been established to transition to the new line department, and a meeting has been set for November 10th, 2010. Jack expressed some concern that this invitation was

addressed to the Grand Chief, and should have been addressed to the Chiefs of both Innu Communities.

There was some discussion of whether or not undergoing two transitions is duplication, but as devolution under enhanced prevention could not occur until at least 2012 it will be necessary to transition under the new provincial model first. The transition will be a staged transition, first to the provincial line department then to an enhanced prevention model, and over time to a self-government agreement.

It was determined that the Transition Coordinator position is of key importance to this work, and Jack noted that efforts are underway to replace the previous Transition Coordinator. There was also discussion about whether it made sense to hire a person with a social work background (who would be qualified to become the new Director of a devolved Innu agency) or to hire someone with the project management skills needed to move the work forward. Ultimately, it was decided that the first step would be to clearly identify the work that needs to be done, as it was acknowledged that the work plan should be revisited.

After a brainstorming session, the key work areas that must be reflected in an updated work plan were identified as:

1. Research into existing Enhanced Prevention framework agreements and a survey of self-government agreements' treatment of CFS
2. Engagement / Communications at the community level
3. Development of a service delivery model for CYFS
4. Financial costing exercise to determine the base budget of the new agency
5. Finalize the organizational structure
6. Prepare for the transition to the devolved agency.

The committee decided that a smaller working group would be tasked with fleshing out the work items and developing a draft of an updated work plan to bring back to the committee prior to its next meeting. Committee membership was to include Barbara, Stella, Antuan (subsequent withdrawal from committee), Kimberley, Lyla and John. Barbara agreed to organize a conference call for an initial discussion of the committee's next steps, with the understanding that an in person meeting might be required for the actual drafting work.

Jack asked about an ongoing commitment to fund the transition coordinator position, as it is difficult to recruit and retain a qualified professional when a six month contract is all that can be offered. Barbara replied that there are a variety of ongoing functions that could potentially be built into the new enhanced prevention model, and that part of the committee's work will be to identify the unique functions that are required in the context of Labrador.

Finally, the upcoming Main Table meeting Nov 3rd/4th was discussed, and it was agreed that the Co-Chairs would provide an update on the outcome of the meeting and seek endorsement to move forward with updating the work plan.