From Community-Based Participatory Research (CBPR) Involving Indigenous Peoples to Indigenous-Led CBPR: It Is More Than Just Drinking Tea

Diana Lewis, Heather Castleden, Ronald David Glass, and Nicole Bates-Eamer

Abstract

Recent research and social movements (e.g., #IdleNoMore, #NotYourMascots, #EveryChildMatters, #LandBack, #Pretendians) have advanced Indigenous resurgence and self-determination. In this essay we explore the evolution of community-based participatory research (CBPR) involving Indigenous Peoples. Much has changed since Castleden et al. (2012) used "drinking tea" to reveal the material realities of CBPR with Indigenous communities; then and now, it is more than simply a cup of tea. Here, we further scholarly understandings of "drinking tea" through Indigenous and decolonial lenses, as we see rapid shifts toward Indigenous-*led* CBPR (ILCBPR). Through our own ILCBPR experiences, we share insights into the intersections of relational accountability, data sovereignty and autonomy, cultural relevance in gender-based analysis, the power of ceremony in governance, and for decolonizing time, place, and all our relations in engaged scholarship. We contextualize our essay with examples from our work and offer guiding questions for those—particularly non-Indigenous people—considering CBPR.

Keywords: community-based participatory research (CBPR), Indigenous Peoples, relational accountability, decolonizing research, Indigenous-led research

---

Introductions: Setting the Table for Tea

Picture this: a group of four people, sitting together, spanning four decades in age, drinking coffee (not tea), and reflecting on a 7+ year, $2 million countrywide program of collaborative, Indigenous-led community-based participatory research (ILCBPR). This program examined the reach and limits of reconciliation between Indigenous and Western knowledge systems within Indigenous-settler partnerships implementing renewable energy projects and policies. They wonder, "What does our program of research have to offer others, and how do we go about writing about those experiences?" As is the protocol in many Indigenous contexts, and since one person is new to the group, they begin with introductions, their genealogies, and ancestral lands.

Diana (aka Dee): Kwe', ni'n na teluisi Dee. Wetapeksi Sipekne'katik, etek Mi'kma'ki. (Translation: Hi, my name is Dee. I am from Sipekne'katik, found in [the unceded territory of] Mi'kma'ki.) My journey into CBPR was at a time in my life when I was not even aware that it was an emerging methodology or approach for doing research with Indigenous communities "in a good way." I was not an academic. I was a community member working closely with my own Mi'kmaw communities on matters of importance to us. Intuitively I just knew, however, that for research to work, non-Indigenous academics must let Indigenous communities lead the way. The academy was

just catching up with this notion.

I had been approached in 2010 by a group of Mi'kmaw women from Pictou Landing First Nation (PLFN) in Nova Scotia, Canada, who were concerned about how a nearby pulp mill was impacting the health of their community, and despite voicing those concerns, they were never heard. They asked for my help, as a Mi'kmaw woman, with a recently completed master of resource and environmental management degree. Knowing I did not have the academic standing yet to achieve what the women needed, I had to approach experts who were far more trained than I was at that point in addressing environmental impacts. But the bottom line that we agreed to was this: Those experts would have to take the women's lead (see London et al., 2022).

As Mi'kmaw Knowledge Holder Catherine Martin has explained to me, the ancestors were guiding us, putting us all on the same path—that Creator was aligning our universe. A few months earlier, one of the leading early career experts at the time in CBPR with Indigenous communities in Canada, and the soon-to-be author of "I Spent the First Year Drinking Tea" (Castleden et al., 2012), had arrived at Dalhousie University. We talked. We connected. I invited Heather to meet with the women. The women said, "Finally someone is listening to us." And the rest is history (see Castleden, Bennett, et al., 2017; Lewis et al., 2016, 2020; Lewis, Castleden, et al., 2021; Lewis, Francis, et al., 2021; Pictou Landing Native Women's Group et al., 2016).

The Pictou Landing Native Women's Group (PLNWG), led by a remarkable Mi'kmaw woman, Sheila Francis, had this to say in our final report after concluding our multiyear ILCBPR project:

> This has been a long and emotional journey, not just for me but especially for the women of the community. At the same time, it has been one of empowerment and voice. Many women in our community have shown themselves to be leaders through this project. . . . Right from the start, you were our partner. You did not come in and assert your credentials or your experience. You did not minimize our lack of expertise as scientists. What [Heather] brought was what we had never received before—compassion, safety, someone who listened to our concerns and who really cared. I think that was the most important thing we needed to move this project forward so successfully. To the ladies who played a role in this project: Whatever conclusions you have taken from this research study, I hope one of them is the fact that you were a part of this study. You led this study. You controlled this study. You are the authors of this study. I hope you will continue to demand and express your concern for your and your family's health, and the health of our community. I hope you will continue to use your voice. I want to thank you for allowing me to represent you. I had to step out of my own comfort zone many times to tell your story, our story, but I would do it again for you. (Pictou Landing Native Women's Group et al., 2016, p. xiv)

This refrain about listening (also known as "drinking tea"), emphasized above, is a common refrain in the research projects I have since formed with Indigenous communities who are experiencing egregious environmental and health injustices.

From 2010 onward, Heather and I have established a trusting research relationship and friendship, in that I know she works "with a good heart and mind," by which I mean that she respects Indigenous communities' right of refusal (see Tuck & Yang, 2014) and puts the needs of the community before the needs of herself or the academy. In fact, in 2015, she coauthored another manuscript whose title captures how she had to invent a new way of working for herself within Indigenous-led projects: "'I Don't Think That Any Peer Review Committee . . . Would Ever Get What I Currently Do': How Institutional Metrics for Success and Merit Risk Perpetuating the (Re)production of Colonial Relationships in Community-Based Participatory Research Involving Indigenous Peoples in Canada" (Castleden et al., 2015). The respect that I have for Heather led me to agree to become the codirector of the research program at the center of our analysis, and within the program, to become the Indigenous colead of a specific research project with an Indigenous community on their renewable energy partnerships. We are now at the stage where we want to share how far we have come (and how far we

still must go) since the days of spending "the first year drinking tea," when studies of CBPR involving Indigenous Peoples in Canada were still mainly initiated and led by non-Indigenous people, and Indigenous Peoples were mainly hired to collect data or offer translation skills. For the most part then (and even now), data was still removed from the people and places that generated it for analysis and ownership; for their contributions, those Indigenous contributors were typically just "acknowledged" rather than being recognized as cocreators and coauthors of new knowledge. Indeed, how far we have come.

Heather: I am a White settler with ancestral roots in the United Kingdom. Like all early European settlers to what is now known as Canada, my ancestors stole Indigenous lands when they arrived (Lowman & Barker, 2015). I was born in the territory of the Yellowknives Dene. I switched from doing investigator-driven research involving Indigenous Peoples to ILCBPR in the early 2000s after I learned the importance of drinking tea and listening, especially considering my Whiteness and settler positionality. I arrived in a northern community for my graduate research with "book-knowledge" about northern Indigenous health, professional knowledge as an American Sign Language (ASL) interpreter, and personal (albeit limited) knowledge of the North, having been born there. What was a thesis on an Indigenous family's experience of raising a deaf child in an off-grid, fly-in Indigenous community (because of my own interests and experiences) should have been, from the perspective I now have, a thesis on the impacts of diamond mining on caribou–Dene–land relations. Let me explain: The family I wanted to connect with—who had tried to raise their deaf child in the community—no longer lived there, and I had not thought to confirm this before university approvals to conduct the study or even before arriving in the community; my timing was off by a decade. Had I spent time drinking tea, *listening* to the community's current priorities, my project could have become an ILCBPR project on the ways in which a new diamond mine was impacting caribou migration patterns as well as hunter safety while on climate-induced changing ice conditions in winters and community reliance on caribou for food security and sovereignty. Such a project could have been immediately useful to them in their legal cases, their impact benefit agreement ne-

gotiations, and their self-determining priorities. In short, I should have spent time drinking tea together before any research. Since then, I've tried to drink plenty of tea with those who choose to engage with me in research relationships (confessional moment: I'm more of a coffee-drinker, but I'll drink tea if it is offered).

To write together with Dee, Ron, and Nicole as part of Dee's and my process of critical reflection on our work is truly special. Dee and I have collaborated through CBPR projects for 13 years, and she has become one of my most trusted, valued, and closest friends. As our work with the women from Pictou Landing was wrapping up, we became the codirectors of a 5-year (now 7 years thanks to COVID-19) program of research called "A SHARED Future" (Achieving Strength, Health, and Autonomy through Renewable Energy Development for the Future; see https://asharedfuture.ca/), wherein eight thematically linked ILCBPR projects were carried out. Through this (see Rotz et al., 2022; Sanchez-Pimienta et al., 2021; Stefanelli et al., 2019; Walker et al., 2019, 2021) and previous work, we "drank a lot of tea" together as well as with the (very large) A SHARED Future team. By drinking tea, I mean we spent a lot of time focused on getting to know each other, building trust and respect for each other, developing a transparent and horizontal governance structure, and sharing stories with each other to establish the basis for the sometimes uncomfortable but necessary and honest conversations with each other and our team about our diverse teachings, approaches, and ways of researching. It is not easy, this tea drinking stuff—it still is not even after all these years. Our A SHARED Future team had to deal with all kinds of relational, ethical, political, practical, and other tensions. Some we have been able to resolve, others are not the sort of tensions one resolves, but rather are the sort that one learns to dwell with, to endure, in doing this work "in a good way." More on that later.

Just around the time that Dee, I, and others conceptualized A SHARED Future, Ron and I crossed virtual paths when he organized an invitational gathering around unsettling research ethics (see Baloy et al., 2016). Although I missed the gathering, as I was busy exploring the formation of A SHARED Future, I was impressed with his praxis to unsettle colonial institutional contexts like ethics in research, and I invited Ron to join

our International Advisory Committee (IAC) for his insights and wisdom in this area. He supported our team's focus and deep engagement with the ethics of research as defined within the domains of place and time, relationality, and knowledge.

As we write this, 7 years since the formation of A SHARED Future, the energy on our team is waning thanks to multiple factors: COVID, the life-threatening climate crisis that continues to take its toll, identity politics that have entered lives and created divides, research and community priorities that have shifted for some projects, and capacity to "do more" remains limited. A SHARED Future is sunsetting in unexpected ways even as parts of it morph into new forms. Ron, Dee, and I decided a reflection and writing retreat was needed to work through some of this angst. At this important knowledge mobilization phase of our work, a new postdoctoral researcher joined us: Enter Nicole, who joined us on our retreat and who has brought fresh enthusiasm and focus through her own experience working at the intersections of Indigenous and Western knowledges around climate justice, clean energy, governance, public policy, and data synthesis. She has been an amazing boost of energy, a breath of fresh air, with a great sense of gumption to get us going again! And now, here we are, walking, talking, reflecting, and writing together in the beautiful Comox Valley—the unceded territory of K'ómoks First Nation.

Ron: I grew up a settler in the southern reaches of the Algonquian-speaking peoples, in the land of the Shaawanwaki, in what became known as Ohio; my ancestors arrived there in desperation and hope as they fled European pogroms, imprisonment, and orphanhood. I was raised up from that slate clay left behind on the etched glacial scrape that holds the Great Lakes, and I live now on the unceded lands of the Lisjan Ohlone people, who continue to fight to preserve their local sacred spaces. Over the years, I have been invited to work in many places, each with its own histories outside the narrative confines of coloniality, each with its own histories of dispossession, oppression, and resurgence. It is always an honor and responsibility to listen with intention to hear beyond the words and to respond fully to the stories of those places and people, to the heartbreaks along with the freedom dreams that animate the hopes that shape change.

In the 1970s I began experiments in liberatory education, and in 1983–1984 I was mentored in that work by the renowned democratic educators Myles Horton and Paulo Freire (Glass, 2010; see also Horton & Freire, 1990). My life path has connected me with a wide diversity of communities in my work as a "historico-cultural-political psychoanalyst" and Freirean philosopher of education (Freire, 1994, p. 55). I came into the circle of A SHARED Future as a guest, invited to listen and share my learning from decades of experiences crafting critical educational projects with communities and organizations seeking to strengthen and mobilize their knowledge in struggles for justice.

When Heather asked me to serve on the International Advisory Committee (IAC), I was the director of a systemwide research program initiative of the University of California Office of the President, the Center for Collaborative Research for an Equitable California (2009–2015; https://ccrec.ucsc.edu/), and in addition, I led its Spencer Foundation–funded project on the ethics of collaborative research for justice (see Foster & Glass, 2017; Glass & Stoudt, 2019; Newman & Glass, 2014). Over the 7 years of Dee's, Heather's, and my collaboration, we not only spent substantial time in Zoom rooms together exploring the complexities of Indigenous–Western reconciliation in the context of facing planetary existential crises, we also codesigned learning spaces and met for an intensive research institute in 2018 hosted by Neqotkuk (Tobique First Nation), a Wolastoqiyik (Maliseet) community on the east coast of Canada. The institute allowed participants the possibility of in-person ceremony, of eating together along with sharing our study and reflections, and it allowed ample time for working as whole persons, as persons in relation to other communities, and to other places.

When I arrived for our retreat in the traditional territories of the ləkʷəŋən-speaking peoples (Victoria, on the west coast of Canada), I looked forward to the opportunity to write with Dee and Heather using A SHARED Future as a reflective starting point and using each of our histories as vantage points to discern lessons learned along the way. I especially looked forward to the IAC and A SHARED Future practice of always beginning meetings with extended check-ins that included the more-than-human, such that our entire discussion might be

driven by the IAC Elders' teachings from the Mayfly, or the Reindeer, or Canada Geese. This assured me that the roots of our work were deep enough to keep us balanced as we moved through examining the complex relations and topics of ILCBPR, an examination that surely would challenge the ethical and political foundations of the growing fields of engaged scholarship and CBPR (Glass et al., 2018). I had been happy to learn that Nicole, a new person in this SHARED Future work, had roots interwoven with one of my ethics project collaborators and coauthors, and I looked forward to her joining the circle.

Nicole: I am a White-settler with English, Irish, Scottish, Norwegian, and German heritage, born and raised in Nanaimo, BC on the traditional territories of the Coast Salish Peoples. I am new to ILCBPR in Canada and just started this postdoc with Heather and Dee. I recently finished a PhD in political science focused on the discourses that construct understandings of how climate change and human mobility intersect, and the profound questions of (in)justice and (in)equity in those intersections as well as the policy responses to them. Since graduating, I had been doing some work across Indigenous and Western knowledge systems related to renewable energy projects and Indigenous-led sustainability assessment systems. I had earlier studied international development in my master's degree (some time ago) and then worked on community development projects around the world before returning home to Vancouver Island 15 years ago.

On the first day of our writing retreat, I am only in the second month of my postdoc, and as is so often the case in academia, I have a serious case of imposter syndrome. While I am biking downtown on a cold winter morning to meet with my two supervisors, Heather and Dee (Dee who I had only met in person the day before), and their colleague, Ron, for the retreat, I am questioning if my lived experiences and studies have prepared me for this intellectual work. I have been voraciously reading anything and everything that they published or that I can find on the research program, so that I might have something to write about at this retreat. We meet in a hotel lobby, chat easily until everyone arrives, and then grab coffees (not tea). The day is not what I think it will be; there seems to be a lot more chatting, laughing, walking, and eating involved than I had anticipated.

On the second day of our retreat, we reconvene over dinner in a smaller town several hours by car up-island, after Heather, Dee, and Ron have visited some ancient Douglas Fir trees in an old growth forest not far from where we meet. Heather's family members join us, and there is little chat about the program or the research. In fact, we talk about our mothers (Heather's mum had died just five months ago and Day 2 happened to fall on her mum's birthday, so it created space, time, and relationality for celebration and reflection, blending "professional work" with "the personal").

By Day 3, I imagine a day hammering out some text; "words on paper!" was my partner's daily and encouraging refrain while I finished my dissertation. We meet in the hotel lobby and set out on a walk along the river estuary. We debate what shade of a gray sky can be called "blue" in February on Vancouver Island; we talk some more about our families, our past experiences, and a bit about the research; and then we discuss how hungry we are before stopping into one place for coffee and then another for breakfast. Back at the hotel, I pull out my computer, ready to write. We talk through key decision points in the different research projects and how we could write about them, and then share a lunch over a meandering conversation. We do a little silent writing after lunch, starting to focus on themes across the project key decision points; we read it aloud to each other at the end of the time.

Day 4 is much like Day 3, but (finally) with more words on paper and a plan for more to follow from each of us, along with a planned series of meetings every two weeks until the paper could be completed.

On Day 5, I return home reflecting on what just happened in this writing retreat attuned to decolonized practices. It did not seem to be as much about getting words on paper as I had thought. Instead, I leave with relatively few words on paper, but a much better understanding of who Dee, Heather, and Ron are, as people, as scholars, and as they have lived out many other roles and relationships in projects and in their lives. I have a better understanding of what ILCBPR means, how to create space for all team members to feel welcome and valued, and how to work together across generations and scholarly disciplines with respect, and with a good heart and in a good way. I feel deeply committed to this team, and I have a whole new appreciation for "drinking tea"

and the importance of the relational, not just the intellectual, in cocreating knowledge for justice.

Introductions: A Summary

There are two reasons for writing such a lengthy set of author introductions. First, we are mindful and respectful of Indigenous protocols for introducing ourselves, our people, and our places; we would be falling into the colonial trap of removing ourselves from our work if we did not take the time and space to do so. Second, by inviting you to drink tea with us, we are embarking on a journey of relational accountability with you, the reader, to walk our talk in decolonizing, disrupting, and unsettling academic processes of scholarly engagement and writing. Now that we have introduced ourselves, we are ready to share our experiences engaging in CBPR involving Indigenous Peoples and ILCBPR with a decolonial lens. For ease of exposition, in the remainder of the essay, we, the four authors, will use the term "we" to refer to ourselves collectively as well as at times to also refer to the teams with which we have worked; the composition of "we" varies across examples, instances, or projects, but we use it throughout to be consistent and inclusive, and we intend the context to make clear the scope of the reference.

From CBPR Involving Indigenous Peoples to ILCBPR

We are a group of interdisciplinary scholars who have worked closely with Indigenous communities in a variety of CBPR; cumulatively, we have about three quarters of a century of experience in CBPR projects aimed at transforming inequitable structures across Canada and the United States. In this essay we share some of the key lessons we have learned, which we hope can contribute toward ongoing efforts to decolonize all aspects of CBPR and the academy writ large. Our intended audience is primarily people who identify as non-Indigenous researchers. We humbly offer our reflections in the hopes that they may inspire, instigate debate, and/or invigorate newcomers as well as long-time actors in this arena. Our offerings may be useful not only for those partnerships and projects that are led by or directly involve Indigenous Peoples and communities, but for any community-engaged scholars in academia or other settings who seek to transform the deep structures of coloniality, racism, sexism, patriarchy, and economic exploitation that threaten the literal survival of the planet.

We revisit the responsibilities entailed in moving to ILCBPR and reflect on how these responsibilities have manifested in a variety of settings. Grounded in respect for ontological, ethical, and epistemological pluralism, ILCBPR provides a philosophy and methodology thoroughly interwoven with relational ethics and accountability (see Coombes et al., 2014). Although we hope that our reflections on ILCBPR may offer useful guidance for other non-Indigenous-led forms of research and knowledge creation, we also want to caution readers: When you seek to integrate these approaches, you need to ensure that they are always connected to local Indigenous epistemologies/ontologies and their praxis of place (see de Leeuw & Hunt, 2018, p. 9).

ILCBPR: Not Pan-Indigenous, Not Linear, Not Formulaic

We begin with a shared understanding that tying any research, including CBPR, to notions of identity with terms like "Indigenous" (Aboriginal, First Nations, Métis, Inuit, Native American, Alaska Native, Native Hawaiian) binds us against our will to conceptions of personhood and community that are dictated by treaties and constitutional law under the authority of the Canadian and the United States' governments. Indigenous identities continue to be defined by these state structures, rather than by conceptions of autonomy, personhood, and sovereignty derived from Indigenous legal traditions (de Leeuw & Hunt, 2018, p. 7). This structural dilemma leads us to use terms like "Indigenous" with caution, and without meaning to imply a generalized pan-Indigenous perspective.

We also know that those places that the Canadian and the United States' governments designated to divide, conquer, and contain (reserves, treaty settlement lands, reservations, etc.) become spaces where Indigenous self-determination and autonomy can exist in particular forms despite colonial efforts to limit the exercise of Indigenous sovereignty, but these are not the only places that Indigenous communities know as their traditional lands. We recall, for example, some Omushkegowuk Cree teachings that remind us through their conception of and responsibilities to *awawa-nenitakik*, that the place of their Muskeg

lands is not just something underfoot throughout a community's territory, but rather, land is an animate being, a relative, a food provider, and a teacher of law and governance to whom people are accountable (Daigle, 2016; for other examples, see Awâsis, 2020; Bawaka Country et al., 2016; Parsons et al., 2021). According to Daigle (2016), this is how Omushkegowuk Cree self-determination is lived, how it is understood and mobilized from their Muskeg lands and not the mapped reserves and the treaty territories meant to contain their way of life. Similar understandings can be said for other Indigenous Nations.

We have learned that to begin ethical collaborations, special attention is necessary not only to the place but also to the time (Baloy et al., 2016; see also Awâsis, 2020) and timing of the research (Stiegman & Castleden, 2015). By this we mean to point beyond notions of the duration of a particular research project, to focus attention on longer histories and wider possibilities for alternative futures that can address the many forms of slow violence that—like environmental destruction—move at paces and scales that can escape notice, unlike spectacular forms of violence that cannot be missed (Nixon, 2013; Sylvestre, 2021). Non-Indigenous CBPR researchers should be in the habit of asking, "Who are the original inhabitants in this place? What are their relationships and responsibilities to the land? What were and are their ways of life? Where are they now? How are they now? What were the processes by which they came to be dispossessed of their land? What are the ongoing consequences of those processes?" These are questions that reveal the colonial history of violence, dispossession, displacement, and cultural erasure that endures into the present and shapes the landscape of the work. These and similar questions also enable researchers to identify the generative cultural resources that have sustained these communities despite attempts at genocide, and that can serve as the basis for the realization of alternative visions.

This shift toward a more expansive future reflects our determination to resist the timelines and frames of reference insisted on by funders, who delineate grant award end-dates, determine uses of grant funds, evaluate eligibility to hold grant funds, and decide metrics for success, all which limit community-led strategies for change (see Sylvestre et al., 2018). For those work-

ing in solidarity in ILCBPR, this shift can contribute to transforming structures that reproduce injustice (see, for example, Sprague Martinez et al., 2023) and to defending cultural formations that have been built over thousands of years. At the same time, ILCBPR researchers and their coconspirators are also taking the approach that when resurgence is the focus, decolonizing is not the priority, but it can be a co-benefit (Corntassel & Hardbarger, 2019). Intergenerational insights and experience are also needed to shape such work and succeed by Indigenous measures, and so we strive to have Indigenous youth and Elders present and engaged in and guiding our projects as much as is possible, from initial stages of partnerships through governance to knowledge production, dissemination, and mobilization.

ILCBPR Is Ceremony

Over the years, we have learned that to enable relations of genuine respect and mutuality to emerge, new ways of understanding sovereignty, autonomy, personhood, history, and future possibilities needed to first be acknowledged and appreciated; yet even this initial period of bearing witness and seeking mutuality did not end the need to attend to the issues raised in the ongoing work of research partnerships and collaborations (i.e., drinking tea—like decolonizing—is not a one-off event; it is an ongoing process; see Wolfe, 2006). We learned that ceremony provides a way to facilitate difficult tasks, both "external" in relation to one another and "internal" in relation to our self-understanding (see also Hughes et al., 2023; Wilson, 2008). To help readers who are new to this concept, we turn to Opaskwayak Cree scholar Shawn Wilson (2008), who writes that

> for Indigenous people, research is a ceremony. In our cultures an integral part of any ceremony is setting the stage properly. When ceremonies take place, everyone who is participating needs to be ready to step beyond the everyday and to accept a raised state of consciousness. You could say that the specific rituals that make up the ceremony are designed to get the participants into a state of consciousness that will allow for the extraordinary to take place. . . . It is fitting that we view research in the same way—as

a means of raising our conscious-ness. (p. 69)

The kind of ceremony we reference provides a way of grappling with the complexities and contradictions in the work that does not focus on allocating blame, but rather calls people into responsibility for the mutual-ity and interdependence of their lives with other people and with all the nonhuman beings that share their time/place, includ-ing the water, air, and earth themselves on which all life depends. We understand cer-emony as a key to expanding our horizons to futures previously unimagined but that are nonetheless possible, a key to sensing the precarity of the present society, and a key to grasping the power each person has, to make a more just future the reality. We learned that ceremony could provide the breaks in the everyday that enable groups to ground themselves in the fraught but fer-tile realms of transformation and achieve a perspective that provides the kind of criti-cal hope on which actual world-historical movements are built (Bozalek et al., 2014).

We know that ceremony, making time and space for time and place, for establishing re-lations, has a double effect of making people both more secure and more vulnerable at the same time. People become more secure in the respect and mutuality made possible, which at the same time enables a deeper vulner-ability to emerge. This vulnerability reflects the precarity of even the deepest structures of injustice and the limiting conditions of ev-eryday life, which, having been produced in history by human beings, can thus be undone in history by human beings when responsibil-ity is taken for what gets carried forward. The vulnerability also reflects the precarity of even the most enduring depths of self-understand-ing and of the distortions of the dominant ideologies that inhabit language and practices; we discover that always at the same time and place that oppressive practices reign, resistant and transformative languages and practices persist and are being (re)created. We learned that when we connect deeply with others (in-cluding other-than-human others) in these vulnerabilities, in respect and mutuality, we cannot help but be changed; and we learned that ceremony opens this kind of transforma-tive knowing to help shape our work. Indeed, we began our reflective essay with ceremony by making space and taking time to emplace our introductions as a way of establishing a relationship with readers.

We hope this overview of our years of learn-ing about and doing/supporting ILCBPR makes more evident why the transactional ethics of institutionalized research ethics review cannot be the basis for fully ethical collaborative CBPR involving any oppressed community, and itself needs to be decolo-nized (Baloy et al., 2016; Bull & Hudson, 2019; Sabati, 2019; Stiegman & Castleden, 2015; Woodward & McTaggart, 2016), and we hope it also makes more evident what ILCBPR has to offer the wider fields of community-engaged research and uni-versity-community research partnerships. In the following sections, we situate these general learnings in more specific accounts, and we hope in this way to also make clear that when we invoke the notion of ILCBPR, we do not intend a general or universal ac-count of Indigeneity. Building on our ear-lier caveats, we do not mean to ignore the significant debates and conflicts about who counts as Indigenous or who is authorized to "speak for" a particular Indigenous com-munity, and in what contexts. We also do not want to flatten or erase the multiple significant differences within/among/across Indigenous communities, nor to obscure the ways that the traditional ceremonies, value frameworks, and relations with the more-than-human are always particular and located. Nonetheless, to respect our community collaborators, we will preserve as needed the anonymity of those who are in the stories we share.

Relationality and Commitments in ILCBPR

When we (i.e., any of the research teams we have been a part of) come together to engage in relationship exploration and research design, we are making a commitment to do more than work together; we are committing to be in relation with each other (Wilson, 2008). These relationships can be compared in some regards to romantic connections between people, as partnerships go through the early "spark" of immediate energy and excitement that is created. It is full of an-ticipation and optimism. As the relationship deepens, commitments are made, perhaps vows expressed and inscribed in some of-ficial way in the community. Partnerships have a honeymoon phase, where every-thing is "sunshine and roses," though they mature through working at the things that do not go so incredibly well, and unexpected challenges and broken commitments need to be discussed and resolved. But when more and more breaches occur, and perhaps less

transparency in communication and even distancing, such relationships are at risk of "death by a thousand cuts." We have asked ourselves, and perhaps you have too: What happened to those relational commitments?

In 2012, Crooks and Castleden wrote about "managing research partnerships" as early career researchers. They illustrated some of the issues that can arise with the time invested in research relationships as well as the ethical and practical challenges that occur when things go sideways. They wrote,

> Like the song says, breaking-up is hard to do. This is very true in [some of] the research partnerships we have had. We have had to develop tactful exit strategies to get ourselves out of research partnerships that were toxic in one way or another. How do I know when the time is right? What are the long-term implications of a break-up? (p. 396)

Our reflections on ILCBPR grapple with these complex, fraught, and at times painful dynamics, and we share some of our experiences of what relational commitments mean to us and offer suggestions for guiding research processes to reduce/eliminate potential toxicities.

In one project, we formed a team of principal investigators based on existing friendships and networks, shared desires for strength-based ILCBPR processes, and support for Indigenous futurities over and above any specific content expertise each team member held. Indigenous and settler academics and Indigenous community members cocreated a research proposal that established roles and responsibilities, per the funding agency's requirements. We engaged in a commitment ceremony of doing the work together over the next 5 years. No one could have anticipated that three of the 10 principal investigators would be gone within a year due to employment changes and needing to respond to their own community's priorities. But in one case, a principal investigator left the team because of incompatibility. Perhaps not surprisingly, this individual was not part of our existing friendship-based network, and we did not perform enough ceremony to ensure they shared our values and relational commitments. Community and organizational partners also experienced employee turnover

and priority shifts. As a result, we invited new principal investigators and new community and organizational partners to our team. They came with new ideas, new disciplinary training, new lived experience, new personalities, and new politics. Ceremony was needed during the onboarding and orientation process, yet we did not always have the foresight to do it well. But ceremony was also needed for all of us on an ongoing basis, and although efforts were made, we could have done better. It is critical for those in leadership roles to recognize this necessity and to act upon it. It is also important for leaders to create ethical space (for more on "ethical space," see Ermine, 2007) for those who are not in leadership roles to feel safe to express such needs when they arise.

You can and should anticipate that such unexpected turns of events, pitfalls, and tensions might happen in your own CBPR/ILCBPR projects, especially those with large teams and long-term grants. Ask yourselves and develop protocols for this question: "How do your orientation and onboarding processes (ceremonies) roll out to ensure the same degree of relational commitment to each other among new team members as those who were part of the team's origins?" Looking back on that project, we know we could have done better and allocated more time, space, and budget to these processes.

None of us could have possibly anticipated that a global pandemic would halt our CBPR activity for nearly three years. But what could we have anticipated? We could anticipate that careers would progress, relationships would evolve, interests would wane, new priorities would emerge, deaths could occur, and, as a result, relational commitments might change. We attempted to mitigate these anticipated challenges by having a valued Elder on our team to help with the hard stuff, and then the Elder themselves fell ill and had to reduce their commitments to focus on healing and health. We kept evolving our team's Terms of Reference to cover unexpected learnings year by year as our commitments to each other and community partners and organizations necessarily changed over time. But it was/ is the quiet quitting that seems to be the most emotionally and operationally challenging. Here we remind ourselves that we could have anticipated that the early broken commitments and ongoing small breaches left unattended would need us to press pause and reconvene to reexamine the state of our

relationships and commitments.

Over the multiyear program, we did organize annual retreats and hold virtual team meetings as we thought they were needed. We engaged in ceremony (e.g., smudging, along with opening and closing prayers to bring people's hearts and minds together, Indigenous teachings from other-than-humans, sharing circles) to seek a raised state of shared consciousness, but we also had individual everyday demands to contend with. So, when is the right time to press pause, or to recognize that the ceremonial circle is broken beyond repair? And what kind of ceremony is needed at that point? Are attempts to maintain ongoing relations ethically required at that point? In ILCBPR, people are not simply defined by their professional identities; unlike in projects that can recruit another epidemiologist, another economist, or another engineer for the research to proceed, in ILCBPR people and relationships matter more than project outcomes. In our case, tremendous efforts were made to mend relations, and when they failed, hearts hurt, and the work and group suffered. You can and should anticipate that this might happen in your own teams and long-term projects and relationships. Ask yourselves and develop protocols for this question: "How do your closure and farewell processes (ceremonies) roll out to ensure the same degree of relational commitment to each other in the ending as you had in the beginning?"

Revisiting Refusal: Community Autonomy in "Scaled-Up" Programs

Historically, CBPR (and now also ILCBPR) projects have typically been carried out in discrete "case study" form within one community context, often with some form of social, political, geographical, and temporal boundaries. But when a project involves multiple communities—some of which are geographically bound and perhaps distant from each other, others of which are socially bound, and thus involve multiple culturally and politically distinct traditions, laws, and protocols—then attending to these differences in respectful ways can be quite the art of negotiation and diplomacy . . . with heartfelt apologies *and* ceremony when things inevitably go awry.

We created a programmatic Terms of Reference to help carry out this complex work, to guide our roles, responsibilities, financial decision-making, data governance protocols, and authorship. After multiple rounds of revision, the principal investigators came to an agreement about these key decision-making areas. A year later, one of the team members left the annual retreat in tears because of a particular tension the Terms of Reference created for them and their relationship to their own community. The issues arising at that meeting were around data sovereignty and who had access to data collected in the community and who would be included in the authorship of outputs from the community. Initially, many of the team held fast to the academic (i.e., colonial) ways of doing work together; that is, all principal investigators would have access to all community data and/or could opt into authorship of all publications, regardless of whether they were colead on that specific project. But then we realized that we did not have to do things the way they had typically been done in academia. Wanting to make amends and knowing we had the power and autonomy to change the status quo, we did! Ownership of community data stayed with the community, thereby respecting Indigenous data sovereignty; project coleads would now have the discretion to decide whether they would invite the codirectors to participate in authorship in recognition of their leadership of the program. Although we found the experience unsettling at the time, rather than rejecting an Indigenous team member and their community's act of refusal, we grappled with and eventually embraced it so that we could continue to move forward in a good way.

Another example of an ILCBPR project involving Indigenous Peoples from many nations across Canada encountering an unanticipated challenge occurred when we had gathered in one location to share stories about the gendered experiences of working in the renewable energy sector. After our circle of introductions, we were to share a meal together, but we had not done the work of understanding each other's ceremonial protocols before the meal commenced; a period of tension ensued. From one participant: I will prepare a spirit plate. Then from another: We need a fire for the spirit plate. From still another: What is a spirit plate? And from still another: We do not burn our spirit plates; we leave them on the land, to return to it. Finally, from the person whose land we were on and who held specific responsibilities to it: We do not do spirit plates. After some hesitation about how to

work through the tension (i.e., "refusal"; see Tuck & Yang, 2014), the Indigenous individuals that had come together to learn from each other realized they were learning from each other, and the tension dissipated when a creative solution was agreed upon. In sharing this story, we want to emphasize that when tensions arise, there are many ways that "refusal" can emerge in any CBPR project, let alone in ILCBPR with multiple Indigenous Peoples from different, distinct nations and particular projects all under one thematic umbrella of a funded program, as was the case with the project here. The key message we want to convey is that respect and humility are critical for relational accountability, ethical space, and for ceremony to navigate tensions as they arise.

Questions to ask in your projects involving multiple community partners and academic coleads might be "How does refusal show up here? How do we deal with Indigenous data sovereignty?" (We deal with that next.) "Do we see refusal as a problem with those who are refusing or as an opportunity for those who want access in unlearning the taken-for-granted processes that have been designed in colonial systems? Is scaling up ILCBPR into thematic programs a wise practice or is such an approach better left to Western systems of research? How big a scale can/should we move to, and might we risk losing the place-based nature of the work?"

The Importance of Indigenous Data Governance and Sovereignty in ILCBPR

Indigenous data sovereignty is defined as "the right of Indigenous Peoples to determine the means of collection, access, analysis, interpretation, management, dissemination and reuse of data pertaining to the Indigenous peoples from whom it has been derived, or to whom it relates" (Walter & Suina, 2019, p. 237). Since "I Spent the First Year Drinking Tea" (Castleden et al., 2012), the Indigenous data governance and sovereignty movement has emerged on the global scene. It is led by strong Indigenous data advocates in response to the harms that Indigenous Peoples have experienced from the narratives and tropes generated by a colonial state that seeks to keep Indigenous Peoples marginalized. In fact, the first major publication on the topic of Indigenous data sovereignty was released in 2016 (Taylor & Kukutai, 2016). Since then, CBPR with Indigenous Peoples and ILCBPR has progressed, seeking to ensure that research is culturally meaningful and meets community needs and that Indigenous Peoples are equal partners in the research process, jointly deciding what data is collected and analyzed, how data is interpreted, and how data is managed and stored. More importantly, Indigenous Peoples are asserting their right to ensure that the narrative about them is strengths-based, meaningful, and reflective of their worldviews. In short, CBPR principles continue to evolve to reflect the importance for Indigenous communities to have reliable data of their own, control over it, and authority over who has access to it: This is a critical aspect of ILCBPR.

Several recent developments reflect this urgency. In 2021, Canada passed the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) Act and has committed to implementing the Declaration based on lasting reconciliation, healing, and cooperative relations (Government of Canada, 2023). Article 19 of UNDRIP affirms the rights of Indigenous Peoples to give free, prior, and informed consent about measures that may impact them. Target 21 of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework (Convention on Biological Diversity, 2022) states that decision-makers must have access to the best available data, including Indigenous data, to make informed decisions to protect biological diversity. At face value, that could be a welcome message, given the history of Western science's neglect and/or dismissal of Indigenous Knowledge systems. But there remain threats of misuse, misinterpretation, and misappropriation of such data. Therefore, it is becoming increasingly more urgent to safeguard the rights of Indigenous Peoples to control how their data are used, controlled, and accessed.

The work that we have performed, individually and collectively, with Indigenous communities across Canada and the United States reflects our commitment to respect their right to assert autonomy over data governance, including how data is disseminated (see example above on the right of refusal). In Canada, we have adopted several Indigenous-created data governance protocols in line with community requirements. For example, principles of Ownership, Control, Access, and Possession or "OCAP" (which is a registered trademark of the First Nations Information Governance Centre [FNIGC]) are employed in projects involving First Nations. These principles

seek to protect First Nations' rights to own, control, access, and possess data, as well as determine the data collection processes and how the data is used (FNIGC, 2020). To fully understand the definition of OCAP, FNIGC requires that any author who is referring to these principles direct readers to their website (*https://fnigc.ca/ocap-training/*). The Global Indigenous Data Alliance (GIDA) has adopted the CARE Principles (Collective Benefit, Authority to Control, Responsibility, Ethics) for Indigenous Data Governance (GIDA, n.d.), and the Ontario Federation of Indigenous Friendship Centres (OFIFC), which was established to support "community" for Indigenous Peoples in urban centers, developed the USAI Framework (Utility, Self-Voicing, Access, and Inter-relationality; OFIFC, 2016). While we write this essay, new Indigenous-led data governance models are emerging across Canada and beyond.

Moreover, we are cognizant of how data is interpreted, that often, colonial concepts and measures may not be compatible with Indigenous concepts or values. Wilkes (2015) noted how the measure of educational attainment, for example, may distort Indigenous realities. She pointed out how survey data typically reveals lower educational attainment among Indigenous populations compared to non-Indigenous populations. On the surface, what is conveyed from a deficit perspective is that Indigenous Peoples are less educated. In fact, as Wilkes argued, lower educational achievement might more appropriately reflect an intergenerational resistance to Western education because of the harms imposed on Indigenous communities by the colonial Indian Residential School System. The right to assert what Morphy (2016) refers to as "the adequacy of categorization" is, in itself, data sovereignty.

In the research that Dee and Heather (Lewis, Castleden, et al., 2021) conducted with the Pictou Landing women, only the Mi'kmaw language could adequately convey the land displacement and environmental dispossession that the community members had experienced when the effluent from the pulp mill started to disconnect the community from their traditional lands and impact the health of community members. The English language has no words to convey the Mi'kmaw relational worldview like the Mi'kmaw language. For example, *Kisu'lt melkiko'tin* means "the place of creation—nature"; *weji-sqalia'timk* means "where we sprouted from—the landscape." Using Indigenous languages to convey Indigenous experiences is truly data governance and data sovereignty.

Therefore, non-Indigenous researchers might ask themselves questions like these about Indigenous data governance and sovereignty: "Do you know what Indigenous sovereignty is and what it means in the context where you are working? Are you aware of best practices (for example: the First Nations Data Governance Strategy [FNIGC, 2020], the British Columbia First Nations Data Governance Initiative [BCFNDGI, n.d.], or the United States Data Sovereignty Network [Native Nations Institute, n.d.])? Are you aware of the guidance provided in Canada's Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans—TCPS 2 (2018) for the application of OCAP or similar principles for other Indigenous groups (Canadian Institutes of Health Research et al., 2018) when conducting research with Indigenous partners? Or have you read *Indigenous Statistics: A Quantitative Research Methodology* (Walter & Andersen, 2016), which speaks to how dominant settler-societies impose their methodologies to create, translate, and deploy data, often from a deficit-based approach? Do you know what it means to take a strengths-based approach in ILCBPR? Are you prepared to use Indigenous languages, measures, and concepts to convey what the English language is unable to?"

Culturally Relevant Gender-Based Analysis in ILCBPR

Research funding agencies and the research community in Canada and the United States have only recently begun to recognize the importance of considering sex and gender in research teams and the data they collect and analyze, particularly in health research. That recognition, although important, has been imposed through a Western (i.e., White supremacist, settler-colonial, hetero-patriarchal) framework, and this practice is largely maintained through funding opportunities, including specific objectives, institutional structures, and systems, as well as privileged methods, approaches, and awardees (see Rose & Castleden, 2022).

Sex- and Gender-Based Analysis (SGBA) includes the consideration of sex-based (biological) and gender-based (sociocultural) differences between men, women,

boys, girls, and gender-diverse people in the design and practice of analysis (Masuda et al., 2018). The Government of Canada now employs Gender-Based Analysis Plus (GBA+) as an analytical tool to assess how diverse groups of women, men, and gender-diverse people may experience policies, programs, and initiatives (Government of Canada, 2021). The "plus" in GBA+ goes beyond biological (sex) and sociocultural (gender) differences; it stresses the interaction and intersectionality of multiple identity factors (such as race, religion, age, and ability).

The Native Women's Association of Canada (NWAC) has developed a culturally relevant gender-based analysis (CR-GBA) approach that goes beyond non-Indigenous understandings of GBA+ to recognize that sex and gender intersect, not just with other identity factors, but with historical, cultural, racialized, and political factors that shape experiences (NWAC, 2020, 2023). NWAC advances CR-GBA frameworks that situate genders within different contexts and across broad systems and structures. Further, CR-GBA reveals how the health of the air, land, and water interconnects with the health of Indigenous women's and other gender-diverse people's bodies (NWAC, 2023). The tenets of CBPR and ILCBPR align with the tenets of CR-GBA; that is, CR-GBA is a process that is collaborative, reciprocal, distinctions based, trauma informed, and culturally grounded (NWAC, 2023). In CBPR involving Indigenous Peoples and ILCBPR, we have learned from those like Arvin et al. (2013) and Simpson (2017) about the need to recognize how Indigenous women and gender-diverse people are simultaneously affected by colonialism and heteropatriarchy, how oppression under colonialism is gendered, and how we must challenge dominant cultural narratives about gender and sex.

In the development of a research program, for which we were seeking funding from a federal health research agency, one of the application requirements was the identification of a "sex and gender champion." The champion needed to be a researcher who had expertise in the study of sex as a biological variable and/or gender as a determinant of health. Their role was to ensure that sex and/or gender considerations were integrated throughout the research. We had no difficulty in identifying such a champion for our team; however, they were non-Indigenous. But we took the Indigenous-led approach seriously, and so we approached the NWAC to partner with us in our work. We recognized that our request would involve a commitment of time and energy from NWAC, and we made clear that our request for their championing efforts was to be reciprocal in nature by asking how we could support their work and offering compensation for their time.

In one of our projects, gender considerations were very much at the forefront of the research, with the first research question asking, "What does a healthy future look like for the members of the community, across the gender spectrum, when our community gets back to living off the local environment using water (hydro), air (wind), earth (wood), and fire (solar)?" In the research objectives, we further articulated the gendered implications of exploring potential gender-based inequities in leadership, participation, benefits, and strategies being used to implement renewable energy projects in the community, including paying particular attention to potential gender-specific health inequities across the lifespan. In this community in particular, women have a central role in the well-being of the entire community and are the teachers who maintain the connection to the ancestors, to the earth, and to the land (Hanharan, 2008). The culture of this community was not based on a matriarchal or patriarchal system but was bilateral with a strong tendency to matrilocality (Bear Nicholas, 1994). In fact, the language of this nation does not differentiate gender (Bear Nicholas, 1994; Sherwood, 1983).

Questions to ask yourselves and develop protocols for: "How well-versed in CR-GBA is your team? What are your own assumptions about gender, and how did you develop them? What makes you 'well-versed' or not? What is your commitment to lifelong learning along this trajectory? Can you move beyond CR-GBA to make similar considerations for equity, diversity, and inclusion (EDI) more broadly? For those who have not begun the journey, will they be required to participate in any training such as gender-based violence, trauma-informed approaches, human rights, power, privilege, antioppression practices, social justice, and other workshops offered by your university and/or communities and organizations during the first year of their involvement with your research program? If there is turnover of team members, will you preferentially recruit

with a CR–GBA lens? How will you know how you are doing with respect to CR–GBA?" You might consider annual anonymized surveys to assess the impact CR–GBA is having in terms of accelerating leadership opportunities for women and gender-diverse team members; this could be evidenced by new research grants, new research appointments, and publications led by diverse team members. Tokenism is a serious obstacle in Western research; how will you measure the impact of your CR–GBA approach that centers and celebrates it? An excellent resource for the application of CR–GBA can be found in NWAC's recent publication, *Culturally Relevant Gender-Based Analysis: A Roadmap for Policy Development* (NWAC, 2023).

Finishing Up This Cup of Tea . . .

Diana: As an Indigenous researcher, there are two important points I must stress as we finish up our cup of tea. First, non-Indigenous researchers must equitably engage with Indigenous researchers in a research program, not just so they are able to check a box for the research application, but in true partnership. Second, research partners must recognize that Indigenous people come to research from a place of responsibility—responsibility to our ancestors who came before us, and to the generations yet to come. We come with a responsibility to all of Creation—*msit no'kmaq* (to all my relations). Our ethics are interwoven throughout the research relationship and are guiding us as we are doing the research for our community and for those who cannot or are no longer able to do so.

Heather: All researchers who are doing work "in a good way" (Ball & Janyst, 2008), by drinking tea in ILCBPR, are not just fake-listening to Indigenous community leaders or community members. They are not just stepping out of the office to have a one-off meeting with Indigenous Peoples to secure the letters of partnership required to prove they have relationships with them for their funding agencies. Those who are drinking tea are actively working to take the backseat in research (see Castleden, Martin, et al., 2017), to disrupt systemic, structural, and interpersonal acts of anti-Indigenous racism, to call out White supremacy in the academy—from policies and procedures to peer review and publishing—and to unlearn their ways of being in a lifelong journey of decolonizing themselves. As tea-drinkers, we can, we should, we must continually do better in the spirit of healing, truth, reconciliation, justice, and support for Indigenous rights and responsibilities in research.

Ron: As we finish our tea, with so much more to hear and say with one another, with so much left unsaid and only partially heard already, I am reminded that we are always in the middle, that all our words and listening are in the midst of making sense, of transforming the world. I am reminded as well to continue to search, and search again, and again, to re-search, so as to learn with others to know better what we already know, to know critically the truths that shape our everyday lives so that we can transform and overcome the damaged and limiting conditions of our situation, and so that we can renew and strengthen the life-sustaining relations that enable our creative response and realization of our freedom dreams. Indeed, I am reminded that this is why research, the disciplined investigation of our world and ourselves to seek the most rigorous understanding, is a kind of sacred way of life, one that requires great humility in light of the determined efforts of the generations who have come before us also searching, and re-searching; each generation must search for those truths that will shape the changes needed to end injustice, to awaken each of us to our responsibilities to one another and to the earth that is the very possibility of life. From this in-between place of becoming otherwise, I am grateful beyond words for the wisdom shared and earned in the struggles to embody ILCBPR of which I have been a part; I hope that our days together in dialogue, in tears and laughter, in visits to Elder trees and walks along river banks, in silent engagement with our keyboards and one another's thoughts, bear fruit for all who read these words. I hope the questions we have posed help others find their own pathways ahead, pathways that can only be forged in the walking, in the movement of these words and this work into other times and places through the words and work of each succeeding generation.

Nicole: As someone relatively new to CBPR with Indigenous Peoples and ILCBPR, I have been reflecting on what I have learned in the months of meeting with this team to draft this essay. As our process on this specific task comes to a close, I find myself more focused on my unlearning than the learning. Dee, Heather, and Ron have graciously shared with me their insights and their wisdoms from their decades-long dedication to

CBPR with Indigenous Peoples and ILCBPR. But what is most apparent to me is how they approach their research, the importance of relationality, and the ethic that grounds their work: with me, with each other, with the communities where/with whom they work. It is the time for personal chats at the beginning of meetings, the space they create for me to contribute my ideas or challenge theirs, and the subtle (and not so subtle) ways in which they disrupt and decolonize the academy—and the responsibility I now feel to do the same.

Dee's Final Word: As we pass on our shared experiences, we also have much to learn from Nicole, as we witness her immersion into CBPR with Indigenous Peoples and ILCBPR. We hope that, like Nicole, you will have come to realize that "drinking tea" does not always take you on the path you expect. Rather, being open to and embracing the relationality required of ILCBPR work can generate the most transformative opportunities to do research with a "good heart and mind." As you too may be embarking on your own CBPR project, be it Indigenous-led or not, we hope that the key lessons we have learned on our collective journey, that we now share with you by inviting you to drink tea with us, can contribute toward ongoing efforts to decolonize all aspects of CBPR and the academy at large.

Author Note

Correspondence concerning this essay should be addressed to Diana Lewis, Department of Geography, Environment & Geomatics, 50 Stone Road East, Hutt Building, Guelph, ON, N1G 2W1. Email: diana.lewis@uoguelph.ca

Declaration of Interest

We have no known conflict of interest to disclose.

About the Authors

Diana Lewis (https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2433-2611) is an assistant professor, Canada Research Chair (Tier II) in Indigenous Environmental Health Governance, and director of the IndigenERA Lab in the Department of Geography, Environment & Geomatics at the University of Guelph. Her research interests include fostering a wider understanding of Indigenous worldviews to inform how Indigenous peoples are impacted by resource or industrial development. She received her PhD in sociology from Dalhousie University.

Heather Castleden is a professor in the School of Public Administration at the University of Victoria, where she holds the President's Impact Chair in Transformative Governance in Planetary Health. Her research interests focus on decolonial community-based participatory research in solidarity with Indigenous peoples on environment, health, and governance matters that are important to them. She received her PhD in human geography from the University of Alberta.

Ronald David Glass is a historico-cultural-political psychoanalyst and an emeritus professor of philosophy of education at the University of California, Santa Cruz. His research focuses on moral and political issues in critical consciousness, and learning processes in the formation of just societies. He received his PhD from Stanford University.

Nicole Bates-Eamer works at the University of Victoria as an adjunct professor in the Department of Political Science and the associate director of CIFAL Victoria, a training hub in the United Nations Institute for Training and Research's global network. Her research relates to the policies, politics, and governance of community preparedness and well-being in a changing climate, particularly regarding displacements and human mobilities. She received her PhD in political science from the University of Victoria.

References

Arvin, M., Tuck, E., & Morrill, A. (2013). Decolonizing feminism: Challenging connections between settler colonialism and heteropatriarchy. *Feminist Formations, 25*(1), 8–34. https://doi.org/10.1353/ff.2013.0006

Awâsis, S. (2020). "Anishinaabe time": Temporalities and impact assessment in pipeline reviews. *Journal of Political Ecology, 27*(1), 830–852. https://doi.org/10.2458/v27i1.23236

Ball, J., & Janyst, P. (2008). Enacting research ethics in partnerships with Indigenous communities in Canada: "Do it in a good way." *Journal of Empirical Research on Human Research Ethics, 3*(2), 33–51. https://doi.org/10.1525/jer.2008.3.2.33

Baloy, N. J. K., Sabati, S., & Glass, R. D. (Eds.). (2016). *Unsettling research ethics: A collaborative conference report.* UC Center for Collaborative Research for an Equitable California. https://scholars.csus.edu/esploro/outputs/report/Unsettling-research-ethics-A-collaborative-conference/99258097463801671

Bawaka Country, Wright, S., Suchet-Pearson, S., Lloyd, K., Burarrwanga, L., Ganambarr, R., Ganambarr-Stubbs, M., Ganambarr, B., Maymuru, D., & Sweeney, J. (2016). Cobecoming Bawaka: Towards a relational understanding of place/space. *Progress in Human Geography, 40*(4), 455–475. https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132515589437

BC First Nations' Data Governance Initiative (BCFNDGI). (n.d.). *British Columbia First Nations' Data Governance Initiative (BCFNDGI): A collaboration of nations asserting data sovereignty.* Retrieved May 30, 2023, from https://www.bcfndgi.com/

Bear Nicholas, A. (1994). Colonialism and the struggle for liberation: The experience of Maliseet women. *University of New Brunswick Law Journal, 43*(223). https://journals.lib.unb.ca/index.php/unblj/article/view/29652

Bozalek, V., Leibowitz, B., Carolissen, R., & Boler, M. (Eds.). (2014). *Discerning critical hope in educational practices.* Routledge.

Bull, J., & Hudson, A. (2019). Research governance in NunatuKavut: Engagement, expectations and evolution. *International Journal of Circumpolar Health, 78*(2), Article 1556558. https://doi.org/10.1080/22423982.2018.1556558

Canadian Institutes of Health Research, Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada, & Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council. (2018). Research involving the First Nations, Inuit and Métis Peoples of Canada. In *Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans.* https://ethics.gc.ca/eng/tcps2-eptc2_2018_chapter9-chapitre9.html

Castleden, H., Bennett, E., Pictou Landing Native Women's Group, Lewis, D., & Martin, D. (2017). "Put it near the Indians": Indigenous perspectives on pulp mill contaminants in their traditional territories (Pictou Landing First Nation, Canada). *Progress in Community Health Partnerships: Research, Education, and Action, 11*(1), 25–33. https://doi.org/10.1353/cpr.2017.0004

Castleden, H. E., Martin, D., Cunsolo, A., Harper, S., Hart, C., Sylvestre, P., Stefanelli, R., Day, L., & Lauridsen, K. (2017). Implementing Indigenous and Western knowledge systems (Part 2): "You have to take a backseat" and abandon the arrogance of expertise. *The International Indigenous Policy Journal, 8*(4), Article 4. https://doi.org/10.18584/iipj.2017.8.4.8

Castleden, H. E., Morgan, V. S., & Lamb, C. (2012). "I spent the first year drinking tea": Exploring Canadian university researchers' perspectives on community-based participatory research involving Indigenous peoples. *Canadian Geographies/Les Géographies Canadiennes, 56*(2), 160–179. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1541-0064.2012.00432.x

Castleden, H., Sylvestre, P., Martin, D., & McNally, M. (2015). "I don't think that any peer review committee . . . would ever 'get' what I currently do": How institutional metrics for success and merit risk perpetuating the (re)production of colonial relationships in community-based participatory research involving Indigenous Peoples in Canada. *International Indigenous Policy Journal, 6*(4). https://doi.org/10.18584/iipj.2015.6.4.2

Convention on Biological Diversity. (2022). Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework. CBD/COP/DEC/15/4. https://www.cbd.int/doc/decisions/cop-15/cop-15-dec-04-en.pdf

Coombes, B., Johnson, J. T., & Howitt, R. (2014). Indigenous geographies III: Methodological innovation and the unsettling of participatory research. *Progress in Human Geography, 38*(6), 845–854. https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132513514723

Corntassel, J., & Hardbarger, T. (2019). Educate to perpetuate: Land-based pedagogies and community resurgence. *International Review of Education, 65*, 87–116. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11159-018-9759-1

Crooks, V., & Castleden, H. (2012). All we really needed to know about tenure-track faculty positions we did not learn in graduate school. *The Canadian Geographer/Le Géographe Canadien, 56*(4), 393–397. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1541-0064.2012.00463.x

Daigle, M. (2016). Awawanenitakik: The spatial politics of recognition and relational geographies of Indigenous self-determination. *The Canadian Geographer/Le Géographe Canadien, 60*(2), 259–269. https://doi.org/10.1111/cag.12260

de Leeuw, S., & Hunt, S. (2018). Unsettling decolonizing geographies. *Geography Compass, 12*(7), Article e12376. https://doi.org/10.1111/gec3.12376

Ermine, W. (2007). The ethical space of engagement. *Indigenous Law Journal, 6*(1), 193–203. https://jps.library.utoronto.ca/index.php/ilj/article/view/27669

First Nations Information Governance Centre. (2020). *A First Nations data governance strategy*. https://fnigc.ca/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/FNIGC_FNDGS_report_EN_FINAL.pdf

Foster, S. S., & Glass, R. D. (2017). Ethical, epistemic, and political issues in equity-oriented collaborative community-based research. In L. L. Rowell, C. D. Bruce, J. M. Shosh, & M. M. Riel (Eds.), *The Palgrave international handbook of action research* (pp. 511–526). Palgrave MacMillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-40523-4_31

Freire, P. (1994). *Pedagogy of hope: Reliving pedagogy of the oppressed*. Continuum.

Glass, R. D. (2010). Memories of Paulo Freire. In T. Wilson, P. Park, & A. Colón-Muñiz (Eds.), *Memories of Paulo* (Cultural Studies and Education Vol. 60, pp. 53–59). Brill. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789460912191_014

Glass, R. D., Morton, J. M., King, J. E., Krueger-Henney, P., Moses, M. S., Sabati, S., & Richardson, T. (2018). The ethical stakes of collaborative community-based social science research. *Urban Education, 53*(4), 503–531. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085918762522

Glass, R. D., & Stoudt, B. (2019). Collaborative research for justice and multi-issue movement building: Challenging discriminatory policing, school closures, and youth unemployment. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 27*, Article 52. https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.27.4470

Global Indigenous Data Alliance. (n.d.). *CARE principles for Indigenous data governance*. https://www.gida-global.org/care

Government of Canada. (2021). *What is Gender-Based Analysis Plus*. https://www.canada.ca/en/women-gender-equality/gender-based-analysis-plus/what-gender-based-analysis-plus.html

Government of Canada. (2023). *Implementing the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples Act*. https://www.justice.gc.ca/eng/declaration/index.html

Hanharan, M. (2008). Carrying the pipe: Maliseet Elder, healer and teacher Imelda Perley. *Canadian Woman Studies/Les Cahiers de la Femme, 26*(3–4). https://cws.journals.yorku.ca/index.php/cws/article/view/22132

Horton, M., & Freire, P. (1990). *We make the road by walking: Conversations on education and social change* (B. Bell, J. Gaventa, & J. Peters, Eds.). Temple University Press.

Hughes, M., Wilson, S., & Barlo, S. (2023). Preparing for the research ceremony: Indigenist researcher training. *Qualitative Inquiry, 29*(3–4), 509–517. https://doi.org/10.1177/10778004221111381

Lewis, D., Castleden, H., Apostle, R., Francis, S., & Francis-Strickland, K. (2020). Governmental fiduciary failure in Indigenous environmental health justice: The case of Pictou Landing First Nation. *International Journal of Indigenous Health, 15*(1), 61–72. https://doi.org/10.32799/ijih.v15i1.34085

Lewis, D., Castleden, H., Francis, S., Strickland, K., & Denny, C. (2016). Increasing response rates on face-to-face surveys with Indigenous communities in Canada: Lessons from Pictou Landing. *Progress in Community Health Partnerships: Research, Education, and Action, 10*(2), 197–205. https://doi.org/10.1353/cpr.2016.0021

Lewis, D., Castleden, H., Apostle, R., Francis, S., & Francis-Strickland, K. (2021). Linking land displacement and environmental dispossession to Mi'kmaw health and well-being: Culturally relevant place-based interpretive frameworks matter. *The Canadian Geographer/Le Géographe canadien, 65*(1), 66–81. https://doi.org/10.1111/cag.12656

Lewis, D., Francis, S., Francis-Strickland, K., Castleden, H., & Apostle, R. (2021). If only they had accessed the data: Governmental failure to monitor pulp mill impacts on human health in Pictou Landing First Nation. *Social Science & Medicine, 288*, Article 113184. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2020.113184

London, R. A., Glass, R. D., Chang, E., Sabati, S., & Nojan, S. (2022). "We are about life-changing research": Community partner perspectives on community-engaged research collaborations. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 26*(1), 19–36. https://openjournals.libs.uga.edu/jheoe/article/view/2512

Lowman, E., & Barker, A. (2015). *Settler: Identity and colonialism in 21st century Canada*. Fernwood.

Masuda, J., Harney, S., Chan, S., Nowell, M., & Kruger, A. (2018). *A SHARED Future living compendium 1.0: Guide and toolkit: A resource from your gender co-champions*. Centre for Environmental Health Equity. https://asharedfuture.ca/wp-content/uploads/2020/05/A-SHARED-Future-Living-Compendium-1.0.pdf

Morphy, F. (2016). Indigenising demographic categories: A prolegomenon to Indigenous data sovereignty. In T. Kukutai (Ed.), *Indigenous data sovereignty: Toward an agenda* (pp. 99–115). Australia National University Press. https://doi.org/10.22459/CAEPR38.11.2016.06

Native Nations Institute. (n.d.). *Indigenous data sovereignty and governance*. The University of Arizona Native Nations Institute. Retrieved July 4, 2023, from https://nni.arizona.edu/our-work/research-policy-analysis/indigenous-data-sovereignty-governance

Native Women's Association of Canada. (2020). *A culturally relevant gender-based analysis (CRGBA) starter kit: Introduction, incorporation, and illustrations of use*. https://nwac.ca/assets-knowledge-centre/A-Culturally-Relevant-Gender-Based-Analysis.pdf

Native Women's Association of Canada. (2023). *Culturally relevant gender-based analysis: A roadmap for policy development*. https://nwac.ca/assets-knowledge-centre/CRGBA_Framework_Roadmap_May11_2022-1_2023-02-21-141640_tiaz.pdf

Newman, A., & Glass, R. D. (2014). Comparing ethical and epistemic standards for investigative journalists and equity-oriented collaborative community-based researchers: Why working for a university matters. *The Journal of Higher Education, 85*(3), 283–311. https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2014.11777329

Nixon, R. (2013). *Slow violence and the environmentalism of the poor*. Harvard University Press. https://doi.org/10.4159/harvard.9780674061194

Ontario Federation of Indigenous Friendship Centres (OFIFC). (2016). *USAI research framework: Utility self-voicing access inter-relationality* (2nd ed.). https://ofifc.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/03/USAI-Research-Framework-Second-Edition.pdf

Parsons, M., Fisher, K., & Crease, R. P. (2021). Legal and ontological pluralism: Recognising rivers as more-than-human entities. In *Decolonising Blue Spaces in the Anthropocene: Freshwater management in Aotearoa New Zealand* (pp. 235–282). Springer Nature. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-61071-5

Pictou Landing Native Women's Group, Castleden, H., Lewis, D., Jamieson, R., Gibson, M., Rainham, D., Russell, R., Martin, D., & Hart, C. (2016). *"Our ancestors are in our land, water, and air": A Two-Eyed Seeing approach to researching environmental health concerns with Pictou Landing First Nation—Final report*. Health, Environments, and Communities Lab, Queen's Universitiy. https://www.nccih.ca/634/_Our_Ancestors_are_in_our_Land,_Water,_and_Air___A_Two-Eyed_Seeing_Approach_to_Researching_Environme....nccih?id=2555&col=4

Rose, J., & Castleden, H. (2022). "A serious rift": The Indigenous health research community's refusal of the 2014 CIHR funding reforms and underlying methodological conservatism. *The International Indigenous Policy Journal, 13*(3), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.18584/iipj.2022.13.3.13961

Rotz, S., Rose, J., Masuda, J., Lewis, D., & Castleden, H. (2022). Toward intersectional and culturally relevant sex and gender analysis in health research. *Social Science & Medicine, 292*, Article 114459. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2021.114459

Sabati, S. (2019). Upholding "colonial unknowing" through the IRB: Reframing institutional research ethics. *Qualitative Inquiry, 25*(9–10), 1056–1064. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800418787214

Sanchez-Pimienta, C. E., Masuda, J. R., Doucette, M. B., Lewis, D., Rotz, S., on behalf of the Native Women's Association of Canada, Neufeld, H. T., & Castleden, H. (2021). Implementing Indigenous gender-based analysis in research: Principles, practices and lessons learned. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 18*(21), Article 11572. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph182111572

Sherwood, D. F. (1983). Maliseet verbs of possession. *Linguistic Inquiry, 14*(2), 351–356.

Simpson, L. B. (2017). *As we have always done: Indigenous freedom through radical resistance.* University of Minnesota Press. https://doi.org/10.5749/j.ctt1pwt77c

Sprague Martinez, L., Chassler, D., Lobb, R., Hakim, D., Pamphile, J., & Battaglia, T. A. (2023). A discussion among deans on advancing community engaged research. *Clinical and Translational Science, 16*(4), 557–563. https://doi.org/10.1111/cts.13478

Stefanelli, R. D., Walker, C., Kornelsen, D., Lewis, D., Martin, D. H., Masuda, J., Richmond, C. A. M., Root, E., Neufeld, H. T., & Castleden, H. (2019). Renewable energy and energy autonomy: How Indigenous Peoples in Canada are shaping an energy future. *Environmental Reviews, 27*(1), 95–105. https://doi.org/10.1139/er-2018-0024

Stiegman, M. L., & Castleden, H. (2015). Leashes and lies: Navigating the colonial tensions of institutional ethics of research involving Indigenous Peoples in Canada. *International Indigenous Policy Journal, 6*(3), Article 2. https://doi.org/10.18584/iipj.2015.6.3.2

Sylvestre, P. (2021). Modulating eventfulness: How liaison policing strategies mitigate potentiality in Indigenous land defence organising. *Antipode, 53*(6), 1807–1828. https://doi.org/10.1111/anti.12735

Sylvestre, P., Castleden, H., Martin, D., & McNally, M. (2018). "Thank you very much . . . you can leave our community now.": Geographies of responsibility, relational ethics, acts of refusal, and the conflicting requirements of academic localities in Indigenous research. *ACME: An International Journal for Critical Geographies, 17*(3), 750–779. https://acme-journal.org/index.php/acme/article/view/1327

Taylor, J., & Kukutai, T. (Eds.). (2016). *Indigenous data sovereignty: Toward an agenda.* Australian National University Press. https://library.oapen.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.12657/31875/1/624262.pdf

Tuck, E., & Yang, K. W. (2014). R-words: Refusing research. In D. Paris & T. Winn (Eds.), *Humanizing research: Decolonizing qualitative inquiry with youth and communities* (pp. 223–248). SAGE. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781544329611

Walker, C., Alexander, A., Doucette, M. B., Lewis, D., Neufeld, H. T., Martin, D., Masuda, J., Stefanelli, R., & Castleden, H. (2019). Are the pens working for justice? News media coverage of renewable energy involving Indigenous Peoples in Canada. *Energy Research & Social Science, 57*, Article 101230. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2019.101230

Walker, C. J., Doucette, M. B., Rotz, S., Lewis, D., Neufeld, H. T., & Castleden, H. (2021). Non-Indigenous partner perspectives on Indigenous Peoples' involvement in renewable energy: Exploring reconciliation as relationships of accountability or status quo innocence? *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management: An International Journal, 16*(3/4), 636–657. https://doi.org/10.1108/QROM-04-2020-1916

Walter, M., & Andersen, C. (2016). *Indigenous statistics: A quantitative research methodology.* Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315426570

Walter, M., & Suina, M. (2019). Indigenous data, Indigenous methodologies and Indigenous

data sovereignty. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology, 22*(3), 233–243. https://doi.org/10.1080/13645579.2018.1531228

Wilkes, R. (2015). Indigenous resistance in comparative perspective: An overview with an autobiographical research critique. In E. Coburn (Ed.), *More will sing their way to freedom: Indigenous resistance and resurgence* (pp. 111–128). Fernwood Publishing.

Wilson, S. (2008). *Research is ceremony: Indigenous research methods.* Fernwood Publishing.

Wolfe, P. (2006). Settler colonialism and the elimination of the native. *Journal of Genocide Research, 8*(4), 387–409. https://doi.org/10.1080/14623520601056240

Woodward, E., & McTaggart, P. M. (2016). Transforming cross-cultural water research through trust, participation and place. *Geographical Research, 54*(2), 129–142. https://doi.org/10.1111/1745-5871.12136