

FEEDBACK REPORT  
CODE OF CONDUCT FOR THE MCK RATITSÉNHAIENHS  
October 2, 2025

---

DATE RECEIVED	FEEDBACK	RESPONSE
Sept. 2, 2025 Kiosk	Enforcement: who will be responsible to enforce this Code should there be a breach?	Section 15.2 added the words “or regulations” after “disciplinary policies”
	This is cool and liked the steps. Agree that this represents an elected official for this community. Chiefs are responsible to people who put them there and there should be consequences in the Code. Sporting events have been abused and maybe chief are not expected to attend and should not be expected to attend. For no hats or visors, that should be for indoors. Weather should be a factor for wearing hats. This group [GAT] developed something to stand on and is important when you accept this position.	Section 7.1.4 added: Hats and/or visors of any kind <b>unless weather is a factor and it is required for an outdoor event.</b>
Sept. 4, 2025 Kiosk	Happy to see “Kanien’kehá:ka of Kahnawà:ke” used in document instead of ‘Kahnawa’kehró:non’.  4.1 & 4.2.2: These are somewhat repetitive.	Agree; this is consistent with recent move to use this term Kanien’kehá:ka of Kahnawà:ke in documents.  They are similar, but sometimes it’s as the individual and sometimes it’s as the group.
	9.2.1: Individual liked this provision.	Strong statement, though somewhat aspirational. Largely unable to “police” this; however, it’s more the spirit and not the letter of the Code here that controls.
	Traditional clothing not included or written in the Code. Could this be added to avoid questions or problems, even if it’s implied Chiefs are allowed to wear?	Acknowledged and explained traditional clothing was brought up and discussed by the GAT. Decided not to include as we felt it unnecessary – a right and privilege to wear.

	Traditional tattoos: Should have more leeway.	New Section 8.1.1 added: Any tattoo with words, slogans, pictures, symbols or print that may be interpreted to be profane, offensive, supremacist, racist, sexually suggestive, obscene, supportive of, or oriented toward the glamorization of alcohol or any illegal activity, derogatory toward any ethnic or religious group, military service or symbol of any nation must be covered.
	What about “sentimental” tattoos? (doesn’t think they should have to be covered up)	A “sentimental tattoo” exception would create more problems than it would solve – would end up having to define what is sentimental and what isn’t (it’s a subjective exercise). Other than the addition of the new section 8.1.1 to exclude offensive/derogatory content, tattoos should largely be unseen. The “to the extent possible” clause provides sufficient room within which to maneuver – large and conspicuous tattoos would be covered up, but smaller ones on a hand, for example, would be exempt (so long as they weren’t offensive, among other considerations). There is a sense of decorum to be observed and a certain respect for the office Chiefs hold. Covering tattoos and dressing in a presentable manner should not be that much of an issue – they are not representing themselves; they are representing the community. Personal interest takes a back seat – it’s about the collective, not the individual.
	Liked the glossary of terms for clarity	N/A
	Overall happy with the Code	N/A
	<p>Personal appearance section (concerns):</p> <p>Tattoos: Personally, I don’t have any, but don’t agree with how the statement is written “must be covered”. Tattoos are, for some people, a way of self-expression. It’s almost censorship to make them cover them up. What about traditional tattoos?</p> <p><b>Suggestion to rewrite the statement similar to 7.1.5 (page 2 and 3)</b></p>	<p>Agree that tattoos are a matter of self-expression; however, as a matter of decorum, tattoos should be covered. The GAT discussed and felt adding “to the extent” possible left some room for people with tattoos on their hands or legs – conspicuous areas of the body.</p> <p>Added a new section 8.1.1 Any tattoo with words, slogans, pictures, symbols or print that may be interpreted to be profane, offensive, supremacist, racist, sexually suggestive, obscene, supportive of, or oriented toward the glamorization of alcohol</p>

		or any illegal activity, derogatory toward any ethnic or religious group, military service or symbol of any nation must be covered.
	Hair (8.4): Suggestion to specify male or female. Also, 8.3 captures essence of 8.4, so it's kind of repetitive. Maybe remove 'presentable' and replace with "combed, braided...ponytail".	Combined Sections 8.3 & 8.4. Section 8.3 now reads: Hair must be clean, groomed and presentable. Deleted Section 8.4
	6 – Attire: Maybe too tight or detailed? Is it necessary to be that specific? Just a thought, but what if some people dress down to be presentable – more approachable for the people they're interacting with. Some people don't want to dress up in a suit or feel it's too.	GAT felt it necessary to outline acceptable and unacceptable clothing. Several examples given of past and present Chiefs' wardrobe choices. The sections are a direct response to people showing up to work (or worse, provincial/federal meetings) in dirty, wrinkled and otherwise unacceptable clothing. Acknowledged some professions dress down to be more approachable (ie social workers, psychologists, etc.); however, given that Chiefs hold elected, public office, the GAT felt a more professional appearance and prescribed clothing is necessary. Again, it's about being a representative of Kahnawà:ke (collective over individual interest).
	Also, there was no mention of piercings, but tattoos were. Why? What about unnatural hair colors (blue, green, purple, etc.)? Would that be acceptable?	GAT chose not to address this specifically but to leave that to be considered within the more general wording of section 5.1 under "Professional Appearance".
	11- Conflict of Interest: Good job!	N/A
Sept. 19, 2025 Online	Throughout there are references to Ratsenhaienhs/letsenhaienhs and Ratitsenhainhs. The terms are not interchangeable and may be open to interpretation that the Grand Chief (Ohenton I:rate ne Ratitsenhaienhs) not have sections apply that reference one chief individually. I would suggest ensuring the terminology reflects all Ratitsenhaienhs as an exclusive group (as needed)	Sometimes the emphasis is on Chiefs as individuals (Council Chiefs) and other times as a group (the Council of Chiefs).  Yes, it should be interpretative vs prescriptive. Each needs to be able to decide what is proper and what is not.

	6.1.2 , 6.1.4 and 6.1.5 - If a reference can be made to the MCK Logo being displayed on the shirt, that would define "project an image consistent with the professionalism....." a little more, as it's interpretive what could be considered professional.	
	6.1.2, 6.1.4 and 6.1.5 - Curious as to what "on occasion" means when it's mentioned  6.1.5 refers to "Casual Fridays" so it could be assumed that's what occasion means.	Changed wording from “on occasion” to “casual Fridays”  Yes that’s what it means so it’s been changed. Also changed 6.1.5 specifically in relation to sneakers to read: Footwear must be clean and presentable, and not be flipflops, flappers, slides or crocs. Sneakers may be worn during the workday provided that the workday does not involve meetings with external entities and they project an image consistent with the professionalism expected of an MCK Ratitsénhaiehns.
	6.1.5 and 7.1.3 are fairly restrictive as there is a sense of style and fashion related to wearing certain types of footwear or clothing. Sneakers, as an example as a fashion trend, have been worn with suits and mainstream acceptable. Leggings as well have been used as underclothing for long sweaters or jackets and have been quite fashionable as well.	Changed 6.1.5 to read: Footwear must be clean and presentable, and not be flipflops, flappers, slides or crocs. Sneakers may be worn during the workday provided that the workday does not involve meetings with external entities and they project an image consistent with the professionalism expected of an MCK Ratitsénhaiehns.  Section 7.1.3 is specific to athletic leggings which are not the same as the leggings that are combined with long sweaters or jackets.
	The references in the entire attire and appearance sections are very open to interpretation with the terms "on occasion", "presentable", "sufficient length" and "proper modesty". By what standard? For example, to be of sufficient length for pants/shorts/skirts, it was probably written for shorts and skirts but I've seen some pretty short pants on some fellas that should be banned. Nobody wants to see your ankles and the 3 inches of leg above that, might as well just wear shorts LOL.	Changed “on occasion” to “casual Fridays”.  “Presentable”, “sufficient length” and “proper modesty” gives leeway to the Chiefs to determine this for themselves. Reasonable person understands what these mean.
	8.1 - Tattoos are an expression of one's self, perhaps without violating that expression of the person it be referred to similarly to 7.1.5 where it only be covered if the imagery/words fall in line with any of those terms. While many have tattoos that wouldn't	New Section 8.1.1 added: Any tattoo with words, slogans, pictures, symbols or print that may be interpreted to be profane, offensive, supremacist, racist, sexually suggestive, obscene, supportive of, or oriented toward the glamorization of alcohol

	violate those terms, some people do choose to ink those types of images/words as well and that is when I would think they are less professional in a workplace.	<p>or any illegal activity, derogatory toward any ethnic or religious group, military service or symbol of any nation must be covered.</p> <p>Also, those that do not fit this description “should” be covered “to the extent possible” and with the following exception: Weather is an exception to wearing short sleeves or shorter pants for arms/legs with ink. Tattoos that fall within the new section 8.1.1 “must” be covered.</p>
	In the attire and personal appearance sections, there are references to being presentable. It's too interpretive.	Interpretation was intended. Chiefs need to exercise discretion.
	10.3 I would exclude the restriction of "on their personal device" because if they use an MCK computer they are exempt from that entire section.	Added after personal “and/or organizational” devices.
	10.3.1 - Can it also include public information policy so information that is not necessarily within the scope of the terms throughout 10.3.4.1 to 10.3.4.4 are also covered. That includes information intended for the public that is not necessarily approved or ready to be announced.	<i>MCK Public Information Policy</i> has been added to section 10.3.1.
	11.6 - Reword so it is more "unless the individual is their spouse"... not that it would happen but you never know, a chief could technically (according to the wording) start a relationship with two people who are spouses.	It has been reworded.
	Glossary: Immediate Family - While it is most likely used this way throughout other MCK policies, there are references in other areas of "spouse or common law partner" and I think it should also be included here so it's not restricted only to married couples.	Spouse has been added to the definition. Common-law partner is considered a spouse according to the definition in the glossary.

	Glossary: Social Media - In the list of social media platforms, indicate they are examples "such as" to ensure the definition is not exclusive to only those platforms.	"Such as" has been added, as well as "etc" after the <i>MCK Public Information Policy</i> .
	While a dress code is a good idea, it should be consistent with the times and issues like having visible tattoos and personal preferences for hair style/facial hair, are considered acceptable by modern standards. It may be looked at as discriminatory to judge based on appearance. That also applies to attire. If a sports shirt or jeans are clean and not frayed or destroyed, it is the personal choice of the person to wear on days where there will not be meetings with external entities. This also applies to footwear, as long as they are enclosed and clean, it's a personal preference. Creating a dress code that will ultimately not be followed or respected (as we have seen in past codes) and with no consequences for breaches anyway, does not seem to be a useful standard.	Dress Code was deemed important by the GAT
	Issues such as work ethic, accountability to community and organization and honest reporting (perhaps 360 appraisals done by staff and transmitted results to community) are much more important factors to weigh on than how a person chooses to dress.	Might want to consider this for the Administrative Guidelines. Would have to align with MCK HR information on this one.
	In instances of complaints against chiefs or alleged abuse by chiefs, a group of community members should be formed to review and respond to the incidents. Having the table decide on the merits of cases of their own alleged wrong doings, isn't a fair process or an example of transparency or accountability to the community. People will not be inclined to communicate instances of perceived wrong doing if it's clear that they will not be given fair process or recourse.	This goes beyond the scope of this Code of Conduct. Should be considered in another document, such as the Internal Complaints Policy or <i>Disciplinary Measures Regulations</i> .

	Perhaps there should be standards set on what professional courtesy would look like. An open statement of treating others with respect, fairness and courtesy doesn't sufficiently outline the parameters of what this looks like or what the consequences of not holding this standard would be.	It is up to the individual to know this.