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Introduction

Indigenous peoples in Canada face many challenges because of the impact of globalization, rapid technological change, and a neo-liberal market economy with its shrinking governmental support. Many Indigenous peoples continue to live in substandard conditions and poverty. However, they also face many opportunities, since much of the industrial development of natural resources occurs on their traditional territories. Recent Supreme Court of Canada case law states that they need to be consulted and accommodated in any development projects that might impact their Aboriginal rights. Thus, there is an urgent need for effective leadership for Indigenous communities to adapt to this external change and to build the internal capacity to take advantage of economic opportunities. Developing effective Indigenous leaders requires a blended approach of revitalizing traditional cultural principles and values while teaching them the core competencies required for success in the modern business world. The wisdom of Indigenous knowledge systems must also be developed, along with Western knowledge and skills to run the governments, organizations, and businesses of today’s Indigenous communities.

In this chapter, we describe a wise practices approach to successful community economic development. This wise practices approach is informed by a review of literature on best practices in Indigenous business, economic development, and community
development. From this literature review, we identified seven elements that are essential for modern Indigenous leaders to cultivate in order to lead their communities through the rapid changes that are occurring. In addition, the modern Indigenous leader must meet the community’s needs and aspirations, while preserving his or her community’s culture and traditions.

Approaches to Indigenous Economic Development
There have been many approaches to Indigenous economic development, most often imposed upon First Nations communities by governments or non-governmental organizations. Such approaches have often been assimilationist in nature. They argued that adhering to cultural values, traditions, and knowledge actually placed Indigenous peoples at a disadvantage. Within the assimilationist stream is modernization theory, which views industrialization and technological advances as part of an inevitable progress (Calliou and Voyageur 2007). Thus, modernists argue that economic underdevelopment among most Indigenous peoples is due to outmoded economic organization and ideas. Modernists further state that if Indigenous peoples do not undergo industrialization and are unable to change with the times, then their disadvantaged position vis-à-vis the Canadian economy is really of their own doing. This “blaming the victim” stance does not recognize the societal, institutional, and structural barriers that restrict Indigenous participation in the market economy. The modernization theory is reflected in the neo-liberal view of a capitalist, market-driven economic system that supports Western liberal democratic values such as individualism, consumerism, individual property ownership, and wealth accumulation. Such notions often set up a clash of cultural values with Indigenous peoples, who generally have a strong belief in collectivism, a spiritual connection to the land and its resources, and a history of sharing the land rather than exclusive ownership of it.

Other theories have challenged modernization theory by highlighting the overt and systemic structures that marginalize Indigenous peoples from the economy. The metropolis-hinterland theory argues that at the root of legal and political barriers are the
metropolitan centres run by elites who exploit the raw materials of the hinterland regions, where Indigenous peoples generally live, and then sell the finished products back to the outlying areas (Davis 1971). Colonialist theory argues that Indigenous communities are essentially internal colonies that are exploited for economic gain by the dominant society, which uses them as a source for cheap resources and unskilled labour (Frideres 1988; Abele 1997, 129). Dependency theory argues that underdevelopment can only be understood by analyzing the economic and power relationships between developed and underdeveloped economies (Dos Santos 1971; Frank 1966). Indigenous peoples have become dependent upon the productive relationships established by the capitalist metropolises of developed countries. Thus, world systems related to a global capitalist economy benefit some regions and lead to the underdevelopment of others (Wallerstein 2004). Robert Anderson (1999) set out a “contingency” theory wherein he argues that while there are world systems at play, Indigenous peoples’ participation in the global economy is contingent upon a number of factors, many of which can be controlled by Indigenous peoples themselves. This contingency approach takes agency and social relations seriously, and emphasizes a community-driven approach to economic development where the community is an active agent in development and controls its pace and nature. Indigenous peoples in Canada have been advocating for greater self-government, respect for their rights to their traditional lands and resources, and an active role in economic development on their traditional lands. Government policy has been established through history to play a role in Indigenous economic development.

Federal Government Policy on Indigenous Economic Development

Historically, Indigenous peoples in Canada adapted well to the presence of the new settler populations, especially during the fur trade, where they played prominent roles (Ray 1974). Indigenous peoples also began to adapt somewhat successfully to the new agricultural economy, and it was government policy that began to impede Indigenous communities’ agricultural success by restrict-
ing their ability to sell their products (Carter 1990). Indigenous peoples in Canada also adopted seasonal labour as a way to earn income and continue their traditional livelihood of hunting, fishing, and trapping (High 1996; Elias 1990). It is only relatively recently that Indigenous peoples have been marginalized from the economy—from the early 1920s onward (Tough 1992).

Federal government policy had an assimilationist agenda early on, and residential school policy had a significant impact on Indigenous identity and cultural capital (Tobias 1976; Milloy 1999). State-sponsored welfare programs also led many Indigenous citizens to become dependent (Helin 2006). Furthermore, policy and laws such as the Indian Act imposed further barriers to Indigenous involvement in the national economy and limited the possibilities of success (Calliou and Voyageur 2007, 140). As one commentator stated, in all liberal democracies such as Canada, Indigenous peoples are transformed into “politically weak, economically marginal and culturally stigmatized members of national societies” (Dyck 1985, 1).

More recently, the Canadian federal government has attempted to deal with Indigenous involvement in the economy through a variety of policies. The federal government instituted a policy in 1989 entitled the Canadian Aboriginal Economic Development Strategy (CAEDS), which was a partnership between three federal government departments. The Department of Indian and Northern Development funded programs in community economic and resource development; the Department of Employment and Immigration funded training and skills development; and the Department of Industry, Science and Technology funded programs in business development.

More recently, in 2009, the Conservative federal government instituted a new policy entitled the Federal Framework for Aboriginal Economic Development (FFAED), which strongly reflects the Conservative government’s neo-liberal approach to the “good society.” Their policy efforts are focused on opening up Canada’s natural resources for the world to exploit. Of course, the natural resources are on traditional Indigenous lands. This market-driven approach to Indigenous participation in the national
economy sees the policy focus on partnerships with private industry, a strong emphasis on northern development, especially of its natural resources, a results-based approach to any funding investments, and enabling legislation (Oppenheimer and Weir 2010).

Much government policy and many non-governmental organizational approaches to Indigenous economic development focused on capacity development and training, particularly in business, management, and leadership development. Some Indigenous institutions were established to carry out such training, including the Council for the Advancement of Native Development Officers, the Indigenous Leadership Institute, the Aboriginal Financial Officers Association, and the National Centre for First Nations Governance. Many post-secondary institutions also established training programs to meet this need (O’Connell, Oppenheimer, and Weir 2010). Each of these institutions uses a variety of methods to deliver the training. One method to learning in the areas of leadership, management, and business is the best practices approach.

**Best Practices in Business and Management**

Leadership development programs use a variety of methods and approaches to teach leadership and management (McGonagill and Pruyn 2010). Besides formal lectures in post-secondary institutions, many organizational or community leaders also rely on the best practices case study approach to develop leaders and look for ways to improve (Leskiw and Singh 2007).

So what are best practices? One definition states that best practices are the “methodologies, strategies, procedures, practices and/or processes that consistently produce successful results” (Foy, Krehbiel, and Plate 2009, i). A best practice is “a proven method, technique, or process for achieving a specific outcome under a specific circumstance and in an effective way” (Calliou and Wesley-Esquimaux 2010, 5).

Best practices are essentially documented case histories of innovation and performance success in a specific practice area. They provide guidelines for others to learn from because of the detailed analysis of the practice under study.
There have been a number of studies that reviewed and documented best practices of Indigenous communities in their economic or community development. We gathered many of the main studies of best practices and analyzed them and drew our own conclusions.

**Literature Review of Best Practices in Indigenous Community Economic Development**

We now provide an overview of some of the literature and studies of best practices in Indigenous community and economic development. These studies have generally identified certain key elements of success that provide a basis for understanding how or why some Indigenous communities achieve results.

**Harvard Project on American Indian Economic Development**

One of the best-known studies of successful Indigenous economic development is the Harvard Project on American Indian Economic Development (HPAIED). The HPAIED began in the mid-1980s and explored why some Native American tribes were defying the odds and achieving economic success and strong community growth. There were some tribes who stood out from the others in achieving success, while the majority were struggling with poverty and dependence. Initially, the study focused narrowly on tribal economics, especially employment and businesses, but what the researchers found was much broader and was as much social and political. One could not really understand tribal economic development without considering the entire community structure, systems, and institutions. In other words, the study of tribal economic development required a holistic approach where a broader set of success factors could be identified and explored.

The HPAIED concluded that in order to achieve successful tribal economic development, there had to be a strong self-governing community that had a stable environment in which investors were willing to risk investment dollars. Only once these factors were in place could they achieve success in their economic development ventures. The HPAIED study came up with four main success factors: 1) de facto sovereignty, that is, the exercise of local autonomy; 2) effective institutions that match the culture, that is,
they set up rules of engagement in the community that resonate with the community’s cultural values; 3) strategic direction, that is, long-term strategic planning rather than short-term decisions; 4) strong, action-oriented leadership, that is, effective leaders who move their strategic vision and ideas into action to achieve results. These were strong leaders who led drastic changes in their communities, who were willing to break with the status quo so there would be improved conditions in their communities. The HPAIED termed this the nation-building approach to Indigenous community economic development (Cornell and Kalt 1988, 1990, 2000; Cornell and Gil-Swedberg 1995; Kalt 1993; Jorgensen 2007).

**National Centre for First Nations Governance**
The National Centre for First Nations Governance, an independent, non-profit, Indigenous-run institution, has developed an approach to assist in leadership development and governance that includes a set of key components: the people (citizens); the land (territory and community lands); laws and jurisdiction; institutions; and resources. Through the governance of these key components, they also identified the following leadership and governance principles necessary to lead and govern First Nations successfully: strategic vision; meaningful information sharing; participation in decision making; territorial integrity; economic realization; respect for the spirit of the land; expansion of jurisdiction; rule of law; transparency and fairness; results-based organizations; cultural alignment of institutions; effective intergovernmental relations; human resource capacity; financial management capacity; performance evaluation; accountability and reporting; diversity of revenue sources. They also published a best practices report that uses case studies to illustrate these leadership and governance principles (NCFNG 2009).

**Institute on Governance**
The Institute on Governance, an independent, non-profit public interest agency located in Ottawa with a mission to advance better governance in the public interest, carried out a number of reports on Aboriginal governance. In some of their reports, they have set
out a model with five principles of good governance: legitimacy and voice; direction; performance; accountability; and fairness (Amos, Graham, and Plumptre 2003; Bruhn and Graham 2009; Bruhn 2009).

**UN Development Program**
The United Nations’ Development Program (UNDP) has identified nine principles of good governance for assistance to developing countries: participation; consensus orientation; strategic vision; responsiveness; effectiveness and efficiency; accountability; transparency; equity; and rule of law (Amos, Graham, and Plumptre 2003).

**DIAND Governance Action Plan**
The federal government of Canada’s Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (DIAND) created a governance action plan to guide its work with First Nations building their capacity for self-government. In their governance action plan, they identified seven “key drivers or levers of capacity development for good governance”: a vision or sense of self as self-governing; stable and effective leadership; effective governing institutions; culture match; strategic orientation; citizen engagement; and effective and stable intergovernmental relations (INAC 2000).

**Friendship Centre Movement Best Practices in Governance and Management**
The Friendship Centre movement in Canada has done great work in bringing culturally appropriate services and programs to urban Aboriginals and off-reserve Indians. The National Association of Friendship Centres partnered with the Institute on Governance to document various Friendship Centres’ best practices. The key factors of successful practices include: board governance; executive leadership; staffing; volunteers; strategic planning; evaluation; adaptive capacity; external relations; sustainability; fundraising; and human resource management. They documented one best practice case study on each of these practice areas to illustrate that specific Friendship Centre’s approach to achievement (Graham and Kinmond 2008; Graham and Mitchell 2009).
Conference Board of Canada
The Conference Board of Canada produced a report that examined ten Aboriginal communities and identified six key factors to success in creating wealth and employment as part of Aboriginal economic development efforts: strong leadership and vision; strategic community economic development plan; access to capital, markets, and management expertise; good governance and management; transparency and accountability; and the positive interplay of business and politics (Loizides and Wuttunee 2005). In another report on best practices in Aboriginal businesses, they set out the following factors of success: purpose; clear corporate vision; winning attitude; using creativity to overcome obstacles; good location; experience and expertise; hiring people from outside the community; recruitment and retention; and developing partnerships (Nelson and Sisco 2008). In yet another report on successful Aboriginal businesses, they looked at ten case studies to form the basis of their conclusion on three main factors of success: leadership; sound business practices; and strong relationships and partnerships (Sisco and Stewart 2009).

Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples
The RCAP report identified five critical factors of success in community economic development in the following manner: restoration of power and control over lands and resources; development of a positive and encouraging social/political/cultural climate for Aboriginal economic development; development of enabling instruments for use in surmounting the problems facing Aboriginal economic development; development of a skilled and positive, forward-looking labour force; and acceptance and willingness to engage in economic activity by the mainstream in collaboration with Aboriginal people (Wein 1999; Newhouse 1999).

Human Resources Development Canada
The federal government’s Human Resources Development Canada department produced a report on Aboriginal social and economic development that set out lessons learned that they feel are important as factors for successful Aboriginal development: governance; planning and policy development; control over resources
and funding arrangements; program delivery and management; accountability; capacity building; and other requirements such as coordination across programs, combining human resource and economic development, and linking education and training to employment (HRDC 1999).

Comprehensive Community Planning Workshop
The Okanagan Indian Band in British Columbia hosted a workshop on comprehensive community planning, and Indian and Northern Affairs Canada (INAC) wrote a report on it setting out the lessons learned, which include: community-based and community-driven planning; building a planning team and process; financial resources mobilization; capacity building, planning tools, and resources; intergovernmental relations; and linkages, networking, and sharing of best practices (INAC 2005).

Public Works Management in First Nations Communities
Public Works and Government Services Canada and Indian Affairs Canada developed a report on good public works management in First Nations communities that explored the experiences of six communities to identify the following keys to success: vision; leadership; policies; management and administration; self-sufficiency; human resources; asset protection and management; accountability; and fiscal accountability (INAC and PWGSC 2002).

Indigenous Research and Education, Charles Darwin University
Indigenous scholar Darryl Cronin, of the Indigenous Research and Education faculty at Charles Darwin University in Australia, developed a paper exploring what Aboriginal people think about governance and community development. He identified the following key elements of a governance and development approach: Aboriginal authority; jurisdictional authority; cultural appropriateness; research, education, and training; leadership; strengthening families; direct and adequate funding; private-sector and non-profit-sector partnerships; and capacity of government agencies (Cronin 2003).
The studies reviewed above informed our own “seven elements of success” model described below. However, before we describe our model, we will critique the concept of “best practices” and rationalize why we chose instead to adopt the concept of “wise practices.”

**Critique of the “Best Practices” Concept**

There is an assumption that calling practices “best practices” means they can inspire others and encourage leaders to improve their own practices. The assumption is that these documented stories can make a difference to those who study them, and that the knowledge can be transferred into action using the best practice case study as a guide. Best practices case studies are also used as a benchmark against which to compare one’s own community or organization. Although there is some truth to each of these assumptions, there is a growing skepticism about the universality of best practices.

There is much utility in learning from best practices case studies. However, as one education scholar put it, best practices can unrealistically elevate expectations, best practices’ “too confident hope ordinarily smashes against the rocks of reality,” and the attempt to implement best practices “ordinarily diverts attention away from the practical to the theoretic” (Davis 1997, 1). Some commentators caution that we cannot assume that what is successful in one situation, context, or culture will necessarily work in a completely different one (Krajewski and Silver, n.d.). Others have raised the issue of universality, asking the following: How could this supposed objective, universal standard of best practice “take into account context and values, subjectivity and plurality? How could it accommodate multiple perspectives, with different groups in different places having different views of what quality was or different interpretations of criteria?” (Dahlberg, Moss, and Pence 1999, 4). Thus, the term “best practices” is often decontextualized and cannot always be generalized into another context or culture.

Furthermore, another question arises: What criteria determine what is “best”? It is often a Western corporate standard. It reflects a certain ideological lens—that of the neo-liberal market. Certainly, the criteria of what successful or best practice is can dif-
fer between Western liberal democracies and Indigenous peoples. Cornell (1987) argues that the middle-class dream of success in the United States is not necessarily the same definition of success that most Native Americans have. Thus, best practices tend to reflect hierarchical evaluative criteria that also tend to exclude local and Indigenous knowledge and ways of doing. For case studies to resonate and be relevant, they need to allow for other perspectives, knowledge, and experiences. There has been a similar assumption that Western-based knowledge and experience with respect to leadership, management, and business practices have an objective quality that can be universally applied to other cultures. Hofstede (1980, 1983) has argued that the failure of many international development initiatives during the 1960s and 1970s was partly due to the lack of cultural sensitivity in the transfer of management ideas. In fact, culture matters. Many Indigenous scholars are arguing that modern management and business practices and knowledge are important for Indigenous peoples, but that they must be reconciled with and built upon traditional cultural values and knowledge (Wuttunee 2004; Smith 2000; Neilsen and Redpath 1997; Newhouse 2000; Calliou 2005).

Finally, some commentators have argued that best practices in adult education are running the risk of eroding the traditional grounding in an ethic of the common good and of social justice (Bartlette 2008). Indigenous communities that involve themselves in successful business enterprises do so for the collective good, for social purposes, and to maintain their cultural identity (Anderson 2001; Champagne 2004).

More Indigenous people have argued that there is something missing in how Indigenous community and leadership development is approached (Snowball and Wesley-Esquimaux 2010; Thoms 2007). They argue that an approach other than best practices must be developed, one that makes a space for Indigenous knowledge, experiences, and stories “learned on the frontlines through socio-cultural insight, ingenuity, intuition, long experience, and trial and error” (Thoms 2007, 8).
The Wise Practices Approach to Economic and Leadership Development

Taking the foregoing critique into account, and in order to resonate with Indigenous leaders, we adopt the notion of “wise practices” as an alternative term to “best practices.” Wise practices are best defined as “locally-appropriate actions, tools, principles or decisions that contribute significantly to the development of sustainable and equitable conditions” (Calliou and Wesley-Esquimaux 2010, 19). Rather than aspiring to be universal, as best practices try to be, wise practices are “idiosyncratic, contextual, textured, and not standardized” (Davis 1997). Thus, wise practices recognize the wisdom in each Indigenous community and in the community’s own stories of achieving success. The concept of wise practices recognizes that culture matters.

Wise practices are thus based on what so many Indigenous scholars have argued: the importance of an Indigenous identity and strong cultural ties (King 2008; Calliou 2005; Grint and Warner 2006; Cowan 2008; Ottmann, 2005b). Indigenous perceptions of leaders’ characteristics also inform the wise practices approach, as is illustrated by the words of Taiaiake Alfred (1999, 10) citing Leroy Little Bear, a Blackfoot philosopher and scholar:

A culture attempts to mold its members into ideal personalities. The ideal personality in Native American cultures is a person who shows kindness to all, who puts the group ahead of individual wants and desires, who is a generalist, who is steeped in spiritual and ritual knowledge—a person who goes about daily life and approaches “all his or her relations” in a sea of friendship, easy-going-ness, humour, and good feelings…. She or he is a person expected to display bravery, hardness, and strength against enemies and outsiders. She or he is a person who is adaptable and takes the world as it comes without complaint.

These characteristics of ideal persons reflect the principles of wisdom: fluid intelligence; ethical judgement; actions undertaken for noble and worthwhile purposes; working for the welfare of others; and having a metaphysical or spiritual quality (Kok 2009). Theorists and practitioners in organizational studies and leader-
ship development are increasingly becoming interested in wisdom. They see a need for wisdom to be practised by leaders, managers, and business persons who must make complex decisions in this period of rapid change, uncertainty, and paradox, all the while considering the welfare of others and the planet (Cooperrider and Srivastva 1998; Korac-Kakabadse, Korac-Kakabadse, and Kouzmin 2001; Weick 2004; Kageler et al. 2005; Sternberg 2005; Knudtson and Suzuki 1992). In order for leaders to practise wisely, they need to have well-developed intuitive powers to move beyond existing ideas or rules. In fact, wisdom “requires one to respect tradition and experience,” and issues a leader faces “can be considered reflexively from a cultural-historical perspective” (Kok 2009, 54). Collective knowledge impacts learning, and many theorists now see knowledge as a socially shared resource. Knowledge “can only be exploited to its maximum degree when complemented by wisdom” (Kok 2009, 55). Indigenous traditional knowledge offers traditional teachings in order to prepare people to live as good human beings who can coexist respectfully and who have a respectful relationship with their environment.

Ottmann (2005b) argues that Indigenous leadership development began with childhood encouragement and direction from the elders, and with inspiration and support from other leaders. Thus, the shared values and beliefs of the community shaped a future leader. Indeed, Little Bear (2011, 77) has stated that individuals are going to have their own “personal interpretation of the collective cultural code; however, the individual’s worldview has its roots in the culture—that is, in the society’s shared philosophy, values, and customs.”

A wise practices approach to developing Indigenous leadership examines the “wisdom of practice” and documents case studies that are “thickly textured, robust, subject matter specific, and richly contextualized” (Davis 1997, 3). The expansion of these detailed, descriptive, and interpretive case studies will illuminate the wisdom of successful practices, especially the construction of the meaning of culturally appropriate leadership practices in the service of the common wealth.

There is a growing body of Indigenous scholarship exploring the use of wise practices and wisdom in a variety of disciplines,
such as business (Erakovic et al. 2011), mental health and addiction (Snowball and Wesley-Esquimaux 2010), and social work (Nabigon and Wenger-Nabigon 2012).

A wise practices model also reflects a strengths-based approach to community economic development. It recognizes that there are many gifts and strengths in a community that strategies for growth can build upon. This assets-based planning method provides for an inventory of assets, including cultural assets (Cunningham and Mathie 2002). This is also referred to as an appreciative inquiry approach, where strengths are identified as a starting point rather than problems or shortcomings (Cooperrider and Whitney 2005; Bushe 1998). Certainly, one of the strengths of an Indigenous community is its local knowledge and experience, that is, the oral histories and traditional teachings held by elders and other wisdom keepers.

The methodology for researching and documenting wise practices is multidisciplinary, using arts-based research methods to visually capture the wise practice case study story (Brearley, Calliou, and Tanton 2009; Brearley and Darso 2008). The wise practices approach uses a qualitative research method to carry out a naturalistic inquiry that allows for a community to find its voice and narrate its own story of achievement, highlighting its strengths and local knowledge and experience. It also uses a participatory action research method that embraces principles of community participation and reflection, empowerment, and emancipation of the people seeking to improve their social situation (Walter 2006).

The wise practices approach involves a journey that goes backwards in order to move forwards. Interviews of community or organizational leaders elicit the story from when the idea for the venture began, documenting all its characters and its journey, including the assorted trials and tribulations that led to ultimate success. The resulting case studies use the storytelling method to inform and inspire other leaders to undertake their own community initiatives in a wise way. This is merely a wise practice in itself, since traditionally Indigenous leaders learned from past stories before making a decision about future action.
Wise Practices Seven Elements of Success Model

Drawing on the conclusions from the best practices literature review that we explained earlier, we have identified seven key factors of success for Indigenous community economic development. Our selection of the success factors was also informed by competency map research we undertook through focus groups at The Banff Centre. The findings supported the importance of culture and identity for Indigenous leaders (Calliou 2005). We call this our wise practices model, which sets out the following seven elements of success:

1. Identity and culture
2. Leadership
3. Strategic vision and planning
4. Good governance and management
5. Accountability and stewardship
6. Performance evaluation
7. Collaborations, partnerships, and external relationships

We will discuss each of these seven key success factors in turn.

Identity and Culture

The first key factor is identity and culture, which is to say that leaders of Indigenous communities have stated clearly that for any Indigenous leader to be competent in advocating and representing their community’s interests, they must have a strong understanding of, and grounding in, their culture, traditional knowledge, and historical connection to their traditional territories (King 2008; Grint and Warner 2006; Cowan 2008). This became very clear in our competency map research (Calliou 2005). Other Indigenous scholars have also found this to be the case (Ottmann, 2005b). This key success factor supports current claims about the importance of identity at work and authentic leadership (Gini 1998; Jaros 2012; Cooper, Scandura, and Schriesheim 2005; Gooty and Michie 2005).

Leadership

The second factor is leadership. Effective leadership is key to successful community economic development. The term “leader-
"ship" is a verb, that is, it refers to action taken by someone to turn ideas into actions and thus into results. It does not need to be related to someone in authority; leadership can be practised by essentially anyone at any level. Warren Bennis and Burt Nanus (1985) defined leadership as that which “gives an organization its vision and its ability to translate the vision into reality.” Leaders must be action oriented in order to transform ideas into action, lead change, and achieve results. They must practise courageous leadership in order to change the status quo and improve the conditions of the community. Also, Sonia Ospina and others argue that values-based leadership towards social justice, what they term “social change leadership,” is about leadership that is collective or shared, and that both beliefs and behaviours are important (Foldy and Ospina 2005).

**Strategic Vision and Planning**
Third is the key factor *strategic vision and planning*. Leaders must set out long-term visions for the community that inspire and motivate community members to support strategic plans that bring positive change. Such strategic plans provide a basis for decision making and help to focus scarce resources on their collective strategic goals. They allow the community or organization to be proactive rather than reactive (Cornell 1998; Anderson and Smith 1998; Guyette 1996).

**Good Governance and Management**
The fourth factor is *good governance and management*. Leaders must set up good governance and management structures and systems to effectively carry out the goals and program needs for their communities (Cornell and Kalt 1990; Cornell 2007; Cornell and Jorgensen 2007; Calliou 2008). Building effective institutions and processes allows leaders and managers to come and go while the government or organization continues to operate. Stable governance and management sends a strong message to potential external partners that they can rest assured that the Indigenous community or organization operates professionally.
Accountability and Stewardship
The fifth factor relates to accountability and stewardship. Good leaders and managers act as stewards of the community resources and are accountable for their decisions and actions (Block 1993; Davis, Donaldson, and Schoorman 1997; Hernandez 2008; Leithwood 2001; Fox 1992). Being open and transparent about their decision making and spending builds community trust in them. Leaders or managers can show how they are accountable by openly reporting how decisions were made, scarce resources allocated, and results achieved.

Performance Evaluation
Next is the sixth factor, performance evaluation. This refers to being accountable and practising stewardship of community resources by measuring for results of decisions made and dollars invested in the various strategies undertaken. Evaluating the performance of the initiatives undertaken by leaders ensures that they are achieving the most value for each dollar invested in their projects (Martz 2013; Meier 2003). Evaluation of human resources is another important measurement that ensures that staff performance is tied to strategic objectives and that results are being achieved. Thus, one is essentially carrying out performance management (Bacal 1999). However, there is a growing literature critiquing evaluation approaches and calling for an Indigenous evaluation framework that makes room for culturally competent evaluations (Chouinard and Cousins 2007; LaFrance and Nichols 2010; Aton et al. 2007).

Collaborations, Partnerships, and External Relationships
Finally, the seventh factor is collaborations, partnerships, and external relationships. External partnerships are often necessary for an Indigenous community’s success. Indigenous communities often need external financial support, as well as external support in other areas. Thus, good working relationships with external funders, bankers, investors, suppliers, and trading partners are key to success. Being self-governing means being interdependent, that is, having networks and external trading partners. Many Indigenous communities enter into partnerships, co-operatives, or
joint ventures (Wuttunee 2002; Fraser 2002; Hammond Ketilson and MacPherson 2002).

**Conclusion**

Through a literature review of best practices in Indigenous community and economic development, we were able to provide an empirical basis for our wise practices model for successful community economic development, with its seven elements that increase the likelihood of success. The concept of wise practices, in contrast to the concept of best practices, provides a space for Indigenous knowledge and local experience in order to lay a foundation for a strengths-based approach to community economic development. It recognizes that culture matters, and that wise practices case studies can inspire and provide wisdom that can teach us ways to build our communities and our local economies. It also recognizes that each community has its own wisdom, experiences, and strengths to build upon.

The wise practices model sets out various elements for Indigenous leaders to become familiar with and learn aspects of, so that they have the competencies to lead change, inspire hope, and take advantage of economic opportunities for their communities. The economic success that can be achieved through such a model is not merely for wealth accumulation, but rather is for the public good. It is for what one commentator described as “tribal capitalism,” and another called “capitalism with a red face” (Champagne 2004; Newhouse 2000). This represents capitalism as a means to an end—a triple bottom-line approach to economic development that seeks to protect and enhance an Indigenous community’s identity and culture.

As Indigenous communities face rapid changes coming from external sources, they are in need of competent leadership to adapt to this change. Developing leaders’ knowledge, skills, and virtues can be accomplished in part by learning from and being inspired to action by wise practices case studies. Leadership for change is necessary, but a wise practices approach also supports the continuance of traditional knowledge as a foundation for the change, so that identity and culture are preserved.
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