

Creating Able Human Beings: Social Studies Curriculum in the Northwest Territories and Nunavut, 1969 to the Present

Catherine A. McGregor

ABSTRACT

Upon transfer of responsibility for schooling in Canada's North from the federal government to the Northwest Territories in 1969–70, the territorial Department of Education immediately mandated curriculum whose central focus was on Dene and Inuit students' cultural and linguistic identities, in order to counteract the intentionally assimilationist approaches of previous federal and church residential and day schools. This article examines social studies curricula over the next 30 years in the NWT, and from 1999–2013 in Nunavut. Reviewing relevant documents, I argue that social studies curricula developed in the North during these 45 years have featured *culturally responsive* education, but did not accomplish this consistently. I also suggest a new term, *culturally founded* education, to refer to integrated curricula developed by northern Aboriginal peoples from their own cultural perspectives. The conclusion recommends future actions to ensure social studies education continues to reflect the people it serves and prepares students to make meaningful contributions in the complex world of the twenty-first century.

RÉSUMÉ

Après le transfert de responsabilité en matière d'éducation dans le nord du Canada par le gouvernement fédéral aux Territoires du Nord-Ouest (TNO) en 1969–1970, le département d'Éducation des Territoires rend, dès lors, obligatoire un programme scolaire axé sur les identités linguistiques et culturelles des élèves dénés et inuits afin de contrer les approches intentionnellement assimilatrices des écoles fédérales antérieures, pensionnats religieux ou écoles publiques. Cet article s'intéresse à l'aspect social des programmes d'études durant les trente années suivantes dans les TNO et de 1999 à 2013 pour le Nunavut. Après consultation de documents pertinents, l'auteure soutient que les programmes d'études instaurés dans le Nord durant cette période de 45 ans reposaient sur la culture autochtone (*culturally responsive*), mais sans grande conviction. Elle suggère également un nouveau terme « *culturally founded education* » à savoir une éducation authentiquement autochtone en référence à l'intégration des programmes développés par les peuples aborigènes du Nord d'après leurs propres perspectives culturelles. La conclusion propose des actions concrètes pour garantir que les programmes d'études soient en lien avec la population et préparent adéquatement les élèves à s'impliquer d'une manière significative dans le monde complexe du XXI^e siècle.

For millennia, Dene and Inuit, in areas now known as northern Canada, upheld deep, intimate relationships with the sub-Arctic boreal forest and Arctic tundra that formed the core of their cultures. This *place-based* knowledge, as we might now refer to it, sustained them and shaped them: their languages, knowledge systems, worldviews, values and attitudes, life skills, and ways of being, doing, knowing, and thinking. Therefore, child rearing and learning were also fundamentally place-based. Extended family members passed on this legacy to successive generations. Adults knew each child's unique strengths, interests, and learning needs intimately, caring deeply for all aspects of their development. Family members taught children everything they needed to know within the context of purposeful, daily activities; adults expected the very best from each child, because group survival depended on each person fulfilling his/her roles and responsibilities to the best of their ability. This *child-centred* education, as we might understand it, ensured northern peoples created "able human beings"¹ who could survive and thrive in their environment. Parents determined children's learning and shared their culture, so education was *culturally founded*.²

The introduction of schooling to the Northwest Territories (NWT) did not offer northern Aboriginal children and youth any cultural continuity with traditional education as practiced by their families. From the late 1800s until the 1950s, through tent, camp and residential schools, Euro-Canadian settler missionaries drastically disrupted these Aboriginal ways of learning.³ None of these teachers shared students' cultures; in fact, early schools intentionally discounted Aboriginal cultures, following federal government direction to assimilate children into Euro-Canadian ways. All instruction was in English and children were punished for speaking their languages. Later in the twentieth century a few unique settler teachers in federal day schools learned Inuktitut and made an effort to accommodate students' cultures. But, for the most part, these schools continued to use imported curricula and English.⁴ Children were caught between two worlds and not well prepared for either.⁵

I arrived in Kugluktuk (then called Coppermine), NWT, in 1973, as a young settler teacher with a strong belief in the Language Experience Approach.⁶ My philosophy espoused using students' language and cultural experiences in their families and community as the foundation for learning to communicate and explore new information about the world. I worked hard to bring this philosophy to life for my students, but always wondered how to be more deeply responsive to students, their culture, and family purposes for education, since most of what we did in school was still so foreign to northern families. In search of answers, I attended graduate school, became a regional consultant, territorial social studies coordinator, and Director of Bilingual Education in the Northwest Territories' Department of Education (NWTDE).⁷ Then I moved to the Eastern Arctic, became Director of the Baffin Divisional Board of Education and undertook more graduate work. I retired in 2013 as the Executive Director of Curriculum and School Services with the Nunavut Department of Education (NDE). Throughout my career I continued to explore ways to transform



Culturally responsive schooling: students and community members prepare to leave for spring camp, Kugluktuk, NWT, circa 1975. Courtesy of McGregor Collection.

northern schools to reflect Aboriginal students. I have found social studies to be one of the spaces in which this work is most compelling, because culture forms the foundation for how human beings live respectfully in relation to their environment, and to each other. This is what social studies teaches.

In this article, I ask: How did NWT and Nunavut social studies curricula, implementation supports, and related teacher development illustrate continuities and challenges in providing education responsive to Aboriginal students' cultures? I explore this question by reviewing territorial social studies curricula, as well as related initiatives that shaped the way social studies developed, tracing the philosophy, purpose, content, pedagogy, and implementation of each curriculum within its historical and legislative context. I review NWT legislation and K-9 curricula from 1969 to 1999. I exclude curricula for grades 10-12 because high schools used Alberta curricula during this period. One exception to this southern Canadian focus in social studies was the addition of an NWT Grade 10 Northern Studies course, but only a few regional centres offered Grade 10.⁸ Most high schools were established only after 1995.⁹ To show how trends changed following division of the NWT and Nunavut, I also review Nunavut legislation and K-12 social studies curricula from 1999–2013. Based on results of this review, I conclude with recommendations to improve northern social studies education in the future.

I discuss the major challenges encountered between 1969 and 2013 to provide education consistent with curricular expectations, including different dimensions of cultural responsiveness. While conducting this review, I found examples of curricula

that extend beyond what is understood as culturally responsive education. Developed by Dene and Inuit, offering their perspectives and knowledge systems, and their ways of learning, such curricula warranted a separate category and approach to analysis. Thus, I have created the term “culturally founded” curricula and have begun to identify implications for what is required to provide this type of curricula for territorial schools.

Key Concepts

I use *child-centred* and *place-based* in the above description of Aboriginal learning that took place long before these terms originated, to emphasize these key characteristics of Aboriginal learning. Following the period of discontinuity between Aboriginal families and schooling under federal administration of education, the nascent NWT government issued new curricular expectations in the early 1970s. They intentionally prescribed elements of *student[child]-centred* learning, and what became known as *place-based* education, in order to make schooling more consistent with Aboriginal learning. Their work anticipated an approach to teaching and learning referred to in educational scholarship as *culturally responsive* education (CRE), which arose in classrooms where teachers and students came from different cultures—teachers usually from the dominant (settler) society and students from a minority (Aboriginal).¹⁰ I use culturally responsive education as a key concept in the article, because it incorporates student-centred and place-based approaches and because most teachers were, and continue to be, settlers. I describe CRE in detail here to substantiate what I look for in outlining and analyzing how northern curricula illustrate or contradict culturally responsive approaches. I introduce the term, *culturally founded* education (CFE), as a second key concept that describes integrated curricula, developed by Aboriginal people, to reflect their perspectives and knowledge systems.

The purpose of culturally responsive education is to create schooling that resonates with ways students learn from their families, in their communities. Fundamental elements of CRE came from *culturally relevant* learning, described by Ladson Billings as helping “students accept and affirm their cultural identity, while developing critical perspectives that [enable them] to challenge inequities that schools...perpetuate.”¹¹ She also emphasized the importance of teachers caring about students and building strong relationships with them and their families.¹²

The cultural affirmation aspect of CRE incorporates student-centred education, which John Dewey described in the early 1900s as encouraging students to create new learning by building on familiar knowledge through personal exploration in real experiences relevant to their lives, which naturally integrate subject areas and develop all aspects of the child.¹³ Students set their own purposes for learning, motivating them to take responsibility for achieving those purposes. Delia Clark echoes these ideas by describing place-based learning as focusing on “local cultural, historical and socio-political situations and the natural and built environment”¹⁴ to make learning meaningful. Students are encouraged to become more critically conscious and motivated to “shape the world they will inherit.”¹⁵

Also in accord with such ideas, culturally responsive pedagogy involves active questioning, critical thinking, and co-operating with others through “hands on, real world experiences that challenge students to learn and solve problems”¹⁶ and to make decisions with community members, inter-generationally, based on understanding how the past affects the present.¹⁷ Teachers set high expectations for students, but provide supports by matching instruction with how they learn.¹⁸ Geneva Gay summarizes CRE as “using the cultural characteristics, experiences and perspectives of ethnically diverse students as conduits for teaching them more effectively.”¹⁹ CRE improves achievement because it teaches the whole child and is “more personally meaningful, and [therefore] learned more easily and thoroughly.”²⁰

Some curricula I reviewed offered learning opportunities that extended beyond cultural responsiveness. To describe these examples, I introduce culturally founded education as a second key concept. This represents curricula developed *by* Aboriginal educators and Elders to articulate and teach all aspects of their knowledge systems, as defined above.²¹ CFE emphasizes children observing and practicing new knowledge and skills. Ideally, Aboriginal teachers deliver CFE using Aboriginal languages. I propose that differences between CRE and CFE include “who defines the problems and their solutions”;²² purposes for teaching; perspectives on, and sources of, knowledge; depth of cultural content; and the extent to which Aboriginal teachers, community members, and Elders are involved as significant knowledge-holders and educators. In the NWT and Nunavut, CFE involves systematically incorporating these ways of learning as foundations for transforming schooling to reflect Aboriginal societies.²³

NWT Social Studies Education: 1970s

Context and Legislation

The NWTDE assumed responsibility for schools from the federal government in 1969–70. A survey of education staff recommended major changes to help Aboriginal students experience more success, such as establishing local parent committees, creating northern curricula, and producing Aboriginal-language resources.²⁴ The following period of intense system development resulted in new legislation, as well as innovative policies, procedures, and teaching approaches.

While legislation may not provide much insight into curriculum content, it can illustrate how school governance does (or does not) support implementation of cultural responsiveness. The first NWT *Education Ordinance* in 1977 mandated creation of local education authorities (LEAs), made up of elected community members, as the first venue for parental decision-making in northern education in most communities.²⁵ LEA responsibilities related to social studies included making decisions about instruction in Aboriginal languages (S.89, ss.2) and working with school staff to incorporate local culture. LEAs could hire non-professional workers to teach culture and language (S.92-94). Where human resources were available, this enabled schools to offer cultural instruction by community members, in their language, as part of social studies.²⁶

Curriculum

Curricula published in the 1970s established a pattern of CRE that continued for more than twenty-five years, with both accomplishments and challenges. *Elementary Education in the Northwest Territories* was the first curriculum published, including all subject areas.²⁷ It did not state an explicit purpose for social studies, but it clearly departed from assimilationist federal schooling practices by expecting culturally responsive approaches that emphasized Aboriginal students' languages and cultures and each student's personal strengths, thereby enhancing identity and self-esteem. Direction to teach students' values reflected a Canadian social studies trend highlighting values education.²⁸ This presented a significant challenge for settler teachers, most of whom were trained in southern Canadian contexts where there was more of a cultural match between teachers, students, and mainstream values taught in schools. How did this new northern curriculum assist settler teachers to teach local values, when they were not familiar with Aboriginal cultures and had not been trained for sensitive cross-cultural teaching? One strategy suggested teachers invite parents and community members to teach "traditional life skills...hunting, fishing, trapping, Arctic Survival"²⁹ and act as "cultural models"³⁰ to reinforce local values, attitudes, heritage, and aspirations. The curriculum also assisted settler teachers to teach students' cultures and values by providing nineteen pages of cross-cultural teaching information that described students' cultures, outlined differences between Euro-Canadian and Aboriginal value systems, and explained how communities viewed schooling. While likely unique at the time, this was the only support provided for implementation or teacher development.

Illustrating other aspects of CRE, social studies content in *Elementary Education* adopted the "expanding horizons" concept, starting with families and community, and progressing to the territory and Canada.³¹ Its themes integrated social studies disciplines and focused on current events; its pedagogy emphasized school and land-based education with hands-on, activity-oriented experiential learning, involving heterogeneous grouping and freedom of choice, as well as arts and media. The document advocated minimal use of texts because "non-Anglo-Saxon peoples receive inferior treatment" within them, and texts often imparted "indoctrination of stereotypes...through use of terms like 'pagan'."³² However, *Elementary Education* also borrowed from the Alberta social studies framework.³³

Learning in the Middle Years came shortly after *Elementary Education*. It did not overtly define social studies purposes either, but continued the same approach.³⁴ Its philosophy demonstrated CRE by directing teachers to acknowledge the role of families and communities in providing students' foundational knowledge of the world. To assist teachers to understand and incorporate student culture, thirty pages described Aboriginal youth, how schools differed from their world, and implications for instruction.³⁵ Again, this was the only support for implementation or teacher development.

The document's central theme was "Man and his Environment." It incorporated CRE by beginning with local knowledge, values, attitudes, and skills for survival and emphasizing early northern environment and history, before extending to national and global contexts. Northern economic and political development were compared

to emerging nations elsewhere, and evolving northern industries to industrial development in Canada. *Learning in the Middle Years* required relating current events to the past and integrating knowledge through themes that instructed academic and social skills. Recommended pedagogy demonstrated culturally responsive approaches by including personal choices that built on student strengths; using small groups; learning decision-making through meaningful inquiry and problem-solving; practicing communication; examining feelings, values, and attitudes; and promoting creativity through media and arts.

In addition to the two comprehensive curricula discussed above, the NWTDE published three curricula specific to social studies in the 1970s. The NWT Territorial Council requested development of Grade 4-10 *Civics*; its purpose was to facilitate development of “the good citizen in a democratic society.”³⁶ Philosophy emphasized students discovering their own interests and learning to think for themselves to address those interests, thereby becoming active citizens. Mandated grade-specific content used the local community to teach about diversity and government forms and functions, but it also included Canadian history and introduced territorial and federal governments. Recommended pedagogy emphasized projects that encouraged learning by doing; asking questions and expressing ideas freely; and experiencing real decision-making processes through clubs and projects.

Grade 7-9 *Environmental Studies*, published in 1978, was very different from *Civics*; it demonstrated more aspects of CRE than any of its curriculum predecessors.³⁷ Its purpose was to help students understand how to use environmental resources effectively and make the world a better place. Its philosophy supported “an interdisciplinary approach to investigating one’s past, present and future” and emphasized how local cultural traditions arise from interdependence between a specific environment and ways of meeting human needs.³⁸ Using the expanding horizons concept, it began with local culture and then expanded to less familiar contexts. It gave priority to such pedagogical methods as instruction by community members on the land and in school; posing questions and answering them through inquiry, research, interviews, discussion, and projects; and using learning centres with hands-on activities involving maps, games, experiments, media, and arts.

Lastly, the purpose of *Social Studies: K-9* was to help students develop the knowledge, skills, and attitudes required to participate effectively in “the private and public life of his or her own society.”³⁹ It continued culturally responsive directions from earlier curricula by stating “all new concepts [must] be related to the known world of the student.”⁴⁰ It directed teachers to incorporate students’ diverse languages, learning styles, values and cultural experiences, and emphasized helping students develop a deep understanding of the North. Less familiar contexts and perspectives were compared to familiar ones using an expanding horizons concept from a Canada Studies framework developed in Ontario.⁴¹ It integrated social studies disciplines and provided graded topic outlines that identified goals and major skills. A spiral approach revisited major understandings and key concepts through the grades, using different topics.⁴² A special section on pedagogy explained different approaches, such as group projects, issues analysis, and simulations.

Clearly, *Elementary Education*, *Learning in the Middle Years*, and *Social Studies K-9* all attempted to make aspects of CRE central to the curriculum. On the other hand, without substantial training and support, it must have been difficult for teachers to meet the expectation to inculcate local values. Borrowing from Alberta and Ontario, *Elementary Education* and *Social Studies K-9* also contradicted and undermined directions to start with students' cultures (*Learning in the Middle Years* did not state whether it borrowed from other jurisdictions).⁴³ Use of materials from other jurisdictions that reflected their cultural perspectives created challenges for teachers to incorporate in any meaningful way deeper aspects of Aboriginal culture, thereby possibly eliminating instruction consistent with CRE.

Civics based some activities on students' experiences and communities, but lessons were similarly adapted from the south, many developed "from scratch" reflected Euro-Canadian perspectives, and recommended resources were southern. Goals, content, and skills reflected citizenship rights and duties common in Canadian curricula at the time, but inconsistent with the Aboriginal emphasis on creating well-rounded, able human beings as the purpose of education.⁴⁴ Only *Environmental Studies* addressed CRE consistently and in-depth. However, without implementation or teacher development information to assist teachers to reconcile this curriculum with the Euro-Canadian approach of *Civics*, they had to manage resulting cultural contradictions themselves, if they were even conscious of them.

NWT Social Studies Education: 1980s

Context and Legislation

Education in the 1980s was defined by a Legislative Assembly Special Committee project that consulted every NWT community about concerns regarding poor attendance, low achievement and inadequate instruction of Aboriginal languages and cultures.⁴⁵ Their report, *Learning: Tradition and Change*, recommended training more Aboriginal teachers, providing more culturally responsive curricula, and establishing a departmental linguistic division to develop Aboriginal resources, among other suggestions.⁴⁶ Significant modifications to the education system included establishing regional boards of education, with one member from each local education authority, directly responsible for all aspects of schooling except curriculum development, which NWTDE maintained. Replacing the departmental linguistics division, a Teaching and Learning Centre (TLC) under each board assumed responsibility for developing language and cultural resources. The Eastern Arctic Teacher Education Program expanded to encourage more Inuit to take training.⁴⁷ A revised *Education Ordinance* issued in 1988 maintained the responsibility of local education authorities for determining K-2 languages of instruction, participating in planning and delivering culture programs, and hiring non-professionals to teach language and culture.⁴⁸

Curriculum

The NWTDE continued to use the social studies curricula reviewed above during this decade. However, the newly created Baffin Divisional Board in the eastern-most

region of the NWT sponsored a major program initiative that substantially informed and altered regional K-9 instruction, including social studies.⁴⁹ The board directed schools to reflect Inuit language and culture. To ascertain what this might include, teachers and high-school students interviewed families in each community for suggestions.⁵⁰ Educators used the results to develop *Piniagtavut*, an integrated, bilingual, K-9 program that addressed board goals and responded to concerns about too few Inuktitut resources and too much curriculum content reflecting Euro-Canadian perspectives.⁵¹

The philosophical framework outlined four content categories—land, sea, sky, and community—each containing a major question to direct instruction, 2-3 sub-topics, and 1-2 focus questions per topic. Other organizing threads included cultural identity and social customs; Inuit seasons; and the past, present, and future within local, regional, territorial, Canadian, and world contexts. At each age level, students were to experience, learn, or live Inuit beliefs, and Inuit child development informed the learning framework. Teachers were encouraged to boost self-motivation by giving students more responsibility for learning through meaningful experiences that integrated development of language, content, and thinking skills, and provided opportunities for student collaboration.⁵²

Teachers received in-service help and an implementation plan directed development of culturally rich, bilingual resources. By 1990, TLC staff had produced nearly 200 Inuktitut books, as well as integrated teaching units. Planning guides for each division (K-3, 4-6, and 7-9) correlated key objectives from NWTDE health, social studies, and science curricula with *Piniagtavut* topics.⁵³

In short, the 1980s was an important decade in the development of social studies education. The introduction of new school governance through boards of education involving Aboriginal parents, and support provided by TLCs involving Aboriginal educators, opened the doors for deeper CRE, as demonstrated by *Piniagtavut*. It was the first bilingual instructional framework expressing Inuit perspectives and a major departure from NWTDE subject-specific curricula in English, demonstrating early elements of CFE.

NWT Social Studies Education: 1990s

Context and Legislation

In 1992, the Canadian and NWT governments and the Tungavik Federation of Nunavut, representing Inuit, signed the Nunavut Political Accord. They settled the *Nunavut Land Claims Agreement* in 1993.⁵⁴ Boards of education in what would become Nunavut, as “strong advocates of Inuit language and culture,”⁵⁵ concentrated on preparing for the new government, coming in 1999.

A new NWT Education Act in 1995 reflected more elements of *Learning: Tradition and Change*.⁵⁶ The preamble emphasized educating the whole child; upholding high standards; maintaining relationships between language, culture, and learning; giving communities more responsibilities; and recognizing Elders’ contributions. The Act directed principals to involve parents and communities in developing policies, goals

and plans, as well as other school activities (S.69, ss.2a, ss.2c). It maintained requirements for principals to plan cultural programs with the LEA, and continued to assign LEAs the responsibility for hiring language and culture instructors (S.75-76) and determining languages of instruction (S.70).

Curriculum

Making up for the absence of new publications in the 1980s, this decade produced three new social studies curricula that continued patterns related to CRE, as well as two groundbreaking Aboriginal curricula that extended beyond CRE to CFE.

As a supplementary resource replacing *Civics*, the purpose of *Civics in the Elementary Social Studies Curriculum*, published in 1992, was to teach the rights and duties of citizens, political processes, and northern government.⁵⁷ It did not state a philosophy, but its content anticipated new social studies topics: “people around us”; “our community”; “other communities”; “our people now and then”; “our land and our people”; and “our country.” Each topic offered helpful information for teaching the material. Pedagogical methods included using students’ experiences, group work, research, role-plays, map work, guest speakers, mock elections, arts, etc. Both topics and some aspects of pedagogy reflected culturally responsive elements, but much of the background information still revealed Euro-Canadian perspectives.

The next year, *Elementary Social Studies* appeared. It emphasized preparing students for the evolving realities of northern life and for becoming responsible twenty-first century citizens, and quoted *Our Students Our Future*, an NWTDE philosophy document that strongly endorsed CRE in all aspects of schooling.⁵⁸ This philosophy directed teachers to connect with students’ realities, involve families and the community, and empower students to act to influence their world. Core curriculum goals referred to northern contexts, including understanding diverse cultural heritages; studying the interdependence of social and physical environments; examining values and attitudes; and exploring social issues. The curriculum integrated social studies disciplines with humanities and mirrored topics from the new *Civics* supplementary resource. It used the expanding horizons concept to relate less familiar information, such as global issues and human rights, to local examples and current events. It also demonstrated CRE by using students’ experiences to incorporate traditional and current community perspectives, knowledge, values, attitudes, and skills. Each topic included central questions about issues for inquiry, sub-questions, and suggested learning experiences. Pedagogy involved teaching students learning processes and collaboration skills; communicating and thinking critically by asking questions, exploring answers and making decisions; and using technology effectively. However, the document continued the pattern of inconsistent CRE by adapting material from Alberta and recommending southern resources without explaining which, or how much, information was borrowed.

Junior Secondary Social Studies echoed the culturally responsive purposes and philosophy of *Elementary Social Studies*, using identical text from *Our Students Our Future*.⁵⁹ Directions continued culturally responsive themes, such as focusing on the whole student, bringing their personal worlds into the classroom, and allowing

boards to choose relevant resources. Content introduced the circumpolar world; covered ancient, middle and modern societies; and included Canadian geography, history, and global connections. Culturally responsive perspectives directed teachers to relate these topics to northern contexts, using traditional culture and contemporary local knowledge as lenses for learning. At the same time, the document emphasized developing skills for the information age, adapted Alberta material, and suggested southern resources. Pedagogical methods focused on inquiry through problem-solving, critical thinking and decision-making, and developing communication skills for co-operation and conflict resolution.

What set the 1990s apart from the previous twenty-five years, however, was the development of two Aboriginal curricula. They differed significantly from culturally responsive projects by designing schooling reflective of Aboriginal cultural worldviews and learning experiences. Indeed, they demonstrated the first northern examples of CFE.

The *Dene Kede* curriculum of 1993 integrated all learning, extending far beyond social studies.⁶⁰ Dene educators worked with Elders and one settler facilitator to identify “what we Dene know and feel about ourselves and our land,” including language, worldview, knowledge, values and attitudes, life skills, and ways of being, doing, knowing, thinking, and learning.⁶¹ It described culture as community, as the spiritual realm, as land skills and knowledge, and as, how Dene perceived themselves. The opening pages featured brief biographies of important Elders. All Dene communities were consulted about the project; consensus determined what material to include, but each community could adapt the generic curriculum to their specific context.

Dene perspectives *infused* the philosophy of *Dene Kede*, offering conceptions of creation, important elements of survival, the nature of the child, and traditional child rearing and learning—all intended to help students “become capable in order to survive.”⁶² It explained significant metaphors—the drum, drum dance, and tipi—and provided general learning expectations for “relationships with the spiritual world, other people, the land [sky and animals] and the self.”⁶³ Each theme outlined grade level expectations, relevant knowledge and skills, and appropriate learning experiences. However, in *Dene Kede*, learning was cyclic and individualized, not linear and comparative. It also included Dene first- and second-language learning, with oral and literacy development.

In the second project, Inuit educators and 45 Elders, with assistance from long-term settler educators, developed the 1996 *Inuuqatigiit* curriculum.⁶⁴ As an integrated curriculum that included social studies content, the opening letter stated, its purpose was for children to “know who they are, where they came from and where they belong in today’s society.”⁶⁵ The philosophy espoused by the document covered curriculum goals, Inuit worldviews, and the importance of Inuit languages. It explained Inuit beliefs about learning, a developmental framework, how families assessed children, and effective learning environments.

Central to the “Foundation Framework” of *Inuuqatigiit* were Inuit strengths, based on relationships to the environment and other people through circles of belonging (from family, community, region, and territory, to more distant contexts);

Inuit seasonal cycles; and the life cycle—past, present, future. Some elements of the curriculum mirrored previously mentioned social studies documents, but perspectives, beliefs, values, content, quotes, and photos illuminated Inuit presence. Two sub-frameworks, for learning about people and about the environment, asked major questions to guide instruction. Each topic, such as Family/Kinship or Caribou, included information from Elders; rationale; relevant values, attitudes and beliefs; major understandings; objectives; knowledge and traditions; and key experiences and activities. The emphasis was on family, community, and Elder instruction, using Inuktitut, through experiences on the land; on research comparing past and present; and on exploration and inquiry using hands-on activities, performance, and media.

The first three curricula produced in this decade replaced earlier social studies documents and continued familiar themes within culturally responsive education, such as incorporating students' experiences; using the expanding horizons concept; focusing on the whole child; and emphasizing inquiry learning. They also demonstrated similar contradictions: *Elementary* and *Junior Secondary* curricula emphasized culturally responsive philosophy from *Our Students Our Future*, but continued to borrow from Alberta. Neither document assisted teachers to reconcile directions emphasizing students' cultures with contradictory expectations outlining content and skills from a Euro-Canadian perspective. They did not explain whether, or how, to make these differences explicit and help students handle inherent conflicts. The 1992 *Civics* focused more on the North than its 1978 predecessor, but still largely reflected Euro-Canadian perspectives. And these documents did not provide implementation or teacher development supports.

Conversely, the culturally founded perspectives, purposes, content, pedagogy, organization, design, and writing of *Dene Kede* demonstrated that curriculum was being conceived *by* Dene. The spirit of Dene worldviews came alive in it, reaching back to ancestors and forward to future generations. Although the deep spiritual element prominent in *Dene Kede* was less evident in *Inuuqatigiit*, it too offered Inuit voices and perspectives, purposes, and pedagogy from Elders, as well as integrated cultural content that strongly differentiated it from previous culturally responsive social studies curricula.

Boards implementing *Inuuqatigiit* expected teachers to use it for planning instruction and provided detailed in-service sessions for each *community* and school; the document also recommended orientation every year.⁶⁶ A separate *Teacher Resource Manual* accompanied *Dene Kede* to outline—in extensive detail with rich examples—how to orient school partners (such as regional TLC staff, teachers, and local education authority members), as well as implement and teach the curriculum.⁶⁷ Both documents clarified how each partner contributes to implementation as well as describing learning in classrooms, schools, and in the bush or on the land. One element was still lacking, however: neither *Inuuqatigiit* nor *Dene Kede* fully explained how teachers reconcile instruction of these curricula with other required social studies documents representing conflicting Euro-Canadian worldviews, content, and skills.

Nunavut Social Studies Education 1999–2013

Context and Legislation

Following division of the NWT in 1999, the first elected Nunavut government directed significant changes to government programs, including schooling, mandating *Inuit Qaujimagajatuqangit* (IQ) as the basis for all services.⁶⁸ “Ideal Nunavut schools” would provide students with strong cultural foundations, in order to become bilingual and learn what it means to be Inuit in the contemporary world.⁶⁹ As Heather McGregor has described, the Nunavut Education Act of 2008 emphasizes familiar themes from the 1995 NWT Act, as well as new ones such as requiring K-12 education to be delivered bilingually using Inuit Language, and honouring Land Claim obligations to involve Inuit in decision-making.⁷⁰ Section 1 of the Act states that the education system “shall be based on Inuit societal values and attitudes and the principles and concepts of *Inuit Qaujimagajatuqangit* (IQ).”⁷¹ As the first education legislation in Canada to include such substantial cultural and linguistic mandates, this moves beyond previous commitments to CRE, towards requiring CFE. New departmental strategies for bilingual education and teacher education emphasize the importance of having Inuit teachers in all grades to instruct in Inuktitut.⁷² Achieving these goals necessitated development of new curricula and many additional resources in Inuit languages. Implications for social studies education have been as significant as for any other subject area.

Curriculum

Building on the work of *Inuuqatigiit*, new curricula developed for Nunavut schools were to be placed within an Inuit educational philosophy. To achieve this, four Inuit Elders were hired as knowledge-holders and worked with a territory-wide Elders Advisory Committee to explore and articulate the fundamentals of such a philosophy. Three documents published in 2007–2008 outlined and connected Elder research about Inuit ways of living and learning to pertinent research from Euro-Canadian perspectives. *Inuit Qaujimagajatuqangit: Education Framework for Nunavut Curriculum* incorporated key elements of *Inuuqatigiit*, extending its purpose “to create able human beings,”⁷³ and outlining a deep foundation of Inuit epistemology: natural laws, principles of living, and values and attitudes; four curriculum strands (instead of subjects) consisting of integrated knowledge, attitudes, and skills (called competencies); and five stages of continuous learning (instead of grades).⁷⁴ The other two documents described Inuit perspectives and related Euro-Canadian research about inclusion and assessment.⁷⁵ This Inuit approach to education was introduced to Nunavut schools through teacher in-service.

Early elements of this foundational work influenced new curriculum development initiatives for high school social studies as early as 2000.⁷⁶ For example, Inuit social studies principles and Elder research on knowledge, content, competencies, and cultural values were combined with elements of Euro-Canadian wellness and leadership education, for a required set of courses in grades 10–12 that connected social studies with wellness.⁷⁷ While these courses constitute strides toward CFE, a culturally

responsive approach was still required because almost all high school teachers were (and continue to be) settlers.

To provide additional culturally founded direction in social studies, Elders, Inuit educators, and long-term settler teachers completed a Grade 7-12 framework for *Nunavusiutit*, a curriculum “strand” combining social studies disciplines that redefines them from Inuit perspectives. The framework, which makes identity and IQ central as integrated learning goals, is organized into *Unikkaat/*Stories (History); *Sirlarjuq/*The World; *Inuuqatiingniq/*Social Interaction; *Avatimik Kamattiarniq/*Looking after the Environment; *Iliqqusiq/*Culture; *Nunaliriniq/*Geography; and *Pivalliajut/*Current Events. Key Inuit values and attitudes—respect, harmony, planning, and the common good—are integrated throughout.⁷⁸

A Grade 10 social studies curriculum developed over the past 5 years introduces made-in-Nunavut resources that reflect Inuit views of history, purposes, content, values and competencies. The first 25-hour module is about the history of Inuit land claims in Canada, emphasizing processes that returned decision-making to Inuit.⁷⁹ The second module is about the intergenerational impacts of Canadian and northern residential school experiences on life in Nunavut communities today.⁸⁰ The third and fourth modules reflect the *Nunavusiutit* framework and are more culturally founded than the first two. The third module outlines how working together and seeking harmony form foundations of governance and leadership.⁸¹ The last module explores how Inuit and Canadian societies view rights, responsibilities, and justice.⁸² Pedagogy in these social studies resources integrates content and literacy development, emphasizes individual growth through self-reflection and metacognitive learning, and uses critical thinking to explore changes needed in communities.

The Nunavut K-3 social studies initiative, started in 2009, develops bilingual resources from Inuit perspectives, but continues CRE as well. For example, Elders working with Inuit and long-term settler educators outlined beliefs about *My Family/Ilakta*.⁸³ They identified an essential question (why are families important?), major guiding ideas (e.g., family characteristics carry on across generations) and enduring understandings (e.g., there are many kinds of families), as well as content and competencies to teach through key learning experiences.⁸⁴ Philosophy includes teaching the whole child and involving parents, community members, and Elders in instruction. On the other hand, because many primary teachers are settlers, each unit includes culturally responsive background information, and activities that identify students’ prior knowledge and experiences. Activities teach concepts and competencies, including reflection and follow-up tasks, as well as accommodating diverse learning needs and assessment. Instruction culminates by sharing learning with families. Suggested pedagogy emphasizes active, hands-on learning experiences in the real world; connecting with families and community in and out of school; self-reflection and sharing in small groups; and using learning centres, drama, media, and arts. Practical resource kits, reflecting traditional and contemporary Inuit life, include bilingual black line masters; videos, games, and books in Inuit languages; and posters and photos. All K-6 teachers received in-service instruction on the unit as an example of the approach being used for other topics in all elementary grades.

In addition to the work described above, Nunavut joined the Western and Northern Canadian Protocol for Collaboration in Basic Education (WNCP), a partnership between western provinces and the three territories to develop curriculum frameworks, and uses the WNCP framework as a temporary teacher resource until made-in-Nunavut social studies curricula can be completed.

Nunavut helped develop *The Common Curriculum Framework for Elementary Social Studies K-9*, which acknowledges different perspectives, such as Aboriginal, but emphasizes Euro-Canadian concepts of citizenship and identity that contribute to a “Canadian spirit.”⁸⁵ Social studies topics and associated learning outcomes include culture and community; land, places, and people; time, continuity, and change; global connections; power and authority; and economics and resources. Pedagogy acknowledges students’ cultural/linguistic backgrounds and personal preferences and strengths. It emphasizes active, experiential learning inside/outside school, involving family and community; it promotes collaboration through inquiry, critical thinking, and creative decision-making; and it includes resource suggestions.

The *legal* mandate to develop an education system founded on IQ creates the most significant difference in Nunavut’s social studies approach, by establishing culturally founded Inuit philosophy, purposes, content, and competencies as the basis for instruction.⁸⁶ This work exceeds the expectations of CRE outlined in scholarship to date. The mandate makes Nunavut adoption of the WNCP curriculum, which only *acknowledges* Aboriginal perspectives, even more complex than the difficulties experienced by NWT developers when they adapted curriculum from Alberta. In both cases, culturally founded and culturally responsive instruction were, and continue to be, compromised. Prioritizing Aboriginal culture, as lived in both traditional and modern contexts, while acknowledging twenty-first century requirements of a global world, continues to challenge northern social studies curriculum development.

Conclusion

From 1969 to 1999 in the NWT, and since 1999 in Nunavut, educators attempted to create social studies curricula more culturally responsive to northern Aboriginal students. The earliest NWT handbooks, *Elementary Education* and *Learning in the Middle Years*, set the pattern for identifying philosophy, purposes, content, and pedagogy that used students’ cultures as the basis for classroom instruction. On the other hand, *Elementary Education* borrowed curriculum elements from Alberta. Both documents included extensive information about Aboriginal cultures to support implementation and educate teachers. We don’t know if teachers received in-service assistance about later documents that did not include such implementation supports or teacher development information. In retrospect, confusing discontinuities in curricula and lack of assistance with implementation and teacher development may have resulted in CRE that was a thin layer of “frosting” on top of layers of “curriculum cake” made primarily of Euro-Canadian perspectives.

Culturally founded curricula such as *Dene Kede* and *Inuuqatigiit*, and the *Nunavusiutit* framework, all still in use, are exceptions, incorporating cultural

knowledge, worldviews, values and attitudes, and life skills that share the purpose of creating “able human beings.” These examples reach beyond the culturally responsive instruction intended by other social studies documents to culturally founded curricula. However, as noted above, only *Dene Kede* provides detailed assistance with the implementation and teacher development that is essential for teachers to achieve intended goals.

This review raises questions about how the NWT and Nunavut can continue to improve social studies curricula in ways that uphold CRE or CFE, when many teachers working in the territories continue to be settlers who have not been raised and educated in the same culture as their students. To avoid the confusion evident in the provision of multiple, and sometimes conflicting, curricula in the past, I offer the following recommendations addressing three elements: curriculum development, implementation supports, and teacher development.⁸⁷ In offering these recommendations I draw on what I have learned from Aboriginal communities about their educational goals, through work implementing curriculum in the NWT and Nunavut, as well as contemporary educational scholarship concerning CRE.⁸⁸

Contemporary pressures to change social studies curricula to include more Canadian history and global issues make it imperative for northern curriculum developers to be clear about the purposes of social studies.⁸⁹ While some question the expanding horizons concept today, I suggest it still benefits northern students to have their experiences and knowledge form the foundation for learning about other places and issues.⁹⁰ CRE and CFE both emphasize designing and providing instruction specifically to assist Aboriginal students to achieve. This necessitates curricula that help students to understand both their historical and contemporary cultural identities, as well as their unique individual strengths, interests, and skills. Therefore embedding culture in social studies remains essential.

Interdisciplinary social studies curricula support CRE and CFE, but developers will have to balance requirements to reflect Aboriginal perspectives with pressures to teach disciplinary ways of thinking.⁹¹ Civics content requires particular attention. For example, do we want to teach students how to use power and authority to exert social control, or rather help them understand how effective co-operation in their community provides a model for building successful relationships with peoples around the world?⁹²

Where social studies continues as a separate subject, cultural research is needed to infuse curricula, pedagogy, and assessment with Aboriginal worldviews, content, and skills. Developers can achieve CRE *and* twenty-first century learning by using essential questions and enduring understandings.⁹³ Competencies that integrate knowledge, values and attitudes, and skills may offer a better match with holistic Aboriginal thinking styles. Using integrated themes that emphasize inquiry through projects may more closely match Aboriginal ways of learning.⁹⁴ The spiral approach that revisits key concepts is still important for students learning in a second language. Social studies curricula could also improve upon previous documents by outlining how to integrate CRE and CFE with possible conflicting cultural expectations from other curricula.⁹⁵

Northern schools have discovered that offering culturally responsive and culturally founded instruction requires on-going institutionalized implementation supports beyond those normally provided for social studies. To achieve the goals articulated by contemporary territorial mandates, it would be helpful for future curricula to clearly outline requirements for community and school leaders to plan and fund such things as instructional positions for Elders and community members (with language interpretation services); appropriate spaces for small group work; specialized equipment, materials, and supplies, especially for on-the-land activities; and local cultural research published in a variety of media. The more culturally founded the school, the more these supports matter.

In addition to these supports, whereas it is important for CRE to have Aboriginal teachers at all levels, CFE *requires* these teachers. Research emerging from CRE helps to show that teachers capable of CFE need to be well prepared, reflective about their identity, culturally competent, and fluent in their Aboriginal language. Opportunities to participate in research about Aboriginal ways of communicating, learning, and assessing would help teachers develop pedagogies consistent with cultural child-rearing expectations.⁹⁶ NWTDE and NDE teacher education programs offer important sites to address these challenges, and social studies developers must respond to their needs for bilingual, culturally founded resources.

Teachers are at the heart of improving instruction for Aboriginal students; therefore, all teachers require orientation, on-going professional development, and social studies in-services that model recommended instructional approaches for students.⁹⁷ As long as northern schools hire settler teachers, development opportunities must involve self-reflection about their unconscious colonial biases, power, and privilege, must provide cultural experiences in the community, and must teach the impacts of northern history on contemporary life and schooling.⁹⁸ These understandings are prerequisites for achieving CRE and CFE. To support both, educators might explore these recommendations through school-wide and classroom-based action research projects that discuss challenges and solutions honestly and respectfully.⁹⁹

Teachers are at the heart of supporting students to stay in school and graduate, therefore establishing welcoming, safe, respectful, caring environments, and developing strong personal relationships with students, families, and communities are essential. Teachers will then be able to re-create instruction that focuses on the whole child, meets individual developmental needs, motivates students to do their best, and helps more students succeed.¹⁰⁰ Students and parents want social studies curricula to set high standards and hold teachers accountable for meeting these expectations.¹⁰¹

Teachers are at the heart of discussing with parents and the public why and how contemporary school systems *can* incorporate Aboriginal cultural worldviews, knowledge systems, values and attitudes, and skills, thereby enhancing students' self-esteem and reinforcing cultural identity. These foundations strengthen development of the competencies and critical consciousness required to survive and thrive in a complex, twenty-first century world.

Teachers are at the heart of transforming social studies education by implementing CRE or CFE, thereby changing instruction to fit students, rather than altering

students to fit the system. This will enable and energize students to become positive agents of change in their communities, their country and the world.¹⁰² Social studies instruction will then follow in the footsteps of generations of Dene and Inuit, continuing to achieve the goals articulated by the late Donald Uluadluak, a well-respected Nunavut Elder:

“People who are made into human beings are educated in a way that those who just have information are not. It is about having the information and the humanity to be able to use it to improve your society and to make life better for those around you.”

Notes

- 1 Both Dene and Inuit use a similar term to refer to their ultimate purpose for educating children.
- 2 For more on traditional Inuit education, before the introduction of schooling, see Heather E. McGregor, *Inuit Education and Schools in the Eastern Arctic* (Vancouver, UBC Press, 2010), chap. 2.
- 3 Paulette Regan, *Unsettling the Settler Within* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2010), 240. Regan defines settlers as people (early and recent immigrants) with “Western European philosophy, political systems, law and values [that] still define Canadian culture.”
- 4 See Norman John Macpherson, *Dreams & Visions: Education in the Northwest Territories From Early Years to 1984* (Yellowknife: Department of Education, Government of Northwest Territories, 1991); Heather E. McGregor, “Listening for More (Hi)Stories from Nunavut’s Dispersed Educational Past,” in this issue.
- 5 Diamond Jenness, *Eskimo Administration: II. Canada* (Montreal: Arctic Institute of North America), 68.
- 6 Russell G. Stauffer, *The Language Experience Approach to the Teaching of Reading* (New York: Harper and Row, 1980), 3.
- 7 I use this acronym even when the department name changes; the appropriate name appears in citations.
- 8 NWT Education, Culture and Employment, *Northern Studies 15 Interim Curriculum* (Yellowknife: Government of the Northwest Territories, 1991).
- 9 Students wishing to complete high school were required to travel to regional residential high schools; this meant few students received grade 10-12 education.
- 10 Nawang Phuntsog, “The Magic of Culturally Responsive Pedagogy: In Search of the Genie’s Lamp in Multicultural Education,” *Teacher Education Quarterly* (Summer 1999): 1; Shelly Brown-Jeffy and Jewell E. Cooper, “Toward a Conceptual Framework of Culturally Relevant Pedagogy: An Overview of the Conceptual and Theoretical Literature,” *Teacher Education Quarterly* (Winter 2011): 65-83.
- 11 Gloria Ladson Billings, “Toward a Theory of Culturally Relevant Pedagogy,” *American Educational Research Association* 32, 3 (Autumn 1995): 469.
- 12 For discussion of CRE, see Christine Sleeter, “The Quest for Social Justice in the Education of Minoritized Students,” in *Professional Development for Culturally Responsive and Relationship-Based Pedagogy*, ed. Christine Sleeter (New York: Peter Lang, 2011), 13.
- 13 John Dewey, *Experience and Education* (New York: Touchstone, 1997), 18-23, 67-69, 20; John Dewey, *Democracy and Education* (e-book, 2008), chaps. 14, p. 5. (<http://www.gutenberg.org/files/852/852-h/852-h.htm>.); International Center for Educators’ Learning Styles, “John Dewey’s Philosophy of Experience and Education” (2014), 3

- (http://www.icels-educators-for-learning.ca/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=53&Itemid=68).
- 14 Delia Clark, "Learning to Make Choices for the Future" (Centre for Place-based Learning and Community Engagement, 2008), 5 (http://promiseofplace.org/assets/files/PBE_Manual_01_Intro.pdf).
 - 15 F. Mogensen and K. Schnack, "The Action Competence Approach and the 'New' Discourses of Education for Sustainable Development, Competence and Quality Criteria," *Environmental Education Research* 16, 1 (2010): 62 (http://www.colorado.edu/journals/cye/21_1/21_1_00_PBE_Research_and_Practice_Observations.pdf).
 - 16 Rebecca Boyd, "Growing Kids who Care—Connecting School, Place and Planet" (2010) (http://www.wcmt.org.uk/sites/default/files/migrated-reports/762_1.pdf).
 - 17 See David Gruenwald, "The Best of Both Worlds: A Critical Pedagogy of Place," *Educational Researcher* 3 (2003): 12; The Centre for Place-Based Education, "What is Place-Based Education?" (Antioch University, 2014) (<http://www.antiochne.edu/aneil/cpbel/>); Greg Mannion and Claire Adey, "Place-Based Education is an Intergenerational Practice," *Children, Youth and Environments* 21, 1 (2011): 35-58.
 - 18 Geneva Gay, "Preparing for Culturally Responsive Teaching," *Journal of Teacher Education* 53, 2 (March/April 2002): 106-16.
 - 19 *Ibid.*, 112.
 - 20 *Ibid.*, 106.
 - 21 See William G. Demmert, Jr., "What is Culture-Based Education? Understanding Pedagogy and Curriculum," in *Honoring Our Heritage: Culturally Appropriate Approaches for Teaching Indigenous Students*, ed. J. Reyhner, W.S. Gilbert, L. Lockard (Flagstaff: Northern Arizona University, 2011), 1-9. Some authors use "culture-based" to describe ideas similar to culturally founded, but others use culture-based interchangeably with CRE, as in this article. The new term allows differentiation.
 - 22 Christine Sleeter, "The Quest for Social Justice," 9.
 - 23 NIEA Digest: In Brief, "Using Culturally Based Education to Increase Academic Achievement and Gradation Rates" (nd) (<http://www.niea.org/data/files/policy/culturallybasededbp.pdf>).
 - 24 Department of Education, *Survey of Education*, ed. B.C. Gillie (Yellowknife: Government of Northwest Territories, 1972).
 - 25 Government of the Northwest Territories, *An Ordinance Respecting Education in the Northwest Territories* (Yellowknife: Council of the Northwest Territories, 1977).
 - 26 Government of the Northwest Territories, *Education Act* (Yellowknife: Council of the Northwest Territories, 1995). While earlier legislation enabled subject instruction in Aboriginal languages, limitations in human resources and materials usually meant this happened only in primary language arts classes. This legislation more accurately represented this reality by stating that Aboriginal language instruction could occur where human resources existed, with significant community demand and ministerial approval (S.71, ss4 a-c).
 - 27 Department of Education, *Elementary Education in the Northwest Territories* (Yellowknife, Government of the Northwest Territories, 1972).
 - 28 Penney Clark, "The Historical Context of Social Studies in English Canada," in *Challenges and Prospects for Canadian Social Studies*, ed. A. Sears and I. Wright (Vancouver: Pacific Educational Press, 2004), 17-37.
 - 29 Department of Education, *Elementary Education*, 13.
 - 30 *Ibid.*, 6-8, 10.
 - 31 See explanation in Clark, "Historical Context of Social Studies," 18.

- 32 Department of Education, *Elementary Education*, 15.
- 33 *Ibid.*, 253.
- 34 Department of Education, Programme Development Division, *Learning in the Middle Years: A Handbook for Curriculum Development* (Yellowknife: Government of Northwest Territories, 1973).
- 35 Department of Education, *Learning in the Middle Years*, 441-44. This section describes a complicated process involving many partners to develop the first two curricula. Without citations for cultural information, it is unclear how they determined or verified the ethnographic-style content.
- 36 Department of Education, Education Programs and Evaluation Division, *Civics* (Yellowknife: Government of Northwest Territories, 1978).
- 37 Department of Education, Education Programs and Evaluation Division, *Environmental Studies* (Yellowknife: Government of Northwest Territories, 1978).
- 38 *Ibid.*, Foreword.
- 39 Department of Education, Education Programs and Evaluation Division, *Social Studies K-9* (Yellowknife: Government of Northwest Territories, 1979), 1.
- 40 *Ibid.*, Foreword.
- 41 *Ibid.*, 13.
- 42 See explanation in Hilda Taba, Mary C. Durkin, Jack R. Frankel, Anthony H. McNaughton, *A Teacher's Handbook to Elementary Social Studies: An Inductive Approach* (Menlo Park, Ca: Addison Wesley, 1971), 29.
- 43 Department of Education, *Elementary Education*, 253; Department of Education, *Social Studies: K-9*, 13.
- 44 Clark, "Historical Context of Social Studies," 28-29.
- 45 Tagak Curley, "Tagak— On Education," *Inuit Monthly* 3, 7 (1974): 28-31.
- 46 Northwest Territories Legislative Assembly, Special Committee on Education, *Learning: Tradition and Change in the Northwest Territories* (Yellowknife, Northwest Territories Legislative Assembly, 1982).
- 47 Department of Education and Nunavut Arctic College, "Qalattuq: 10 Year Educator Training Strategy 2006–2016" (Iqaluit: Government of Nunavut, July 2006), 19. The first Aboriginal teacher education program in Canada started in Yellowknife in 1969. In 1979, it opened in the Eastern Arctic, affiliated with McGill in 1981, and expanded to a B.Ed program in 1986.
- 48 Territorial Printer, *Revised Statutes of the NWT, Vol. II, 1988, Education Ordinance* (Yellowknife, Government of Northwest Territories, 1990), SS. 89, 90, 92-94.
- 49 A program outlines topics, content, and learning experiences; a curriculum outlines sequenced knowledge, skills, and attitudes.
- 50 Baffin Divisional Board of Education, *Our Future is Now: Directions for Education in the Baffin* (Iqaluit: Baffin Divisional Board of Education, 1987), 1-10.
- 51 Baffin Divisional Board of Education, *Piniagtavut* (Iqaluit: Baffin Divisional Board of Education, 1989), i-ii.
- 52 Jim Cummins, "Empowering Minority Students: A Framework for Intervention," *Harvard Educational Review* 56, 1 (1986): 18-36.
- 53 For example, Baffin Divisional Board of Education, *Piniagtavut Planning Guide K-3* (Iqaluit, Baffin Divisional Board, nd).
- 54 Government of Canada, Government of Northwest Territories, Tungavik Federation of Nunavut, *Nunavut Political Accord* (1992) (http://landclaimscoalition.ca/pdf/Nunavut_Political_Accord_1992.pdf); Jens Dahl, Jack Hickeys, Peter Jull, Eds., *Nunavut: Inuit Regain Control of Their Lands and Their Lives* (Copenhagen: IWGIA, Document No. 102, 2000), 95.
- 55 Nunavut Education Councils, *BELIEFS* (unpublished notes, Iqaluit: Baffin Divisional Board of Education, April/October 1995).

- 56 Government of the Northwest Territories, *Education Act* (Yellowknife: Council of the Northwest Territories, 1995).
- 57 Department of Education, *Civics in the Elementary Social Studies Curriculum* (Yellowknife: Government of Northwest Territories, 1992).
- 58 For this and the next paragraph, see NWT Education, Culture and Employment, *Elementary Social Studies* (Yellowknife: Government of Northwest Territories, 1993), and Department of Education, *Our Students Our Future: An Educational Framework* (Yellowknife: Government of Northwest Territories, 1991), 20.
- 59 NWT Education, Culture and Employment, *Junior Secondary Social Studies* (Yellowknife: Government of Northwest Territories, 1993).
- 60 NWT Education, Culture and Employment, *Dene Kede* (Yellowknife: Government of Northwest Territories, 1993), xiii.
- 61 *Ibid.*, xiii-xiv. The Foreword discusses difficulties articulating Dene perspectives without written records and describes extensive consultations to complete research. See also Jaqueline Ottmann and Lori Pritchard, “Aboriginal Perspectives and the Social Studies Curriculum,” *First Nations Perspectives* 3, 1 (2010): 21-46.
- 62 NWT Education, *Dene Kede*, xiv.
- 63 *Ibid.*, xxix.
- 64 NWT Education, Culture and Employment, *Inuuqatigiit* (Yellowknife: Government of Northwest Territories, 1996).
- 65 *Ibid.*, i.
- 66 C. McGregor, “Baffin Divisional Board of Education—*Inuuqatigiit* Implementation—School Planning Guide” (Iqaluit, Baffin Divisional Board of Education, 1996).
- 67 NWT Education, Culture and Employment, *Dene Kede Teacher Resource Manual* (Yellowknife: Government of Northwest Territories, 1993).
- 68 *Inuit Qaujimaqatugangit* articulates Inuit culture: worldview, knowledge, beliefs, ways of thinking, learning and communicating, child-rearing, values, attitudes, and skills handed down through generations.
- 69 M. Lynn Aylward, “Executive Summary of *Sivuniksamut Illinniarniq* Consultations” (Arviat: Department of Education, Curriculum and School Services, 2004), 11.
- 70 Heather E. McGregor, “Nunavut’s Education Act: Education, Legislation and Change in the Arctic,” *The Northern Review* 36 (Fall 2012): 27-52; Government of Nunavut, *Nunavut Education Act* (Iqaluit: Legislative Assembly of Nunavut, 2008).
- 71 *Ibid.*, p 2.
- 72 Department of Education, “Bilingual Education Strategy for Nunavut: 2004–2008” (Iqaluit: Government of Nunavut, 2004); Department of Education and Nunavut Arctic College, *Qalattug*.
- 73 Nunavut Department of Education, Curriculum and School Services Division, *Inuit Qaujimaqatugangit: Education Framework for Nunavut Curriculum* (Iqaluit: Government of Nunavut, 2007), 17.
- 74 A competency combines related knowledge, skills, and attitudes instead of conceiving of, organizing, and teaching each in isolation.
- 75 Nunavut Department of Education, Curriculum and School Services Division, *Inuugugijaittuq: Foundation for Inclusive Education in Nunavut Schools* (Iqaluit: Government of Nunavut, 2008). See also Nunavut Department of Education, Curriculum and School Services Division, *Ilitaunnikuliriniq: Foundation for Dynamic Assessment as Learning in Nunavut Schools* (Iqaluit: Government of Nunavut, 2008).
- 76 Nunavut Department of Education, *Education Framework*, 48.
- 77 Government of Nunavut, *Nunavut Education Act* (2008), 2. *Aulajaaqtut* courses include: identity, wellness, safety, survival, volunteerism, and leadership.
- 78 Nunavut Department of Education, Curriculum and School Services Division, *Nunavusiutit Framework* (Arviat: Government of Nunavut, 2009).

- 79 Nunavut Department of Education, Curriculum and School Services, *Staking the Claim: Dreams, Democracy and Canadian Inuit* (Iqaluit: Government of Nunavut, 2009).
- 80 Department of Education, Culture and Employment, Government of Northwest Territories, Department of Education, Government of Nunavut, Legacy of Hope Foundation, *The Residential School System in Canada: Understanding the Past—Seeking Reconciliation—Building Hope for Tomorrow* (Ottawa: Nation Media and Design, 2013).
- 81 Department of Education, Curriculum and School Services, *Inuuqatigiitsiarniq: Seeking Harmony* (Iqaluit: Government of Nunavut, Draft 2013).
- 82 Department of Education, Curriculum and School Services, *Rights, Responsibilities and Justice* (Iqaluit: Government of Nunavut, Draft 2013).
- 83 Nunavut Department of Education, Curriculum and School Services, *My Family/Ilatka* (Iqaluit: Government of Nunavut, 2011).
- 84 Jay McTighe and Grant Wiggins, “Understanding by Design, Overview of UbD & the Design Template” (<http://www.grantwiggins.org/documents/UbDQuikvue1005.pdf>), provides a sample social studies unit using major understandings and essential questions; see also North Slope Borough School District, “Curriculum Alignment Integration and Mapping (CAIM) Project” (Barrow, Alaska, 2014) (<http://www.nsbdsd.org/Page/671>), for a model of the approach with CFE.
- 85 WNCP, *The Common Curriculum Framework for Social Studies Kindergarten to Grade 9* (Manitoba Education, Training and Youth, 2002), 3; see also David Scott, “Teaching Aboriginal Perspectives: An investigation into teacher practices amidst curriculum change,” *Canadian Social Studies* 46, 1 (Spring 2013): 31–43 (http://www2.education.ualberta.ca/css/Css_46_1/CSS-Vol-46-1-complete.pdf), which describes WNCP deficiencies regarding Aboriginal perspectives.
- 86 For more on Nunavut curriculum see Heather E. McGregor, “Curriculum Change in Nunavut Towards Inuit Qaujimaqatuqangit,” *McGill Journal of Education* 47, 3 (Fall 2012): 285–302.
- 87 See Heraldo V. Richards, Ayanna F. Brown, Timothy B. Forde, “Addressing Diversity in Schools: Culturally Responsive Pedagogy,” *Teaching Exceptional Children* 39, 3 (Jan/Feb 2007): 64–68; Ontario Ministry of Education, “Capacity Building Series: Culturally Responsive Pedagogy” (Toronto: Ontario Ministry of Education, Student Achievement Division, Nov. 2013), 1–8 (http://www.edu.gov.on.ca/eng/literacynumeracy/inspire/research/CBS_ResponsivePedagogy.pdf).
- 88 See NWT, Education, Culture and Employment, *The Education Renewal and Innovation Framework: Directions for Change* (Yellowknife, Government of Northwest Territories, 2013), 23–24.
- 89 See for example Marc Chalifoux and J.D.M. Stewart, *Canadian History Report Card: Curriculum Analysis of High Schools in Canada* (The Dominion Institute, June 2009); Rahima Wade, “Beyond expanding horizons: new directions for elementary social studies,” *The Elementary School Journal* 1, 2 (Nov. 2002): 115–34; Lindsay Gibson, “Comparing Recent Canadian and American Social Studies Curriculum and Methods Texts: An Essay Review,” *Canadian Social Studies* 45, 2 (Fall 2012): 42.
- 90 NWT, Department of Education, *Education Renewal*, 23; Ottman and Pritchard, “Aboriginal Perspectives”; Wade, “Beyond expanding horizons,” 115.
- 91 WNCP, “Guiding Principles for WNCP Curriculum Framework Projects” (WNCP, January 2011), 10 (http://www.education.gov.sk.ca/adx/asp/adxGetMedia.aspx?DocID=7413,1429,107,81,1,Documents&MediaID=15800&Filename=Guiding_Principles_FEB2011.pdf); see also Sidney Stephens, *Handbook for Culturally Responsive Science Curriculum* (Alaska Science Consortium and Alaska Rural System Initiative, nd), which combines different cultural perspectives.

- 92 WNCB, *Common Curriculum Framework*, 15, 21; Department of Education, “*Nunavusiutit Framework*.”
- 93 Taba et al., *Teachers Handbook Elementary Social Studies*, chap. 2; McTighe and Wiggins, “Understanding by Design;” Roland Case, “Beyond Inert Facts: Teaching for Understanding in Elementary Social Studies,” in *The Anthology of Social Studies: Issues and Strategies for Elementary Teachers, Vol. 1* (Vancouver: Pacific Educational Press, 2008), 33-47.
- 94 WNCB, “Guiding Principles,” 10-12. These twenty-first century principles include competencies.
- 95 See Elizabeth Ann Munroe, Lisa Lunney Borden, Anne Murray Orr, Denise Toney, Jane Meader, “Decolonizing Aboriginal Education in the 21st Century,” *McGill Journal of Education* 48, 2 (Spring 2013): 317-338. They provide a comprehensive discussion of these challenges and ways to address them. See also, Ray Barnhardt and Angayuq Oscar Kawagley, “Indigenous Knowledge Systems and Alaska Native Ways of Knowing,” *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* 36, 1 (2005): 8-23; Angelina E. Castagno and Bryan Brayboy, “Culturally Responsive Schooling for Indigenous Youth: A Review of the Literature,” *Review of Educational Research* 78 (Feb. 2009): 941-993.
- 96 See Jerry Lipka, Gerald Mohatt, Esther Ilutsik, Ciulistet Group, *Transforming the Culture of Schools: Yup’ik Eskimo Examples* (Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1998).
- 97 Ottmann and Pritchard, “Aboriginal Perspectives,” 34-37.
- 98 Taiaiake Alfred, “Foreword,” in Regan, *Unsettling the Settler Within*, ix-xi. See also Richards, Brown, and Forde, “Addressing Diversity in Schools,” ix-xi.
- 99 See Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami, *First Canadians, Canadians First: National Strategy on Inuit Education* (Ottawa, ON: Published for the National Committee on Inuit Education by Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami, 2011); Heather E. McGregor, “Developing an education research agenda in Nunavut: A Northerner’s Point of View,” *Northern Public Affairs* 2 (Special Issue 2011): 77-79.
- 100 See Fiona Walton and Mark Sandiford, “*Going Places: Preparing High School Students for a Changing, Wider World*” (Documentary Video, Charlottetown: University of Prince Edward Island, 2011); Fiona Walton, Mark Sandiford, Kerri Wheatley, *Alluriarniaq Stepping Forward: Youth Perspectives on High School Education in Nunavut* (Documentary Video: Charlottetown: University of Prince Edward Island, 2012).
- 101 See Shelley Zion, Theo Zion, Kathleen King, “Module 2: Culturally Responsive Pedagogy and Practice” (National Centre for Culturally Responsive Educational Systems: Arizona State University, 2008); NWT Education, *Education Renewal*, 23.
- 102 Cathy McGregor, “The Teacher as Change Agent,” *Aurora: The Professional Journal for NWT Teachers* 2, 3 (1980): 3-9.