



## **CES WORKING GROUP**

MAY , 2023

**Prepared By: Fluid Consulting**

## Table of Contents

Introduction .....	3
Background .....	4
Focus Group Structure .....	4
Open Discussion Insights .....	5
Activity Insights .....	8
Activity 1 .....	8
Activity 2 .....	10
Activity 3 .....	11
Appendix A.....	12
Focus Group Handout & Worksheets.....	12

## Introduction

Community Engagement (CE) is an important part of how we shape the future of the Six Nations of the Grand River (SNGR). The Community Engagement process is how we gather opinions on what projects, products and services should be developed for the Community.

The purpose of a Community Engagement Standards (CES) and Guide is to help departments, businesses and partners understand what must be done, and how, in order to work with the Community.

As part of the CES project, focus groups were conducted with Six Nations community members and organizational representatives that are experienced in the design, implementation and management of community engagement. In total, 20 community members participated in focus groups between April – May 2023.

Participants reviewed and provided insight on the findings of the Interviews from February and March, undertook general discussions regarding the Rights and Responsibilities of parties involved in Community Engagement and how that concept is defined at SNGR. This report provides a summary of key insights from those activities, with summary of discussions found in the Appendix. The full data set can be made available upon request.

The information collected during the Focus Groups will provide insight to both the engagement undertaken for the CES project, as well as the Standards and Guide that result from the project. Should you have any questions regarding this report, the CES project or community engagement in general please visit [www.SNfuture.com](http://www.SNfuture.com) or contact the individuals below.

Taylor Hill  
CES Working Group Chair  
taylor.hill@sixnations.ca

Tabitha Curley  
CES Engagement Lead  
tabitha@fluidconnects.ca

## Background

Focus Groups were planned and promoted during April and May 2023. Two sessions invited community organizations to attend daytime focus groups and two additional sessions invited community members to join the discussion in the evenings. A total of 22 individuals participated; 18 attended the organizational sessions and 4 community members attended Community sessions.

Staff/volunteers/board members from the following community organizations were in attendance:

- Anti-Bullying Taskforce
- CKRZ Radio
- Ganohkwasra
- Kayanase
- Six Nations Cannabis Commission
- Six Nations Cannabis Coalition
- Six Nations Election Review Committee
- Six Nations Home & Community Care
- Six Nations Mental Health / Addictions
- Six Nations Public Library
- Six Nations of the Grand River Development Corporation (SNGRDC)
- Two Rivers Community Development Centre
- Ogwehoweh Skill Trades Training Centre (OSTTC)

## Focus Group Structure

Focus Group participants were provided with handouts which included 1) a printed PowerPoint providing an overview of the Community Engagement Standards engagement 2) a summary of a selection of questions and responses from the Individual Interviews portion of the CES Engagement and 3) Activity Sheets 1-3; these sheets framed the conversation while also providing participants with a non-verbal method to submit their comments. Not all participants completed and returned the sheets, some choose to only provide verbal comments which were scribed by a notetaker. The Focus Group package is available in Appendix A.

**CES Overview** the moderator, Tabitha Curley, walked the participants through the CES engagement purpose, objectives, communication strategy and general project information. Binders with all reports to date were available in printed form and links were posted to [www.snfuture.com](http://www.snfuture.com) where these reports are available to the public.

**Summary of Individual Interviews** were used to frame the open discussion. The moderator walked participants through the key findings of a selection of questions targeted to the audience group. The notetaker recorded the discussion had amongst participants. Participants were also invited to record their insights on the Activity One Worksheet if they chose to.

- **Activity One** invited organizational representatives and community members were asked to review and discuss the data obtained through the Individual Interview phase of the engagement. This activity was to help frame the conversation and seek additional insight.
- **Activity Two** invited participants to draft the wording for *An Agreement to Work Together with a Good Mind* statement. This chart outlines rights and responsibilities of individuals, organizations and political bodies when conducting or participating in community engagement. This activity is intended as a tool to create a positive environment for community engagement and will be available in the Community Engagement Standards Toolkit draft for further discussion.
- **Activity Three** asked participants to help define community engagement for Six Nations of the Grand River. This definition will be used in the Community Engagement Standards Guide.

## Open Discussion Insights

Focus Group participants provided general insights across all material presented during the session(s). The following section provides a summary of the key insights captured from the group discussion held at each Focus Group. *Open Discussion Insights* and *Activity Insight* should be read together as not all participants are comfortable speaking out and chose to submit their comments using the worksheets rather than communicating them in the open discussion. Insight gathered from the Focus Groups will help to inform the development of the Draft Community Engagement Standards Guide and Toolkits.

### April 21, 2023 – Organizational Session

- All participants stated they would use the community engagement standards guide once it was developed and that their organization is looking to engage the Six Nations Community.
- All agreed that best practices need to be shared amongst organizations; learning has never been centralized.
- Current Community Engagement models amount to a “shot in the dark” and many organizations are unsure of what they should be doing, how to do it properly and the resources it takes to conduct or the resources/data available to them (i.e., number of households for a mailout, number of band members living on-reserve to off etc.).
- The loudest 10-20% of voices are normally heard versus the silent majority.
- Empowerment is key to participation.
- Participants discussed if the CES Standards and Guide will apply to only SNGREC related projects/programs, or will private business have to conform as well; how could it be enforced.
- Project relevancy – people only engage when they are impacted.
- Need sample that is representative of all demographics of Band list.
- Community engagement has no way to confirm that attendees are registered community members; discussed methods other organizations use and the definition of a community member (i.e., non-band member who lives or participates in our community).
- People who work at Council are the only ones that are in “the know,” and that seems to stop once you are no longer employed there; stated that the best way to receive information is from the email campaigns Council sends out to all staff.

- Documents need to be shortened and summarized, with use audio/visual or social media to support; should also have a link to where the full document is.
- Do not have time to read a 200-page document – give an executive summary of the engagement; guide should include standardized questions that need to be answered for each section of the executive summary.
- Community is sometimes used as a political tool; they want us to fight amongst ourselves. Need to work together. Inaction is an action.
- Historical information needs to be reviewed more often; need to include what has been done or not done in the past. Need updates on past engagements and where to find the final reports.
- Transparency is very important in engagement and community relations.
- Need a conflict resolution process.
- Process to store this historical knowledge in a centralized place – people are not aware of what was done in the past; do not always hear the results of the discussion or know where to access the results or the process others have used.

#### **April 26, 2023 - Organizational Session**

- Sample size comparisons to municipalities or regions is difficult because those demographics are dynamic and SNGR is restricted to Band list; people move in and out of those communities and Six Nations are more invested in the long-term future of community.
- Strong belief amongst community that engagement does not impact decisions and council will do what they want regardless.
- Shared a need for a template for community engagement so staff can present an informed plan for engagement.
- Concerns about pockets of funding that may go unused because the organization need to engage the community on what they want to see but are unsure of how to engage them; It seems like there is general fear or hesitancy to engage the community at all levels; fear of potential lateral violence towards staff.
- People like the convenience of email campaigns, increase with incentives and timing (i.e., receiving at work). Suggested emails or handouts are provided through non-council workplaces as well.
- Constant communication and updates are needed – quarterly or semi-annual reporting on all ongoing projects and programs.
- The rights and powers of community members are at least equal to or greater than that of SNGREC.
- Radio and newspaper are decreasing in audience.
- Silence often means Yes.
- It is more effective to engage where people are – events, at work, family occasions, etc.
- Need symposium to discuss larger and more complex issues like environment, health, and housing to explain where we are, what we need, and to bring together people who can discuss options for the community (i.e., what to do about water, sewage, drainage, housing, types of testing available, costs etc.)

### **April 26, 2023 - Community Session**

- Historical divisions in community create difficulty in engaging; people afraid to pick a side even if they agree with one or the other – opinions may affect job, personal relationships, etc.
- Concerns with the legitimacy of HCCC; not all seats filled. They should only be concerned with issues that impact all nations under the confederacy, not just what is happening at Six Nations.
- There is a lack of knowledge and trust with both SNGREC and HCCC.
- Not everyone knows what Council or Confederacy are doing and they need to get better at telling people and giving updates.
- A need for a centralized hub of information, both physical and digital.
- Any complaints or appeals process needs to be a non-partisan function or department.
- Opportunity to create standardized engagement packages for community groups conducting engagement – “pick and play” marketing and communications.

### **May 3, 2023**

- Concerns with lateral violence for engagement staff and community members.
- Political divide in community creates barriers to engagement.
- There is a fear that voicing opinions in public will have repercussions in personal lives.
- Many people suffer from a lack of belonging in the community – stuck between traditional and elected governance bodies.
- A lot of engagement is viewed as pointless as SNGREC and organizations will proceed as they originally planned, regardless of community input.
- There are a lack of regulations and bylaws that may hinder the CES Standards and Guide being implemented.
- The amount of engagement that has taken place within the community has caused apathy toward activities.
- In-person activities are the most effective, especially when undertaken as a dinner event with incentives.
- The engagement process must ensure that people can remain anonymous.
- There are barriers created by a lack of digital literacy and access.
- The traditional structure has broken-down, lacking transparency and contact information.
- A degree of hypocrisy exists within the community (i.e., stewards of the land but public areas are full of litter).
- Strong concerns about media presence, especially being quoted or photographed without permission when attending as a community member.
- Engagement activities and participation are impacted by a lack of safe spaces; bullying and lateral violence are major concerns for engagement staff and community members.

## Activity Insights

The following section provides a summary of the Worksheets submitted for each Activity that was undertaken by the Focus Group participants.

### Activity 1

The First Activity ask participants to provide their comments on a selection of individual interviews. Participants were provided with excerpts from the [Individual Interviews- What We Heard Report](#) to guide the discussion. Below is a summary of the submitted written comments. Blank worksheets for each session are available in Appendix A.

Question	Summary Comments
<b>What are the most common issues that are brought up during community engagement?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The need for ongoing engagement;</li> <li>• Concerns with authority and governance;</li> <li>• Housing, land and illegal dumping;</li> </ul>
<b>Why do you think some community members do not participate in community engagement?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of time;</li> <li>• Issues with employees;</li> <li>• Media and representation concerns;</li> <li>• Lack of transparency;</li> <li>• Lack of safe spaces;</li> <li>• Fear of lateral violence;</li> </ul>
<b>In your experience, what methods of community engagement are effective?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Face-to-Face;</li> <li>• Social Media;</li> <li>• Briefing Note(s);</li> <li>• Audio/Visual materials;</li> <li>• Interactive engagement;</li> <li>• Digital communication;</li> <li>• Incentives;</li> <li>• Door-to-door seen as unsafe;</li> <li>• Central kiosk/pop-up information;</li> <li>• Print media is standard;</li> <li>• Use existing programs – i.e., “Compelling Conversations” on CKRZ radio</li> <li>• Word-of-Mouth;</li> <li>• Email campaigns from organizations/departments;</li> </ul>
<b>What does successful community engagement look like at Six Nations? How can it be measured?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Over 50 people at engagement activities;</li> <li>• No anger/outbursts;</li> <li>• Safe space(s) for discussion;</li> <li>• Mindfulness activities;</li> </ul>
<b>What is an appropriate community sample size?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5% or under 1000 people;</li> <li>• 100-2000 people;</li> <li>• 51% of population;</li> <li>• Balance of on and off reserve;</li> <li>• 75%;</li> <li>• Range from youth to elder;</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project dependent;</li> <li>• 2/3 of voting-age population;</li> <li>• Attempt to engage 1000-2000 people;</li> </ul>
<b>How many days should community engagement last?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• On-going over 1 year;</li> <li>• One month;</li> <li>• 5-10 days of focused engagement;</li> <li>• 90 days for large projects;</li> <li>• 2 months – 3 months is too long;</li> <li>• 21 days;</li> <li>• 90 days;</li> <li>• 3-5 months, and 4-6 engagement activities;</li> </ul>
<b>Should community engagement have an appeal process?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes, but may stall projects;</li> <li>• Needs a non-biased jury;</li> <li>• Existing SNGREC process(es);</li> <li>• Should be part of project process;</li> <li>• Majority against appeal process;</li> <li>• Not appeal, but extended review and comment period;</li> <li>• Yes, it is a necessity;</li> <li>• Neutral body;</li> <li>• No, that is what engagement is for;</li> <li>• Complaint process, not appeals;</li> </ul>
<b>If yes, what could this appeal process look like and who should be responsible for receiving and reviewing appeals?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Case-by-case;</li> <li>• Mix of SNGREC and HCCC;</li> <li>• Dedicated department/staff;</li> <li>• Needs community support (1000 signatures, etc.);</li> <li>• Outside parties;</li> <li>• Non-band Council/HCCC;</li> <li>• Appeals run risk of being used as delay tactic;</li> <li>• Appeal board of volunteers;</li> <li>• Non-political/remove conflict of interest;</li> <li>• Needs pre-determined outcomes;</li> <li>• Appeals committee;</li> <li>• Step-by-step process;</li> </ul>
<b>Additional Comments</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tap into people that care;</li> <li>• Humanize engagement process and staff;</li> <li>• SNGREC and HCCC should provide equal funding;</li> <li>• Needs 2-3 staff;</li> <li>• Accountability/transparency;</li> <li>• Non-political</li> <li>• Must reach youth – QR codes and social media;</li> <li>• History of engagement has caused trust and safety concerns;</li> <li>• Projects and programs must give back to community;</li> <li>• Alcohol and drug-free activities – must be enforced;</li> <li>• Hire security and mental health moderators;</li> </ul>

## Activity 2

The second activity that Focus Group participants undertook was to craft concepts and wording for a tool to combat the toxic – and at times, abusive – environments that can occur during Community Engagement. In discussing the Rights and Responsibilities of the main parties involved in Community Engagement the aim is to create a community agreement on Good Mind practices. The table below summarizes those insights:

<b>Community Engagement – Rights and Responsibilities</b>			
<b>Factor</b>	<b>Community</b>	<b>Org. Conducting Engagement</b>	<b>Political Bodies</b>
<b>Rights</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To transparency and honesty;</li> <li>• To information and education;</li> <li>• To freedom of speech and protest;</li> <li>• To safety;</li> <li>• To confidentiality;</li> <li>• To be heard;</li> <li>• To be treated with respect;</li> <li>• To receive feedback in a timely manner;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To protection and safety;</li> <li>• To respect;</li> <li>• To engage community;</li> <li>• To be free of verbal/physical abuse;</li> <li>• To be heard;</li> <li>• To be treated with dignity and respect;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To provide information to community;</li> <li>• To be safe;</li> <li>• To be free of verbal/physical abuse;</li> </ul>
<b>Responsibilities</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To educate oneself;</li> <li>• To be respectful;</li> <li>• To protect youth, elders and the environment;</li> <li>• To be honest;</li> <li>• To participate;</li> <li>• To be kind;</li> <li>• To voice opinions;</li> <li>• To treat others with dignity and respect;</li> <li>• To not interrupt people;</li> <li>• To facilitate a safe space;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To let the community provide concerns;</li> <li>• To provide education;</li> <li>• To communicate clearly;</li> <li>• To create safe spaces;</li> <li>• To be respectful;</li> <li>• To provide notice;</li> <li>• To manage activities;</li> <li>• To have conflict resolution process(es);</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To be transparent;</li> <li>• To enforce guidelines;</li> <li>• To keep people informed;</li> <li>• To listen and act upon concerns;</li> <li>• To be present when needed;</li> <li>• To be non-partisan;</li> <li>• To act in the best interest of the whole community;</li> <li>• To be positive about other political bodies;</li> </ul>
<b>Additional Comments</b>	Some people are afraid to stand up for their rights. No one questions others and would rather just avoid conflict. The CES Project is a needed endeavour.		

### Activity 3

The last activity involved Focus Group Participants providing insights on the draft Community Engagement. That definition and a summary of comments is provided below:

Working definition:

*“Community Engagement helps shape our Community. It is a process for gathering opinions and insights on what projects, products and services should be developed. The process involves building community relationships (collaboration), fostering respectful dialogue (good mind), promoting environmentalism (stewardship) and increasing public participation (feedback) to achieve the greatest good for today and the faces yet to come.”*

Comments included:

- Good definition!
- I believe community engagement does shape a community as it builds trusting relationships with one another, and communication is open and effective. Everyone has a chance to know what is going on and opinions can even be inputted by community members. It also allows for proper feedback, so community members have something to grow from.
- This definition is great - love the last part.
- Add "it demonstrates our commitment to hearing the community voices."
- No issues with definition.
- Sounds good.
- It is a process of taking a community issue back to the community for the purpose of gathering opinions and insights.

## Appendix A

### Focus Group Handout & Worksheets



## **CES FOCUS GROUP**

April 21 & 26, 2023  
Organizational Sessions


April 26 & May 3, 2023  
Community Sessions

**Prepared By: Fluid Consulting**

# Community Engagement Standards

## Focus Group – Daytime Session

- 11:00 Welcome
- 11:05 PowerPoint Presentation – overview of the project and explain how each portion of the engagement feeds the next.
- 11:15 Review Focus Group Questions
- Questions 3: Most effective methods of Community Engagement.
  - Question 6: What does successful community engagement look like at Six Nations? How can it be measured?
  - Question 11: What is an appropriate community sample size?
  - Question 12: How many days should community engagement last?
  - Question 14: Should community engagement have an appeal process?
- 11:30 Break for lunch.
- 11:45 Review responses to focus group questions from the Individual Interview Summary Report
- Facilitator to review while participants eat. Full report included in participant package.
- 12:00 Engagement Activity One – Brainstorm Session
- Respondents use sticky notes or coloured dots to agree with comment and provide additional commentary. Participants will also be provided with a worksheet option.
- 12:20 Engagement Activity Two – Mutual Agreement to Participate with a Good Mind
- Brainstorm wording for Mutual Agreement of a Good Mind – prompt draft community engagement definition
- 1:00 Engagement Concludes
- Participants are entered into the Grand Prize draw.
  - All participants are also encouraged to complete the Community Survey in the next portion of the engagement.



## Community Engagement Standards

Focus Groups Sessions  
 April 21, 2023 | 11-1 PM  
 April 26, 2023 | 11-1 PM  
 April 26, 2023 | 6-8 PM  
 May 3, 2023 | 6-8 PM

1

## Background


- Fluid Consulting has been retained by Six Nations of the Grand River Elected Council to develop a set of community engagement standards for Six Nations of the Grand River. These standards will be piloted for an undetermined time period starting in the Fall of 2023.
- The standards will be accompanied by a How To Engage Guide for community members/staff and potential partners to have a clear and predictable process to undertake community engagement on SN.
- An initial scoping workshop was held in April 2022 with 4 collaborator groups, both the SNGRDC BOD and AC participated in these focus groups.

2

## Who is CES?

The CES Working Group is a collection of SNGR Community Members experienced in community matters, operations, and engagement. The Group's purpose is to review, guide, and provide input on a proposed Community Engagement Standards Guide and Strategic Workplan.

Trevor Bomberly  
 Taylor Hill  
 Sara Curley-Smith  
 Sherri-Lynn Hill  
 Carl Hill  
 Zach Miller  
 Serena Mendizabal  
 Rachel Martin  
 Cultural Rep-TBA



3

## Why Community Engagement?

A formal and embraced process outlining community engagement standards on Six Nations of the Grand River does not exist.

In the absence of a common language, community organizations and departments have set individual methodologies for each engagement based on best practices and learned insight.

Proven difficult to conduct planning for capital expenditures and execute on new development projects.

Learnings and best practices have yet to be centralized; this engagement seeks to gather these insights into a formal process.

4

## How and When

- The CES Working Group will use a multilayered approach to:
  - Engage Key Stakeholders through individual interviews
  - Seek feedback from community members through guided discussions and focus groups
  - Survey the community using online and in-person survey methods.
  - Commentary periods for community members to submit comments on the Draft and Revised form of CES Standards Guide.
- Community-facing engagement April – August 2023 (3 months of engagement activities)
- Seek to have the CES Standards Guide approved by SNGREC for piloting in August 2023, prior to call for election.
- Piloting to begin in Fall 2023. Through this engagement we are seeking to determine how long this should be piloted for.

5

## What We Heard Report - Individual Interviews

- Invited 20 community members with extensive experience in Community Engagement to provide insight on 20 initial questions.

- 16 members participated in the process.
- Individual interviews were intended to crowd source initial engagement materials and inform subsequent engagement materials

6

## Learn More

- Engagement information will be stored on the [www.snfuture.com/projects/ces-sngr/](http://www.snfuture.com/projects/ces-sngr/) website as a matter of historical record.
- Each level of engagement will be accompanied by a summary report that will be posted to SNFUTURE
- Quick access to engagement materials <https://linktr.ee/sixnationsces> QR Code

7

## Communication Strategies

- **ONLINE:** SNFUTURE website, create a linktree and QR code, utilize SNFUTURE Mailchimp
- **PRINTED COLLATERAL:** Poster with tear away displayed in public spaces, posters sent via email campaigns, mailout campaign.
- **VIDEO:** Develop a series of short videos explaining the engagement process and encouraging people to participate.
- **SOCIAL MEDIA:** Create social media images and post copy for various stages of the engagement.
- **RADIO:** Advertisements during bingo periods with radio show hosted once CES draft is released.
- **NEWSPAPER:** Half page ad to announce each engagement period with weekly classified ads.
- **PARTICIPATE:** Offer incentives for participating. Participants to receive a \$10 gift card (which they can choose to donate) and a ballot into a Grand Prize (\$500).
- **SURVEYORS:** Will attend community booths throughout survey period to encourage individuals to complete surveys

8

## Focus Group Activity #1

You have a worksheet and sticky notes in front of you. Please add additional insights and commentary to 7 focus group questions.

Alternatively, we will review each question individually and you can provide verbal commentary which will be scribed for you.

17

## Focus Group Activity #2

Complete the chart to help draft Rights and Responsibilities for using our Good Minds during community engagement.

	COMMUNITY MEMBERS	ORGANIZATION CONDUCTING CE	POLITICAL BODIES
Rights			
Responsibilities			

18

## Focus Group Activity #3

Review the Community Engagement Definition and make any desired suggestions

Draft Community Engagement Definition

Community Engagement helps shape our Community. It is a process for gathering opinions and insights on what projects, products and services should be developed. The process involves building community relationships (collaboration), fostering respectful dialogue (good mind), promoting environmentalism (stewardship) and increasing public participation (feedback) to achieve the greatest good for today and the faces yet to come.

19

### IAP2 Spectrum of Public Participation



IAP2's Spectrum of Public Participation was designed to assist with the selection of the level of participation that defines the public's role in any public participation process. The Spectrum is used internationally, and it is found in public participation plans around the world.

		INCREASING IMPACT ON THE DECISION				
		INFORM	CONSULT	INVOLVE	COLLABORATE	EMPOWER
PUBLIC PARTICIPATION GOAL		To provide the public with balanced and objective information to assist them in understanding the problem, alternatives, opportunities and/or solutions.	To obtain public feedback on analysis, alternatives and/or decisions.	To work directly with the public throughout the process to ensure that public concerns and aspirations are consistently understood and considered.	To partner with the public in each aspect of the decision including the development of alternatives and the identification of the preferred solution.	To place final decision making in the hands of the public.
	PROMISE TO THE PUBLIC	We will keep you informed.	We will keep you informed, listen to and acknowledge concerns and aspirations, and provide feedback on how public input influenced the decision.	We will work with you to ensure that your concerns and aspirations are directly reflected in the alternatives developed and provide feedback on how public input influenced the decision.	We will look to you for advice and innovation in formulating solutions and incorporate your advice and recommendations into the decisions to the maximum extent possible.	We will implement what you decide.

© IAP2 International Federation 2018. All rights reserved. 20181112\_v1

20

Focus Group Handout  
-Summary of Individual Interview Questions-  
Focus Group Engagement Activity #1

Focus Group Sessions are the second way that the SNGR community is being engaged. The first was a series of interviews with individuals that have experience in community engagement within SNGR. The summary of key questions is provided in this document. These are for your reference when doing Activity #1.

**Question 1: What are the most common issues that are brought up during community engagement?**

**General Finding**

The Interviewees identified that the main issues that occur during community engagement relate to either the subject matter or process itself. Items such as health, land, water, services and funding are topics raised during community engagement, even if those are not the subject of focus. In addition, the process is not regarded as a safe and trusting space. This is compounded by inconsistent / over-usage of engagement with the community, lack of subject matter education and communications that are not accessible for the majority of community members.

**Summary of Responses**

- Issues around the lack of land, housing, services, funding and clean water;
- Small number of people participate, and typically dominate with negative dialogue and absence of HCCC;
- Governance Issues and wrongdoings of Canada, Ontario and Municipalities;
- People that attend are typically against the project;
- Lack of understanding, skepticism and suspicious of data collection;
- Intimidation, accountability concerns, lack of trust;
- Low turnout and responses, lack of results, desensitization to engagement, lack of hope, Council as a deterrent;
- Lateral violence (or fear of), lack of education on topic, lack of awareness;
- Concerns regarding healthcare and language issues;
- Promotional misalignment, lack of time to engage, pessimism toward due diligence processes, lack of digital access;
- Concerns related to transparency and accountability, unsatisfied that Council represents community interests;
- Lack of roads, generational poverty issues, distrust of Council, lack of understand of project processes and amount of work, entitlement to share in project benefits, mis-understanding use of funds and speed of business;
- Lack of trust in Council, negativity / naysaying, no solutions, misunderstanding of benefits.

Focus Group Handout  
-Summary of Individual Interview Questions-  
Focus Group Engagement Activity #1

**Question 2: Why do you think some community members do not participate in community engagement?**

**General Finding**

The key themes identified by interviewees were the lack of safe space(s) and personal relevance to the engagement process. Engagement activities are often dominated by a small number of vocal community members, and participants often encounter negativity and / or bullying. In addition, engagement participants hold pessimism toward SNGREC-related activities, and believe that the project does not impact them personally or that their contributions will not impact the project or its benefits.

**Summary of Responses**

- Discussions dominated by small group of negative people, fear of reprisal for speaking out, and empathy – ninety percent of people do not participate because it does not affect them;
- Lack of time to educate on topic or no interest, people want to be left alone, and stay away from negativity and traditional community members do not participate in Council engagements;
- Either already agreeable, rely on elected officials to make decisions, want to avoid conflict have time constraints or are not interested.
- People do not care unless it affects them, do not want to be bullied or believe it will happen regardless of their input;
- Do not want to take an active role in decision-making;
- Lack of trust in Council and development corporation;
- Do not see their comments impacted project;
- Can not see the relevance to this life or change in the community, do not have enough information, fear of speaking out or being bullied, lack of time and do not see their comments impacting the project;
- Silent majority is either in favour or do not care, do not want to be involved in a toxic environment, feelings that no one listens, scared to speak up, and do not have time to get involved;
- Only see it as a part of elected Council;
- Communication and awareness are not reaching everyone, need more one-on-one opportunities, need to engage where people already go, and people avoid situations that may have conflict;
- Feeling that voices are not being heard, no change will happen regardless of input, and fear of negativity;
- Toxic environment, only care if it impacts them, lack of education of subject material, comfortable with others making decisions and not enough incentives;
- Apathy toward the overall process, silent majority feel they cannot make a difference, accessibility / living off-reserve, does not impact them directly.

Focus Group Handout  
 -Summary of Individual Interview Questions-  
 Focus Group Engagement Activity #1

*Focus Group Sessions are the second way that the SNGR community is being engaged. The first was a series of interviews with individuals that have experience in community engagement within SNGR. The summary of key questions is provided in this document. These are for your reference when doing Activity #1.*

**Question 3: In your experience, what methods of community engagement are effective?**

**General Finding**

The key theme of the responses below is that Interviewees believe that community members are more responsive to engagement activities that involve in-person contact. Digital communication is growing in popularity, as is radio, but in general the traditional forms of media (print, ads, etc.) are seen ineffective. (below average of 2.5).

**Summary of Responses**

Interviewees were asked to rate the effectiveness of different types of engagement activities (with 1 being the least effective, and 5 being the most effective). Below is a summary of those results. The full set of comments related to Types of Engagement Activities can be found in the Appendix, starting on Page 27.

Average Rating by Engagement Activity	
Type	Average Rating
Physical Surveys	3.31
Word of Mouth	3.14
Door-to-Door Surveys	3.08
Focus Groups	2.86
Online Surveys	2.43
Mail-outs	2.43
Referendums	2.43
Radio Ads	2.32
Newspaper Ads	2.29
Community Posters	2.21

Comments by Type Engagement Activity	
Type	Comments
<b>Physical Surveys</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not sure if this fits. When we did the leakage study, we had community members book appointments and do the survey. We also paid them for their time.</li> <li>• This is the most effective method;</li> <li>• Depends on where it is located. Social biases given responses because they want to look good, or not rock the boat in public, may tell you what you want</li> </ul>

	<p>to hear. May want to incentive and wants to give a quick response versus a thought out one.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to have a prize for individuals to take the time to fill it out. Need to be creative on how to collect the surveys (sit at plaza at radio bingo times, go out to community events etc.)</li> <li>• If we are taking to direct surveys- what do you think about this.</li> <li>• Depends on where and how they are made available.</li> <li>• When you interview someone, they feel more appreciated and can articulate themselves better. I think this is a great way to crowd source information at the beginning of an engagement. Also good if they are handed out to employees and they are given worktime to complete and their employer is encouraging them to participate.</li> <li>• Extremely effective- get the word out is key, add a prize to it to win do fill it out. Leaving it up to individuals to have free access to give perspective without having others involved.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Word of Mouth</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Untapped area in our community. We do know how quickly things travel through the grape vine. Seeding approach.</li> <li>• Effective to share but wrong information can also be shared. Snowball effect.</li> <li>• Good way to communicate but still dependent on the member to respond</li> <li>• I think this is under utilized. I think that we need to spend more time informing people who work in the field or have an interest in the engagement about the project so they can share with people they know. There can be lots of misinformation.</li> <li>• Concern a lot gets lost in translation. Telephone effective message can change over time. Message does get out; people add own thoughts and opinions</li> </ul>
<p><b>Door-to-Door Surveys</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extremely expensive and comes with a great deal of personal risks – could be useful if used for larger picture not for individual issues- needs to be done by a sample size not everyone,- administrative bodies to interpret larger studies;</li> <li>• This is the most effective method;</li> <li>• Some of the best surveys are when people gone to people’s homes and gotten responses that way. People feel more comfortable in their own home, more time and better responses. Average 500-600 can get in 1000s with door to door;</li> <li>• Most effective when talking about bigger picture, when you go door to door people feel more comfortable and ready to share. They have a bit privacy and likely give you more time and more thought on the topic;</li> <li>• Fear of dogs, fear of being considered “census” takers and lack of trust;</li> <li>• This can present a time and safety concern if its random. However, if its specific to a geographic area than its better because they is a direct link to the individual they live there so they are more motivated to complete. Would also be good for a general engagement not to ask specific questions;</li> <li>• Trending down- was effective in the past because people knew each other and had those connection. People did not answer door. Very generational- baby boomers- would say highly effective – survey the elders complex. Running from dogs, Safety concern and time concern.</li> </ul>

<p><b>Focus Groups</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This comment will serve most of the questions in this section: the best thing to do to get participation is communication/marketing, the people must be made aware of the issue beforehand and incentives are a good way to get people to participate;</li> <li>• Depends on what you are engaging on, how familiar the community is with the subject, and who participates;</li> <li>• I liked the family groups/organization groups meetings to gather information. I held one at my home with family and found they were more open to giving input/express themselves;</li> <li>• Depends on who is included – randomize groups might not be as good because outspoken people might lead it; being with people you are more comfortable with may make it easier for everyone to share;</li> <li>• Don't always get many people out and lots of times the same people;</li> <li>• Focus groups are more conversational and you go back and forth. They are also normally made up of people that are likeminded as you, so conversations build off one another versus attack one another;</li> <li>• Focus group with like-minded people, with other like-minded people you can get your thoughts out their without getting criticized. Larger groups people can be afraid.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Online Surveys</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The community has a strong online presence. But the accuracy of the online survey results would depend greatly on what information is understood by the participant if there are no other forms of direct communication outside the survey;</li> <li>• Depends on where it is located if its effective. location matters if people know about it;</li> <li>• Work better when anonymous and people cannot trace back to who said what;</li> <li>• 250 people when we do online on the higher end;</li> <li>• Access to online surveys is somewhat limited;</li> <li>• This is good for when you are asking specific questions and either or options, not when you are trying to seek complex answers or solutions. Needs to be last type of engagement not the beginning;</li> <li>• Connectivity- online surveys very effective can be done at own time and leisure, no fear of being criticize but also understand that not everyone has internet.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Mail-outs</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Really depends on people's level of interest. If its something that catches their eye and interest, they tend to read it and you got their attention. Need bright ads and wording that draws you in quickly;</li> <li>• Some people read them and sometimes they end up in the garbage;</li> <li>• Not everyone has a mailbox;</li> <li>• Most considered junk mail and end up in the garbage;</li> <li>• I think it necessary to attempt to get information out there but not everyone reads them, however at least they are exposed to the information;</li> <li>• Everyone checks the mail, great way to get the word out. Best method was to hire people to put stuff in the mailbox. Issue with Canada Post.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Referendums</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Depends on what you are engaging on, how familiar the community is with the subject, and who participates;</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is the most effective method;</li> <li>• Same issues we deal with in general, does not apply, won't participate, don't know, don't see value of (lower turnout);</li> <li>• Not enough participating;</li> <li>• Get political undertone;</li> <li>• Low turnout;</li> <li>• I think this only works when its an either-or choice and has to be for something that is big enough to use this type of resources and needs to be coupled with educational campaigns, so people are informed on what they are voting on;</li> <li>• Less effective based on past numbers- silent majority, low numbers in past under 20 % about huge changes;</li> </ul>
<b>Radio Ads</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Too overpriced for the value you are getting from them and very demographic based;</li> <li>• Needed for those who listens to the radio station – CKRZ or Jukasa is it on both and who is audience, not everyone listens;</li> <li>• Must hit the high traffic times and radio bingo;</li> <li>• Not all listen to the local stations;</li> <li>• Think this is best used at high frequency times like the lunch hours, radio bingo times for ads. Thinks it's a great place to get complex information out in like an update or interview about the project versus just sending them to a link for more information;</li> <li>• Trending up. Making a comeback in a lot of ways because more people are listening to their local radio to hear updates and people call in to have follow up questions. Generates conversations.</li> </ul>
<b>Newspaper Ads</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Really depends on people's level of interest. If its something that catches their eye and interest, they tend to read it and you got their attention. Need bright ads and wording that draws you in quickly. Only reaches a certain demographic of people who read newspapers;</li> <li>• Needed for elders and people who read the newspaper;</li> <li>• Not all people read the local newspapers;</li> <li>• I think it necessary to attempt to get information out there but not everyone reads them, however at least they are exposed to the information. Smaller more frequent ad and making use of classified is best;</li> <li>• Getting less effective, visually as a younger person there are papers left on the Wednesday were before they were always gone. Online users may be more affective than paper ads.</li> </ul>
<b>Community Posters</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gets lost in the noise of all the other ads. Depends on colouring and wording;</li> <li>• Can be creative with where you put them so community can see them;</li> <li>• I think it necessary to attempt to get information out there but not everyone reads them, however at least they are exposed to the information;</li> <li>• Great use for these because it generates conversation. We use our public areas quite effectively in many ways. Leads them to another source of information to learn more.</li> </ul>

Focus Group Handout  
-Summary of Individual Interview Questions-  
Focus Group Engagement Activity #1

**Question 6: What does successful community engagement look like at Six Nations? How can it be measured?**

General Finding

The Interviewees identified different contexts for measuring successful engagement with the community. The main themes were benchmarking against engagement rates of larger cities and regions that surround SNGR, total number of community members engagement (numerical or percentage) and ratios of on and off-reserve community members. Taken together, it can be said that Interviewees would like to exceed the standards of comparable communities and establish success criteria that involves a high threshold of community members participating in engagement activities.

Summary of Responses

- As a ratio of respondents against total community membership;
- When no one opposes it, when project communication clearly outlines information so people can have informed opinions and a verifiable and balanced perspective;
- Participation at least on par with the communities around SNGR, examples of how comments / feedback is incorporated, and project specific thresholds;
- Having participation and understanding of how community members rank project benefits and what they learned;
- Community Plan engagement as an example;
- Includes all different parties, non-hierarchical, non-council processes, consultation with all parties and not just development corporation governance;
- Based on percentage (i.e., 1% of band list), engagement dependent;
- Need to increase benchmarks for success, 10-20% of population as base line, 50-60% could be ideal, need to include traditional Chiefs and Clan Mothers;
- Thresholds on surveys – between 500-1000 seem to make people happy;
- Good selection pool of people engaged, over 66% of on-reserve population, representative engagement results;
- Number of responses – anything over 1000;
- Presentation and acceptance of both pros and cons; needs to be measured by number of participants;
- When community is presented with transparent information, the information is being shared by community members and there are no protests;
- Quantitative measurements are difficult because projects are specific, have to make sure the right people are engaged.

Focus Group Handout  
-Summary of Individual Interview Questions-  
Focus Group Engagement Activity #1

**Question 11: What is an appropriate community sample size?**

General Finding

The responses provided a more focused approach to information found in Question 6. The numerical suggestions for sample size ranged from 100-2000 community members, with percentages ranging based on type of projects (anywhere from 5% - 66%). A key area of discussion was to ensure that any sample was representative of community demographics, and the balance of on and off-reserve community members. The inclusion of youth in the process, especially for long-term projects, is regarded as an ongoing opportunity.

Summary of Responses

- Aspect ratio to determine sample size;
- Geographic representation (households per area), on / off reserve considerations (only 18+ or youth), must be a range of 5% +/- of sample size;
- Must be relative to the communities around SNGR (benchmarking), should be based upon on-reserve population, off-reserve is more difficult to engage;
- Not possible to have a standard sample size, just results of engagement;
- Must go with the results of community engagement;
- Half the on-reserve population, standards set by surrounding municipalities / regions are problematic, consensus will require large amount of funding and engagement;
- Both on and off-reserve population over the age of 18, need to keep youth involved in larger / longer projects that may affect them;
- Satisfactory to have 100-500 people on-reserve, but goal should be 1200 on reserve and 3000 for full community (10%), bigger projects should aspire for 30-40%, compare to larger cities;
- The goal should be 1000-2000, with anything over that ideal;
- The target should be 66% of the community;
- The goal should be over 1000 people;
- Minimum threshold of 25% of adults on-reserve (21-60 years of age);
- Project specific goal should be 5-10% of population, feedback on larger issues should be 30% through multi-channels;
- Not going to achieve 100%, but 30% would be satisfactory.

Focus Group Handout  
-Summary of Individual Interview Questions-  
Focus Group Engagement Activity #1

**Question 12: How many days should community engagement last?**

General Finding

The Interviewees noted a range of periods for engagement, but also that the exercise is project specific. The responses ranged from 5-10 days of focused engagement to 90 days for larger projects. Longer periods were the more frequent of answers, and several involved a multi-stage process of engagement, review and commentary. A key theme was to ensure that engagement length was sufficient to provide all community members with the opportunity to participate.

Summary of Responses

- Several days or months, whatever period is needed to give all demographics the opportunity to participate;
- Depends on project complexity, lower sensitivity should be 30 days, higher sensitivity should be 90 days, must be pre-determined requirements;
- Typically, 30-90 days;
- 6-8 weeks;
- 3-5 months (at least)
- At least 30 days;
- Anything requiring feedback needs 2-3 weeks, trial for 1 week, depends on type of project and how familiar community is with topic;
- 5-10 days of intentional engagement;
- 3-6 months;
- 30 days for feedback, but allow more time for challenges, 45-60 community feedback process;
- Setting limits can be problematic, but 45-60 days should be sufficient;
- Forward facing activities should be 6-8 weeks, with 7-10 days of active engagement, followed by a commentary period of two weeks;
- 3-6 months.

Focus Group Handout  
-Summary of Individual Interview Questions-  
Focus Group Engagement Activity #1

**Question 14: Should community engagement have an appeal process?**

General Finding

Interviewees were somewhat divided on the approach to a community engagement appeal process. Several responses were against the process or noted that the community currently appeals through protest-related activities. The majority of Interviewees discussed the merits of the appeal process, but outlined the need for clear criteria and procedure, third-party oversight, verifiable community support for appeal and pre-defined outcomes. It is also noted that SNGREC has a current complaints process, and that an appeal process is something to be piloted to gain more data through lessons learned.

Summary of Responses

- There should be no appeal process, once the community speaks the matter should be closed, dispute resolution should be made available;
- If comments are reorders / reviewed properly, and there are effective standards there should be no need for appeals;
- There would need to be a clear criteria and process and defined remedies and outcomes;
- No;
- Protests are this community's appeal process;
- Yes, this is a necessity;
- Need formal way to submit complaints, standard criteria, people will shutdown projects when they do not agree;
- Need good levers to get to that stage / not a de facto process, need protocol before it gets appealed – number of people, percentage of people, number of signatures, etc.;
- There is a complaints process to hear the matters, unsettled items come before council, need 1000 signatures, if there is a process and standards then no appeals, must progress forward;
- There should always be an appeal process as part of due diligence;
- Yes;
- Not an appeal process but a pilot or trial period;
- Needs to be complaint process through a third-party, need support for complaint, only requests for project to go back to engagement with adjusts to come as result;
- Not appeal process but silver-second thought – committee of elders and youth to vet the information against 7 generations planning.

Focus Group Handout  
-Summary of Individual Interview Questions-  
Focus Group Engagement Activity #1

**Question 15: If yes, what could this appeal process look like and who should be responsible for receiving and reviewing appeals?**

General Finding

As a follow-up to Question 14, the responses identified more specific criteria for an appeals process. These included minimum community support for appeals on a case-by-case basis (i.e., petition), independent committee review and arbitration, demographic representation of committee, 30–45 day window for appeals and potential outcomes (re-engagement, project closure, etc.). The key risk identified with this process is the political nature of the community and engagement in general. An appeals process may heighten those issues.

Summary of Responses

- Needs grounds for appeal, 100 signatures, overseen by governance body, 14-day decision cycle;
- Independent committee for appeals, needs larger support for appeal, documentation prepared by appealing party, Council response, committee oversees and decides, need to define outcome;
- Opposition is political;
- Committee involving Clan Mothers and youth;
- Need independent committee to review, make use of community members with expertise;
- Need protocols, percentage of people, number of signatures, well-known process that is communicated, community support for process, third-party committee, only used for higher level projects with community impacts;
- Can use council process through Yerihwahrón:kas, appeal process would need to present complaints and solutions, justification, need for 1000 signatures;
- Independent committee to review within 2 months;
- Could loop into outreach process, timelines of 45 days and appeals within 15 days of presenting findings;
- A jury of community members, experts, elders and youth, need representatives from Council and HCCC to hear the issues but not vote, results must be reported back to community;
- Silver-second thought does not have to be a committee cross-section of elders and youth, third-party source of review / recommendations, addition to community engagement process as secondary review.

Community Engagement Standards  
- Individual Interview Findings-  
Focus Group Engagement Activity #1

For this activity we ask that you review the summary of the Individuals Interviews for questions:

- Question 3: Most effective methods of Community Engagement.
- Question 11: What is an appropriate community sample size?
- Question 12: How many days should community engagement last?
- Question 14: Should community engagement have an appeal process?
- Question 15: If yes, what could this appeal process look like and who should be responsible for receiving and reviewing appeals?

Once you have reviewed them, we ask that you add additional commentary on each of the questions using with the sticky notes provide or this worksheet. These comments will be compiled and will help to form questions to be posed to the community through a community survey.

Question #	Comments
Questions 3	
Question 11	
Question 12	
Question 14	
Question 15	

Additional Comments/Notes:

Community Engagement Standards  
 - Individual Interview Findings-  
 Focus Group Engagement Activity #1

For this activity we ask that you review the summary of the Individuals Interviews appearing earlier in your handout. Once you have reviewed them, we ask that you add additional commentary on each of the questions using with the sticky notes provide or this worksheet. These comments will be compiled and will help to form questions to be posed to the community through a community survey.

Question #	Comments
Question 1: What are the most common issues that are brought up during community engagement?	
Question 2: Why do you think some community members do not participate in community engagement?	
Question 6: What does successful community engagement look like at Six Nations? How can it be measured?	
Question 11: What is an appropriate community sample size?	
Question 12: How many days should community engagement last?	
Question 14: Should community engagement have an appeal process?	
Question 15: If yes, what could this appeal process look like and who should be responsible for receiving and reviewing appeals?	

Additional Comments/Notes:

Community Engagement Standards  
 -Working Together Using Our Good Minds-  
 Focus Group Engagement Activity #2

A common theme identified in the individual interview phase of the CES engagement was the toxic and at times abusive environment that can occur during community engagement. This exercise is intended to create a set of agreements amongst all parties involved in Community Engagement to use their Good Minds when participating and conducting community engagement.

We ask that participants fill out the chart as individuals or as a group to help draft Rights and Responsibilities for each party involved.

This chart will be used in the Community Engagement Standards Guide as a tool for creating healthier community engagement environments and will appear in the Community Survey portion of the engagement to seek further feedback and community support.

	Community	Organization Conducting Engagement	Political Bodies
Rights			
Responsibilities			

Additional Notes/Comments

Focus Group Handout  
-Community Engagement Definition-  
Focus Group Engagement Activity #3 (Optional)

Below is a draft community engagement definition for Six Nations of the Grand River. We invite Focus Group participants to provide their insights on the specific wording of the definition.

**Draft Community Engagement Definition**

Community Engagement helps shape our Community. It is a process for gathering opinions and insights on what projects, products and services should be developed. The process involves building community relationships (collaboration), fostering respectful dialogue (good mind), promoting environmentalism (stewardship) and increasing public participation (feedback) to achieve the greatest good for today and the faces yet to come.

**Notes**