

Final Report

Evaluation of the Nunavut Teacher Education Program

Submitted to:

**The Government of Nunavut Department of Education
and
Nunavut Arctic College**

Aarluk Consulting Inc.



September 8, 2005

List of Acronyms

ADM - Assistant Deputy Minister
CLEY - Culture, Language Elders and Youth
CTEP – Community-based Teacher Education Program
DEA – District Education Authority
DOE - Department of Education
FANS – Financial Assistance for Nunavut Students
GN - Government of Nunavut
GNWT - Government of the Northwest Territories
NAC - Nunavut Arctic College
NLCA - Nunavut Land Claims Agreement
NTI - Nunavut Tunngavik Inc.
NTEP – Nunavut Teacher Education Program
NWT - Northwest Territories
TEP – Teacher Education Program

Table of Contents

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	4
2. INTRODUCTION.....	12
2.1. PURPOSE AND BACKGROUND.....	12
2.2. STUDY TEAM	12
2.3. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	12
3. EVALUATION PROFILE.....	13
3.1. OBJECTIVES	13
3.2. FOCUS OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION QUESTIONS.....	14
3.3. RESEARCH ACTIVITIES.....	14
3.4. LIMITATIONS.....	15
4. EDUCATION IN NUNAVUT.....	16
4.1. BACKGROUND.....	16
4.2. ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION.....	17
4.3. POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION	19
5. NUNAVUT TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM.....	21
5.1. BACKGROUND.....	21
5.2. CURRENT PROGRAM DESIGN AND DELIVERY	25
5.2.1. <i>General Program Design</i>	25
5.2.2. <i>Enrolment and Registration</i>	27
5.2.3. <i>Community-Based Program Delivery</i>	30
5.2.4. <i>Relationship with McGill University</i>	33
5.3. ADMINISTRATION	35
5.4. GRADUATE DATA	36
5.5. FUNDING.....	38
6. OVERVIEW OF OTHER INDIGENOUS TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS.....	41
6.1. BACKGROUND.....	41
6.2. INDIGENOUS TEACHER EDUCATION MODELS	41
6.2.1. <i>Kativik School Board</i>	41
6.2.2. <i>University of Alaska Fairbanks</i>	44
6.2.3. <i>First Nations University</i>	48
6.2.4. <i>Sámi</i>	49
6.2.5. <i>Māori</i>	51
6.2.6. <i>Hawaii</i>	54
7. EVALUATION FINDINGS.....	57
7.1. RATIONALE AND RELEVANCE	57
7.2. DESIGN AND DELIVERY	59
7.3. EFFECTIVENESS AND EFFICIENCY	66

7.4. FUTURE DIRECTIONS.....	78
8. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	86
8.1. CONCLUSIONS.....	86
8.2. RECOMMENDATIONS.....	87
APPENDIX I –LIST OF INDIVIDUALS CONSULTED.....	90
APPENDIX II - LIST OF DOCUMENTS.....	93

List Of Tables

TABLE 1: ENROLMENT OF INUIT STUDENTS IN NUNAVUT BY REGION, 2002	17
TABLE 2: NUMBER OF CURRENT INUIT TEACHERS IN NUNAVUT INCLUDING NUMBER OF NTEP GRADUATES CURRENTLY EMPLOYED AS OF SEPTEMBER 2004.....	19
TABLE 3: NTEP/CTEP ENROLMENT, 2001-2005.....	27
TABLE 4: LOCATION AND NUMBER OF REGISTRATIONS IN NTEP/CTEP AS OF JUNE 2005	28
TABLE 5: NUMBER OF APPLICATIONS TO NTEP/CTEP AND ACCEPTANCE RATE, 2004...	29
TABLE 6: NTEP/CTEP WITHDRAWALS AND REASONS, 2001-2004.....	30
TABLE 7: LIST OF COMMUNITIES WHERE COMMUNITY-BASED PROGRAMS HAVE BEEN OFFERED, 1991 - 2004	32
TABLE 8: NUMBER OF NTEP GRADUATES AS OF JUNE 2005	37
TABLE 9: NTEP (IQALUIT)EXPENSES, 2001 – 2004.....	38
TABLE 10: CTEP EXPENSES, 2001-2004.....	39
TABLE 11: NTEP/CTEP COSTS PER STUDENT, 2001-2004	40

1. Executive Summary

Introduction

This report provides results from a study undertaken by Aarluk Consulting Inc. to evaluate the campus-based and community-based Nunavut Teacher Education Program (NTEP/CTEP). This evaluation was conducted for Nunavut Arctic College (NAC).

Evaluation Profile

The evaluation research was overseen by a Steering Committee consisting of representatives of the Nunavut Department of Education, Nunavut Arctic College and Nunavut Tunngavik Inc. This study was primarily qualitative in nature with research activities that included a literature and file review; interviews in English and Inuktitut with thirty one key respondents including Government of Nunavut (GN) officials, NTEP and NAC staff, students, union officials and Inuit organizations involved in the program; surveys of school principals (13 of 42 responded) and five focus group with DEA chairs (24 respondents), and regional school operations staff (5 respondents). Focus groups with a panel of experts chosen by the Steering Committee and students had been planned, but did not happen due to conflicting schedules. However, 5 of the 6 members of the panel of experts were interviewed individually.

Limitations on the research included the fact that the number of students surveyed was statistically too small to make generalizations about student perspectives in general, 3 Nunavut respondents were unavailable during the scheduled interviewing period and that there was little historical data on the results and impacts of the program making it difficult to provide trend analysis of NTEP performance indicators.

The Nunavut Teacher Education Program

The Nunavut Teacher Education Program began in 1979 as the Eastern Arctic Teacher Education Program (EATEP). An affiliation was established with McGill University soon after (in 1981). This association, during its early years, was supported by a major grant from the Donner Canadian Foundation. The program was initially a two-year teacher education program culminating in the Certificate in Native and Northern Education from McGill University and certification to teach in the NWT. Teacher training courses were available to full-time trainees through an institutional program based in Iqaluit, and to part-time trainees who were employed in schools as teacher assistants through courses offered in the field in many eastern Arctic communities.

In 1985, the Eastern Arctic Teacher Education Program became a part of the newly established Arctic College. During the next year, the program was expanded to include a Bachelor of Education degree, adding another 30 credits to the program. A fourth year was added in 1994 increasing total credits required to 120. NTEP was expanded during this period in part to provide a more comprehensive training program equivalent to other teacher education programs.

The Nunavut Teacher Education Program currently offers a campus-based program and community-based program (CTEP), which prepares Inuit to become classroom teachers for elementary schools in Nunavut. The programs are offered at the Nunatta Campus of Nunavut Arctic College in Iqaluit and various communities throughout Nunavut. The program offered at the main campus in Iqaluit is a full-time continuous program. The locations of the community programs vary – these are selected in order to meet the goal of having at least one program ongoing in any year in each of the three regions of Nunavut. All programs are delivered in modules during three semesters (fall, winter and summer) and include a practicum in each year except the fourth Bachelor of Education year.

Currently, the College offers two basic teacher training programs:

- a) Three-year Nunavut Arctic College Teaching Diploma (90 credits) which includes the McGill University Certificate in Education of Inuit and First Nations (60 credits); and
- b) Four-year Bachelor of Education Degree (120 credits).

Since it started, NTEP has produced 224 Inuit graduates of the Diploma program with 124 moving on to graduate from the Bachelor of Education program. It must be noted that graduates from the Bachelor of Education program first receive their Diploma; therefore the number of Inuit with teaching credentials can be assumed to be approximately 224. For the 2004-2005 year, 86 students in total were enrolled. Of these 42 were in the Iqaluit campus-based program and 44 in the four community-based programs. On average, approximately 52 per cent of students (199 of a total of 375) were enrolled at the Iqaluit main campus between 2001 and 2005. The number of female students far exceeds the number of male students. Female students made up 83 to 88 per cent of the student population between 2001 and 2005.

Drop out rates for the 2001-2004 years were 6, 9 and 11 per cent respectively with an average of 9 per cent. These levels are notably lower than the levels in the mid-1990s when NTEP drop out rates reached between 20-30 per cent.

NTEP has worked in association with McGill University since 1981. Liaisons between Nunavut Arctic College and McGill University are generally through the NTEP Principal and the Office of First Nations and Inuit Education (OFNIE) in the Faculty of Education at McGill University. OFNIE provides general administrative and registration support to NTEP such as record keeping and assistance in finding instructors. OFNIE gives official accreditation to its programs, but does not provide program delivery services.

The specific roles and responsibilities of both NAC and McGill University are outlined in a formal agreement between the college and the university. The present agreement term is for 3 years beginning on September 1, 2004 and ending on June 30, 2007. For the current year, under the present agreement, Nunavut Arctic College pays \$150,000 to McGill University for its services.

NTEP presently has a full-time staff of seven all working at the main campus in Iqaluit. These include a principal, a community coordinator (presently working for the Department of Education), and five instructors (one Inuk and four non-Inuit). In the 2003-2004 year, all NTEP programs received a total of approximately \$2,263,000 in funding. Approximately \$686,000 of this came in the form of base funding from the Nunavut Arctic College budget specifically for the campus-based program. However, there is no base funding for the community-based program (CTEP). Since 2003-2004, approximately \$1,879,000 of the total NTEP budget has come directly from the Government of Nunavut Department of Education, specifically for CTEP.

A cost-per-student calculation can be made for NTEP using data collected from NAC and McGill sources. The annual costs per student for the entire NTEP (campus and community based) have been rising. Costs between 2001 and 2004 were \$18,678, \$22,698 and \$24,073 per student respectively, with an average for those years of \$21,216 per student enrolled. Costs per student now are actually lower than they were almost ten years ago. The above average cost per student (\$21,216) compares to \$29,101 for TEP in 1997. Little data are available to explain why this change in cost per student has occurred. Also, given the limitations of available data, accurate comparisons of costs per student between CTEP and NTEP are not possible. Funds are fluid between the two programs during some periods and there have been funds carried forward between years.

Overview of Other Indigenous Teacher Education Programs

As part of this evaluation, a summary was compiled of noteworthy indigenous education programs in Canada and abroad in order to provide potentially useful models for NTEP to consider. Seven such programs were detailed from Canada (2), Alaska (1), New Zealand (2), Hawaii (1) and Norway (1).

The Kativik School Board of Nunavik and the First Nations University in Saskatchewan were the two Canadian examples provided. The Kativik model was noteworthy because it was a fully community-based program offered in a region with very similar circumstances to Nunavut. The Kativik program is delivered by Inuit educators and is classroom-based since all student teachers continue to work while in the program. The First Nations University is a post-secondary institution that has made the transition from a college structure to that of a more autonomous university. The University of Alaska Fairbanks has a well-developed teacher education program which provides a full-time internship in the final year of the studies. The program also has integrated its content well with research initiatives at the University and built an extensive rural component.

The Sámi University College in Norway has attributes relevant to NTEP since it is a fully Sámi institution in which the principal language of instruction is the Sámi language and all staff are Sámi. Two programs are summarized from New Zealand - Te Wānanga-o-Raukawa and Te Whare Wananga o Awanuiarangi. These post-secondary institutions are unique educational institutions with administration, structure and content all controlled by Māori and based on the Māori language and culture. The Sámi and Māori examples have extensive Internet-based delivery systems that allow for distance education to be fully integrated within their programs. Also interesting is the fact that all international examples offer accreditation that is recognized nationally.

Evaluation Findings

The evaluation findings for 26 questions covering four areas are summarized below.

Rationale and Relevance

- A large majority of respondents agreed that NTEP remains relevant, however many believed that a number of areas demand serious and immediate attention, including program content and communications with stakeholders; and
- A slight majority of respondents stated that even though more NTEP courses are now taught in Inuktitut, little Inuit culture has been incorporated into the structure and delivery methods of the program.

Design and Delivery

- NTEP has a long history. However, current program goals and objectives have been communicated poorly and should be reviewed;
- NTEP has been consistently producing graduates; however concerns exist regarding whether funds provided are being used optimally since in some years CTEP specific funds have lapsed. If NTEP is to expand into training for the middle and high school years, significant additional resources will be necessary;
- There is little communication between NTEP staff and DOE staff on use of current curriculum and approaches designated by DOE;
- There is consensus that there should be more practicum time at all stages of the program, especially for the fourth year B.Ed.; and
- Stronger partnerships should be developed between NTEP and all stakeholders, especially the DOE curriculum unit and schools.

Effectiveness and Efficiency

- Accessibility issues exist relating to the challenges for some potential students to relocate to Iqaluit and the low academic levels of some students entering the program;

- NTEP has partially fulfilled some goals of the 1997 GNWT goals such as producing graduates, (e.g. it has produced 224 Diploma graduates), however many other goals remain unattained, including achieving the 1997 objective of having 317 Inuit teachers working in the system by 2005;
- There is a consensus that there should be more Inuit instructors and that current instructors should be given more chances for collaboration, research and professional development. However, personality conflicts within NTEP have adversely affected past attempts to bring in more Inuit instructors;
- A large majority of respondents stated that NTEP should communicate more with the communities and DEA on a regular basis;
- A majority of respondents stated that while some course content is adequate, there is a need to renew content in general;
- A slight majority of respondents stated that the community-based program is essential and in some cases a preferable model to the campus-based program. Quality assurance of the program, however, was a major concern;
- There is consensus that the relationship with McGill University is too expensive and provides too little in return. A majority of respondents suggested that NTEP should look to renegotiate its agreement with McGill or find another university partner. In some cases, NTEP is not receiving the services from McGill agreed to in the present Agreement;
- There is a general perception among NTEP staff that the campus-based program is working well with the resources it is given, however it was believed that long-term plans are lacking, leading many to suggest options for new delivery models. All respondents agreed that the steering committee should be re-established;
- When compared to data on per-student costs from eight years ago, current NTEP programming is more cost efficient; and
- There is consensus that NTEP structure and delivery has changed little for a number of years. Few respondents, however, had comments on the effectiveness of the program compared to earlier years

Future Directions

- There is currently no formal communications strategy at either NTEP or NAC and there is consensus that one should be developed;
- A majority of respondents believe that expanding into the junior and senior levels is important, however many stated that NTEP should concentrate on the elementary level first. If NTEP were to expand, it would need considerably more resources;
- Respondents who provided suggestions for future directions stated that for program expansion into the high school level, a targeted approach with a small number of students would work best; and

- These respondents also stated that the community-based program should be redesigned to allow more communities to have access to the program.

Conclusions

NTEP has had a long history, producing 224 Diploma graduates as of this year. Inuit teachers can now be found in most schools of Nunavut. However, there remains much work to be done if Inuktitut is to become the principal language of instruction in all Nunavut schools. NTEP has a strong role to play in continuing to train qualified Inuit teachers. There is a strong consensus from stakeholders that the program remains relevant and should be significantly enhanced if the goals of graduating a large number of K-12 Inuit teachers and building program content and structure around Inuit culture are to be reached within the present generation.

There is consensus that there should be more practicum time at all stages of the program, especially for the fourth year B.Ed., and that allowing campus-based students to have some practicum time in their home communities is of great value. There was also consensus that even though NTEP has more courses taught in Inuktitut, little program content, structure and delivery methods are based on Inuit culture. As a result, a majority of respondents stated that course content is in need of renewal. A majority also stated that the community-based program is essential, should be expanded and that maintaining quality of instruction in the program is an on-going concern.

Recommendations

Based on the review and analysis of all data, the following recommendations to NTEP are made (recommendations are not in order of priority):

1. **NTEP should integrate both the campus and community programs into one seamless program.** This administrative change will allow for easier longterm planning, sharing of instructors between Iqaluit and other communities, pooling of funds, the development of new delivery models to increase practicum time for both programs and consistent content based on Inuit culture and language. The option for a NAC foundation year would also be part of this integration of content and delivery. The establishment of formal student and staff exchanges with regional and international teacher education institutions would also occur through this process.
2. **NTEP policies and procedures should be clarified and include the development of a formal communications policy and professional development policy.** This process would include measures to clarify both internal and external procedures for reporting and communications, management protocols and administrative policies. They should be developed in conjunction with the larger review process of Nunavut Arctic College and be consistent with broader Nunavut Arctic College policy and Department of Education directives.

3. The NTEP Steering Committee should be re-established as a Nunavut Arctic College program advisory committee. This committee would have clear terms of reference with its costs spread across all stakeholders involved. Committee members would be made up of representatives from: Department of Education, Nunavut Arctic College, NTEP staff, regional school operations, DEAs, principals; unions; university partner; Inuit organizations; and students. The proposed communications strategy would also be designed and implemented in conjunction with this committee.

4. A formal plan should be created for the recruitment, training and retention of full-time Inuit instructors. Specific targets should be set within this plan that conform to Article 23 requirements, e.g. that all NTEP instructors will be Inuit by 2010. Adequate, multi-year funds should be devoted to the implementation of this plan. This plan would also allow for greater incorporation of Inuktitut and Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit, and create a critical mass of Inuit instructors able to work collaboratively on curriculum and teaching materials projects. The implementation of this plan would be closely related to the content recommendations stated in recommendation 7 and rely on partnerships between Nunavut Arctic College, Inuit organizations and the Department of Education.

5. NTEP should be expanded to allow for access to the program by greater numbers of communities and students. Increased numbers of new students as well as existing teachers that have yet to graduate should be encouraged to enrol so that NTEP can support NLCA Article 23 goals. Options to increase accessibility include the hiring of full-time community-instructors and pedagogical coordinators to act as support for students and cooperating teachers and allowing for campus based instructors to teach in the communities as well. Distance learning technologies should also be used to reduce the effects of barriers such as a lack of available housing and challenges associated with relocating to a new community. This increase in accessibility would rely on a significant infusion of new base funding to the program and restructuring of present funding allocations.

6. A formal long-term plan should be developed within a year of publication of this report, and all NTEP stakeholders should be involved in the development of the plan. This plan would include reviewing and establishing long-term goals and objectives and performance indicators. A key objective of this long-term plan would be to significantly increase the number of K-12 Inuit teacher graduates. The development of these long-term plans should correspond with the re-establishment of the NTEP program advisory committee. One recommended step to aid in the development of such a plan would be a symposium similar to the Teacher Education Symposium held at Arctic College in 1994.

7. NTEP program content, delivery structure and pedagogy should be redesigned to be more fully based on Inuit culture and language; this should be achieved through the establishment of a curriculum development committee under the leadership of a full-time coordinator.

Through this process, which would coincide with the development of the long-term plan proposed above, a curriculum development committee would be established to review all current NTEP programming and to develop revisions so that content and structures are more substantially based on Inuit language and culture. Potential members of this committee would include experienced Inuit educators, Inuit policy makers, elders and youth. Any renewal of NTEP content and delivery structure should also conform to requirements under Articles 23 and 32 of the NLCA, and conform to Nunavut Arctic College policy, DOE curriculum standards and principles of Inuit Qaujimagatuqangit. The curriculum development committee would report to the Nunavut Arctic College Board of Governors.

8. NTEP data should be more consistently collected and compiled at one NAC administrative site. Record keeping standards should be established to simplify and consolidate data collection and storage at a single point at Nunavut Arctic College. This would allow for easier access to records by students and staff and compilation of existing and future long-term performance data.

9. NTEP should re-examine its university partnership and establish clear conditions for future agreements. Conditions for any new university partnership should include: greater flexibility for NTEP content and structure to reflect Inuit culture and language; cost-efficiency; implementation of programs for middle and high school level teachers; as well as a graduate level program and increased services to be provided by the partner university. If the current agreement can not be renegotiated to accommodate these conditions, a new university partner should be sought through a tender process, beginning with requests for expression of interest.

2. Introduction

2.1. Purpose and Background

This report provides results from a study undertaken by Aarluk Consulting Inc. under contract to Nunavut Arctic College (NAC). The purpose of the study was to conduct an evaluation of both the campus based and community based Nunavut Teacher Education Program (NTEP/CTEP), hereinafter referred to as NTEP unless otherwise specified.

This report provides:

- Background information on the history and current situation surrounding teacher education in Nunavut;
- An overview of other Canadian and international indigenous teacher training program models;
- Information on how NTEP is managed and administered; and
- Evaluation research results in the areas of rationale and relevance, administration and operations, effectiveness and impacts, and future directions and recommendations.

2.2. Study Team

The Aarluk team consisted of Ron Ryan (Project Manager), Greg Smith, Blair Stevenson, David Boulton, James Arreak, James Forth and Ryan Lotan.

2.3. Acknowledgements

The report was made possible through the patience and co-operation of a number of people. The authors would like to thank in particular the numerous key respondents and stakeholders who agreed to be interviewed, took part in focus groups, or otherwise provided information for the evaluation research. We would also like to acknowledge the assistance of DOE, NTI and NAC personnel who participated, and the members of the Steering Committee overseeing the evaluation research.

3. Evaluation Profile

3.1. Objectives

As described in the Request for Proposals (RFP) the objectives of the evaluation were to:

- Determine how effective and efficient NTEP has been in developing Inuit teachers who have the academic, professional and cultural/linguistic skills required to provide the children of Nunavut with the knowledge and education needed to maintain their cultural/linguistic heritage and equip them for life in the 21st Century;
- Assess options to increase the number of graduates and broaden the scope of NTEP beyond the Elementary School level to junior and senior secondary levels;
- Recommend changes to program content, delivery and staffing that reflect Department of Education curriculum frameworks and pedagogical approaches, including major initiatives such as Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit, Language of Instruction and Inclusion, and identify the resources needed to support these changes;
- Assess the current structure of the program within Nunavut Arctic College and recommend the most effective management and governance structure for the program in the new educational environment of Nunavut; and,
- Ensure the program adheres to national academic standards and the transferability of credits.

The specific objectives of the review are:

- The compilation and assessment of NTEP performance information (recruitment, enrolment barriers, number of graduates, student retention, community delivery, student teacher ratios, cost effectiveness, etc.);
- A comparison of alternative models for indigenous teacher education;

- A review of key documents related to the program, including previous long term plans; reports, evaluations, or studies; the 5-year teacher training strategies; program mission statements etc.;
- Interviews with internal and external NTEP constituents regarding best practices that should be continued, as well as challenges that need to be met, effectiveness and efficiency of the program in meeting its goals, future directions and goals for the program and required program resources, delivery options, etc.;
- Determine how the program can develop an effective communications strategy, broaden its scope and attract more students;
- Examine the effectiveness of the current partnership with McGill University and review other possible alternatives; and
 - Provide recommendations for program expansion and improvement.

3.2. Focus of Research and Evaluation Questions

The evaluation research was carried out under contract to Nunavut Arctic College, and overseen by a Steering Committee consisting of representatives of DOE, NTI and NAC. At the outset, the Steering Committee approved a list of 26 questions to be addressed by the evaluation research. These covered the areas of rationale and relevance, administration and operations, effectiveness and impacts, and future directions and recommendations. Each question is addressed in the Evaluation Findings in Section 7.

3.3. Research Activities

Research for this evaluation was qualitative in nature with a methodology based on the conducting of interviews, surveys and focus groups. Research activities consisted of the following steps:

- An initial meeting with the Steering Committee in Iqaluit to review the evaluation questions, issues, methodologies, work plan and schedule;
- A literature review and report on Nunavut and international indigenous teacher training programs;
- A file review and report on documents provided by NTEP and NAC;
- Interviews in English and Inuktitut with thirty one key respondents, including GN officials, NTEP and NAC staff, Inuit organizations, unions, McGill University and students;
- Five focus groups conducted by telephone, with District Education Authority (DEA) chairs, and regional school operations executive directors.

A panel of experts recommended by the Steering Committee was interviewed individually;

- Surveys sent to all school principals in Nunavut (13 of 42 responded);
- Analysis of all information gathered based on the approved evaluation questions and indicators;
- Provision of a report on preliminary findings to the Steering Committee;
- Follow-up meeting with representatives of NAC and DOE;
- Preparation and submission of a draft report; and
- Incorporation of written comments into the final report.

3.4. Limitations

Some challenges were encountered during the research phase of the report. Limitations on the research included the fact that the number of students surveyed was statistically too small to make generalizations about student perspectives, three Nunavut respondents were unavailable during the scheduled interviewing period and that there was little historical data on the results and impacts of the program making it difficult to provide trend analysis of NTEP performance indicators.

4. Education in Nunavut

4.1. Background

Nunavut is a unique jurisdiction in Canada since the language first learned and still used by most people is Inuktitut/Inuinnaqtun. In Nunavut, according to 2001 Census data from Statistics Canada:

- Inuit made up 85 per cent of the total Nunavut population (n= 22,560 of 26,665); this ranged from a low of 59 per cent of the population in the capital, Iqaluit, to more than 95 per cent in smaller communities).
- Inuktitut or Inuinnaqtun was the language first learned and still understood for 85.6 per cent of the Inuit population (n=19,310).
- 79.2 per cent of Inuit whose first language was Inuktitut/Inuinnaqtun stated that this was the only or main language they usually spoke at home.

The 2001 Aboriginal Household Survey found that while Inuktitut remains strong, there is considerable evidence of its erosion as a language spoken by Inuit at home and in the workplace, particularly in the capital (Iqaluit), but also in other communities such as in the Kitikmeot region where Inuinnaqtun is spoken. English is creeping into daily use of Inuktitut, and Inuit feel strongly about the need to speak Inuktitut and teach it to their children:

- Eighty-eight per cent of all Inuit respondents say they speak Inuktitut or Inuinnaqtun very well or relatively well; and
- Between 96-97 per cent of Inuit believe that it is important to teach children Inuktitut in school.

These demographic and linguistic facts are of critical importance for Inuit and the Government of Nunavut and underlay key elements of education in the territory.

Even though the Inuktitut language currently remains strong in Nunavut, it has not been strongly supported in schools. The Inuktitut language and Inuit culture in many instances are strong in spite of the legacy of schooling that took place in the region over the last

half century. Historically, formal education in what is now Nunavut took place in southern mission schools or residential schools to which young Inuit, taken out of their communities, were sent. This process was in most cases devastating to Inuit since schools were often structured on southern models with southern and Christian religious content and English was the language of instruction, leading to loss of Inuit language and culture. For many Inuit, mental, physical and in some cases sexual abuse was also a part of this early residential school legacy.

It was only within the last two decades that Inuit began taking control of their own schooling system. This process was supported by the establishment of a Northwest Territories (NWT) special committee on education, which published its report, *Learning: Tradition and Change in the Northwest Territories*, in 1982. This report identified the need for community involvement in shaping the schools and called for the establishment of divisional boards and community authorities. Another significant step taken almost a decade later was the development of the 1996 document, *Inuuqatigiit* – the curriculum from the Inuit perspective. More a teaching guide than a curriculum, *Inuuqatigiit* outlines Inuit goals and content for education in Inuit schools. This still remains one of the more significant documents guiding instruction in Nunavut schools today.

4.2. Elementary and Secondary Education¹

There are 42 elementary and secondary schools in the communities of Nunavut, serving over 8,000 students. These schools are administered through the Department of Education and include full Kindergarten to grade three instruction in Inuktitut in 73 per cent of elementary schools.² Within the transition years of grades four to six, Inuktitut language instruction is phased out, with the primary language of instruction becoming English from grade seven and up.

The table below outlines the enrolment levels of Inuit students in Nunavut schools by region as of 2002.³

Table 1: Enrolment of Inuit Students in Nunavut by Region, 2002

Regions	Number of Students (K-12)
Qikitani	4169
Kivalliq	2471
Kitikmeot	1418
Total	8058

Source: DOE files

¹ Government of Nunavut, Iqaluit, www.gov.nu.ca

² Source: Corson, David, *Policy Options for Bilingual Education in the Territory of Nunavut*, Report to the Department of Education, Iqaluit, 2000.

³ Nunavut Department of Education, *Enrolment Report*, Dec.20, 2001.

The budget for the public school system was \$84.5 million as of 2002. The funding per student in 2001-2002 was approximately \$9,100 and the overall student to teacher ratio in public school was 14.5 to 1, including principals and specialist teachers.

The Department of Education administers school programming through its offices in Iqaluit and Arviat and has regional school operations offices in Kugluktuk, Baker Lake and Pond Inlet. The Nunavut Department of Education develops Inuktitut texts for educational use through its curriculum unit, housed in Arviat, and which is supported by regional learning centres. Inuktitut is taught at the elementary and secondary school level throughout the territory with language policy developed according to each community's request, in consultation with the department.

New Language of Instruction policy covering the teaching and use of Inuktitut has recently been developed through the Department of Education with policy options offered in the report by Ian Martin, *Aajjiqatigiingniq*⁴ and outlined in the recent *Bilingual Education Strategy for Nunavut 2004-2008*. This strategy covers language policy to have Inuktitut become a language of instruction in Nunavut schools. The broad goals of the strategy are covered under the following five areas:

1. Community Planning;
2. Inuit Qaujimaqatuqangit Frameworks and Curriculum Foundations;
3. Curriculum, Teaching Materials and Learning Resource Development and Implementation;
4. Accountability; and
5. Inuktitut and Inuinnaqtun across the Education System.

This document specifically states that standards relating to language should be identified for teacher and principal education and certification, as an action step to achieve improved accountability and enhanced success within the school system:

“in order to ensure successful implementation of the language models, it is essential to ensure high standards for teacher education and a strategic approach to teacher recruitment, training, professional development and retention. Increasing the number of teachers, improving the quality of graduates and enhancing the breadth of the training program that teachers receive are all essential to the success of the bilingual programs offered students in Nunavut schools” (p.13-14).

⁴ Martin, Ian: *Aajjiqatigiingniq Volumes 1 and 2*, Department of Education, Iqaluit, December 2000.

Inuit Teachers ⁵

Presently, 218 (38 per cent) of the 573 teachers in Nunavut are Inuit. The majority of Inuit teachers (approximately 90 per cent) are working in elementary schools. Sixty-one per cent of the Inuit teachers are certified or have a degree. There are not enough certified or degree-level Inuit teachers currently available to teach all the elementary grades in Inuktitut required to properly implement the Language of Instruction models proposed by the Government of Nunavut Department of Education. These models call for Inuktitut to be the language of instruction in more classrooms replacing English, which continues to be the language of instruction in the higher grades.

If the Nunavut government goal of 85 per cent Inuit employment were to be achieved, 269 teaching positions currently occupied by non-Inuit teachers would need to be replaced with Inuit teachers. This would be a 123 per cent increase in the current number of Inuit teachers. This does not include new teachers that will be required as a result of population growth and the future retirement of current Inuit teachers.

The following table details the number of Inuit teachers by region.

Table 2: Number of current Inuit teachers in Nunavut including number of NTEP graduates currently employed as of September 2004.

Region	Inuit Teachers				All Teachers	
	# of Inuit Teachers on Staff	Certified	B.Ed.	Language Specialist	Letter of Authority	Total Number of Teachers in Regions
Qikiqtani	135	31	39	62	3	327
Kivalliq	52	33	6	11	2	163
Kitikmeot	31.5	12	12	7.5	0	83
Total	218.5	76	57	80.0	5	573

Source: Government of Nunavut, Department of Education files, 2005

4.3. Post-Secondary Education ⁶

Nunavut Arctic College is the only Nunavut-wide post-secondary institution. Formally established in 1995 from the previous Northwest Territories Arctic College, NAC provides post-secondary programs throughout Nunavut. These are presently offered at its Cambridge Bay, Iqaluit and Rankin Inlet campuses and 23 Community Learning Centres

⁵ Source: Peter Geikie, Nunavut Department of Education.

⁶ Sources: Nunavut Arctic College Web-site, www.nac.nu.ca and Judith Paradis-Pastori, Nunavut Arctic College

throughout the territory. Courses are taught as either short-term courses or part of existing accredited programs offered at the college. Nunavut Arctic College serves approximately 500 full-time and 730 part-time students.

The Nunavut Arctic College Board of Governors consists of six Minister-appointed regular members (two from each region), a staff representative and a student representative. The six Board members appointed by the Minister of Education hold their seats for two-year terms, renewable up to two times. The staff representative serves a two-year term and is chosen from each of the three regions on a rotating basis. The staff member is recommended to the President of the College, who in turn recommends the candidate to the Minister of Education for appointment. The staff representative's term cannot be renewed. The student representative is also chosen from each region on a rotating basis, and is recommended for appointment by the Minister. The student representative serves a one-year, non-renewable term.

The Nunavut Arctic College Board of Governors as a whole, and through its subcommittees, administers the College's day-to-day affairs. The Board accomplishes this through recommendations to Nunavut's Minister of Education on the setting of:

- Annual budgets;
- College administrative policies;
- Program and course priorities;
- Tuition, housing and other student fees;
- Student admission requirements;
- By-laws governing students; and
- The long-term development of the College through five-year Corporate Plans.

The Government of Nunavut provides \$14.3 million annual base funding for the College plus additional funding for specialized programs such as the Community-based Teacher Education Program. The Government of Nunavut also runs a post-secondary student support system. For Inuit post-secondary students, grants are provided for tuition, travel, and living expenses. The annual cost for the Financial Assistance for Nunavut Students (FANS) system is \$3.6 million, of which \$600,000 comes through the Canada Student Loan Program. About 320 students per school term receive FANS support. In order for students at Nunavut Arctic College to be eligible for FANS, they must be enrolled in a certificate program. Further direction concerning post-secondary education will be given by the Government of Nunavut in an adult education strategy currently being drafted.

5. Nunavut Teacher Education Program

5.1. Background⁷

The Nunavut Teacher Education Program began in 1979 as the Eastern Arctic Teacher Education Program (EATEP). An affiliation was established with McGill University soon after (in 1981). This association, during its early years, was supported by a major grant from the Donner Canadian Foundation. The program was initially a two-year teacher education program culminating in the Certificate in Native and Northern Education from McGill University and certification to teach in the NWT. Graduates accumulated sixty university credits in elementary education. Teacher training courses were available to full-time trainees through an institutional program based in Iqaluit, and to part-time trainees who were employed in schools as teacher assistants through courses offered in the field in many eastern Arctic communities.

In 1985, the Eastern Arctic Teacher Education Program became a part of the newly established Arctic College. During the next year, the program, in association with McGill University, was expanded to include a Bachelor of Education degree, adding another 30 credits to the program. While all courses could be completed in Nunavut, students were encouraged during these early years to attend summer schools at McGill. A fourth year was added in 1994 for a new total of 120 credits. NTEP was expanded during this time in order to provide a more comprehensive training program and provide the skills deemed necessary in comparison to equivalent teacher education programs.

As of 1992, the EATEP major priorities were:

- The preparation of teachers to teach in Inuktitut;
- Providing field-based teacher training; and
- Integration of classroom assistant development and teacher training.

⁷ Source: NTEP, *Purpose & Principles – 1997* and *Amittuq-Tununirusiq Community-Based Teacher-Training Program: A Proposal* Submitted Jointly by the Eastern Arctic Teacher Education Program and the Baffin Divisional Board of Education. 1992.

By 1992, EATEP had a successful placement rate in the field of 84 per cent with only 12 of 74 graduates not working in the area of education. Key limitations of the program at that time were a high drop-out rate caused by family pressures exacerbated by people being away from home communities. As a result, the number of graduates was barely enough to match increasing enrolment in schools.

The philosophy of the teacher education program in 1992 was as follows:

- *Cultural Base*: Teachers need to have a thorough grounding in teaching Inuktitut at all levels. Traditional cultural knowledge and skills will also be taught in the program as well as how to integrate this into the classroom teaching. Community involvement will be critical in an Inuit-based school system and trainees will have to learn how to work effectively to involve parents and elders in delivery of programs.
- *Modelling*: Teachers trained in the program will be models for students on cultural beliefs, processes, and practices. These must be modeled for them in the program and include implementation of child-centred approaches, processoriented learning and interactive pedagogy.
- *Relevance*: Programs will draw on the daily context of community life and incorporate areas of student's interests.
- *Student Centred*: Trainees must be capable of designing programs to meet a wide range of academic and linguistic levels.
- *Balance*: Trainees must learn how to address social, emotional, intellectual and physical needs of students as well as themselves.
- *Integration*: Theoretical course work will be incorporated into the practice of teaching in real classrooms on a regular basis.
- *Process Orientation*: Trainees will learn how to teach students "how to learn" and enable them to become problem solvers and decision-makers in Nunavut.
- *Expectations*: Trainees must learn how to set reasonable expectation for their students and to work at levels that match their cognitive abilities.

A decision was made in 1993 to form two colleges out of the previous Arctic College, one to serve the new Nunavut territory, the other to serve the rest of the NWT. The college for Nunavut was established in January 1995 and called Nunavut Arctic College. Shortly after the establishment of Nunavut Arctic College, the Eastern Arctic Teacher Education Program was renamed the Nunavut Teacher Education Program (NTEP).

Since that time, Aurora College in the NWT, has gone on to provide a Bachelor of Education Degree Programs for Aboriginal and northern students through a fulltime/part-time campus-based program. Delivered in partnership with the University of Saskatchewan, students complete both the Aurora College Teacher Education three-year diploma and their bachelor of education degree (Year 4). All students complete Years 2,

⁸ Source: Aurora College Calendar, 2004 from www.auroracollege.nt.ca

3 and 4 of the program at Thebacha Campus in Fort Smith. Courses have been critically selected to ensure the inclusion of Aboriginal content and effective teaching techniques, as well as to meet the degree requirements of the University partner. The Program is delivered over a four-year period consisting of academic and educational course work, culture-camps and internships.

As of 1997, NTEP had graduated 161 teachers of whom 56 had a Bachelor of Education (B.Ed.). In this same year, a series of meetings was held with various stakeholders as part of an ongoing process of defining and adapting the program to ensure the teacher education needs of Nunavut are met.

The broad vision agreed to during those meetings included:

- *Program Purpose:* Based on Inuit culture and language, NTEP is committed to developing effective and confident Inuit teachers with the skills and knowledge necessary to equip the children of Nunavut with what they will need for life in the 21st century.
- *Program Beliefs:* Teacher education is a life long process; reflects and serves the needs of community; partnerships; teachers as exceptional role models; Inuit language and culture of students forms the basis of learning.
- *Principles:*
 - o Language and culture are the foundations for the program;
 - o Theory and practice are balanced and linked;
 - o Academic excellence and intellectual challenge are fostered and encouraged;
 - o Critical reflection is the basis for improving teaching;
 - o The personal and professional are equally important in teaching;
 - o The reality of classroom teaching is a central concern for teacher education;
 - o NTEP works in partnership with Boards and Centres for Teaching and Learning;
 - o NTEP maintains close ties with schools, classrooms and teachers; and
 - o Independence and self-management are promoted and developed.
- *Program Guidelines:*
 - o Student well-being – a holistic attitude towards valuing students is an integral part of NTEP and provides an opportunity for students to focus on personal/physical development including referral to counselling support as required.
 - o Language of instruction – it is a bilingual program, at least half in Inuktitut/Inuinnaqtun.
 - o Course content and selection – the cultural context of Nunavut is paramount. Course content is regularly reviewed to ensure it reflects practices and current curricula and programs used in Nunavut.

- o Theory and Practice – opportunities will be provided for students to practice planning, organizing and presenting lessons and materials in classroom settings. Practicum will be for at least 6 weeks per year.
 - o Inuit Instructors – the program will guarantee three positions for Inuit instructors.
 - o Elders – Elders will be encouraged to contribute to the development of the program and its delivery.
 - o Cultural skills – opportunities will be provided to students to improve their cultural skills.
 - o Teaching Strategies – instructors will model teaching practices and strategies, which they expect students to utilize in working with children in schools.
 - o Teaching materials – students will be required, where appropriate, to produce teaching materials in Inuktitut and Inuinnaqtun for use in schools.
 - o Academic Level – instructors will strive to improve the academic levels of students and supports including tutoring will be provided.
 - o Duration of the program – a B.Ed. degree is the basic requirement for teaching in Nunavut. Program will consist of three semesters in each academic year for four years.
 - o Community Involvement – NTEP will make every effort to inform and involve the community in its courses and special events. The community is an important resource for the program.
- *Roles and Responsibilities of Graduates:* Graduates will display knowledge about language, culture and history of Inuit; demonstrate thorough understanding of child development and learning theory, child centered curriculum development, planning and implementation, importance of being positive role models; and be able to use appropriate technologies to enhance and support student learning etc.
 - *Graduate Beliefs:* Graduates believe in and enjoy teaching students; are motivated, curious; will take part in experiential, inquiry-based learning that is challenging and meaningful, maintain professional relationships with students, parents and colleagues, believe in the school as a community, and be open, flexible, honest, and have integrity, etc.
 - *Graduate Skills:* Graduates are literate in Inuktitut/Inuinnaqtun and demonstrate a wide variety of skills related to cultural knowledge; are inquisitive and motivated; have organizational and management skills; plan and prepare carefully; and reflect and evaluate themselves while assessing their personal and professional needs. Graduates skilfully integrate curriculum providing student-centered, experiential learning, are capable of creating rich learning environments, have interpersonal skills, and a good grasp of technology and how to use it to promote education etc.

Guidelines were also set for the roles and characteristics of the NTEP Principal, NTEP Instructors, Coordinators, Nunavut Boards of Education, Teaching and Learning Centres, Cooperating Teachers, School Principals, Community-based Teacher Education, Specialization, McGill University, and the NTEP Steering Committee. The above guidelines are still the most current in use for present programming.

5.2. Current Program Design and Delivery⁹

5.2.1. General Program Design

The Nunavut Teacher Education Program currently offers a campus-based program and community-based program, which prepares Inuit to become classroom teachers for schools in Nunavut. The emphasis of both programs is on training primary and elementary teachers – Kindergarten to grade 6. The programs are offered at the Nunatta Campus of Nunavut Arctic College in Iqaluit and various communities throughout Nunavut. The program offered at the main campus in Iqaluit is a full-time continuous program for three or four years. The locations of the community programs vary – these are selected in order to meet the goal of having at least one program ongoing in any year in each of the three regions of Nunavut. All programs are delivered in modules during three semesters (fall, winter and summer) and include a practicum in each year except the fourth Bachelor of Education year.

Currently, in affiliation with McGill University, the College offers two types of basic teacher training programs:

- a) Three-year Nunavut Arctic College Teaching Diploma (90 credits) which includes the McGill University Certificate in Education of Inuit and First Nations (60 credits); and
- b) Four-year Bachelor of Education Degree (120 credits).

It should also be noted that a one-year Middle Years Teaching Certificate (30 credits) program has also been designed in partnership with McGill University. This certificate program is open to graduates of the B.Ed. program and is offered at McGill University during the summer term. However, even though specific courses from this certificate program have been offered periodically, there have never been graduates of the program from Nunavut. Reasons cited for the lack of graduates from this certificate are that the program is provided primarily in the summer and is marketed poorly.

NTEP also offers a one-year Nunavut Aboriginal Language Specialist program. This program prepares Inuit to become qualified language instructors to teach Inuktitut/Inuinnaqtun in Nunavut schools. This evaluation, however does not examine the Language Specialist program, instead emphasizing teacher training programs offered by NTEP.

The basic three-year teacher training program, leading to the Certificate in Education for First Nations and Inuit (formerly the Certificate in Native and Northern Education), is offered as a full-time program at the Nunatta Campus in Iqaluit. It is also offered as a

⁹ Source: Nunavut Arctic College 2003-2005 Calendar

full-time program in several Nunavut communities. Trainees who live in communities without full-time programs can pursue their training by attending the field-based courses they require when these are available in Iqaluit or through one of the full-time community teacher education programs.

Graduates of the Nunavut Arctic College Diploma Program earn a NAC Teaching Diploma and the McGill Certificate in Education for First Nations and Inuit that allows them to find employment in Nunavut elementary schools. Graduates of the Diploma program may continue on into the Bachelor of Education program with credits from the Certificate program transferable to the Bachelor of Education program.

NTEP is a bilingual program (Inuktitut and English). The required and elective course content for the Diploma program is as follows:

Required Courses

012-101 Introductory Teaching Methods	012-207 Cultural Skills
012-102 Inuktitut: Orthography & Phonology	012-214 Reading Processes and Methods
012-105 Languages Arts in Inuktitut	012-215 Education Administration in Nunavut
012-110 How Children Grow	012-217 Teaching Practicum II
012-112 How Children Learn	012-221 Science Methods
012-113 Background Mathematics	012-222 General Methods in Special Education
012-114 Reading Writing Inuktitut	012-117 Teaching Practicum I
012-116 How Children Behave	012-205 Social Studies Methods
012-118 Background Science	012-371 Practicum III
012-203 Mathematics Methods	012-227 Curriculum Development
012-204 Use of Curriculum	

Plus 9 electives from a variety of disciplines including but not limited to:

012-213 Children's Literature
 012-321 Integrated Language Arts
 012-600 Measurement and Evaluation
 012-246 Cooperative Learning
 012-330 Experiences in Communication
 012-236 Basic Art Media
 012-343 Music, Movement and Communication
 012-309 Health Education
 012-350 Physical Education Methods
 012-123 Software Applications
 012-362 Desktop Publishing
 012-363 Internet Resources
 012-377 Landforms in Environmental Systems
 012-375 Geography of the Circumpolar North
 012-301 Ecological Features of the Natural Environment
 012-300 Ecological Problems and Solutions

5.2.2. Enrolment and Registration

The number of students in Nunavut Teacher Education Programs varies by year and community. For the 2004-2005 year, 86 students in total were enrolled. Of these 42 were in the Iqaluit campus-based program and 44 in the four community-based programs. On average, approximately 52 per cent of students (199 of a total of 375) were enrolled at the Iqaluit main campus between 2001 and 2005. The number of female students far exceeds the number of male students. Female students made up 83 to 88 per cent of the student population between 2001 and 2005. The table below summarizes student enrolment for the years 2001-2005.

Table 3: NTEP/CTEP Enrolment, 2001-2005

Academic Year	Community	Male	Female	Total
August 2001- July 2002	Arviat	7	6	13
	Cambridge Bay	0	6	6
	Iqaluit	2	41	43
	Sanikiluaq	1	8	9
	Taloyoak	1	10	11
	Total	11	71	82
August 2002- July 2003	Cambridge Bay	0	10	10
	Clyde River	3	8	11
	Coral Harbour	1	9	10
	Iqaluit	6	56	62
	Sanikiluaq	0	9	9
	Taloyoak	1	10	11
	Total	11	103	113
August 2003- July 2004	Arviat	7	10	17
	Cambridge Bay	0	1	1
	Clyde River	0	4	4
	Iqaluit	5	47	52
	Pangritung	0	1	1
	Sanikiluaq	0	8	8
	Taloyoak	0	7	7
	Whale Cove	1	3	4
	Total	13	81	94
August 2004 – May 2005	Arctic Bay	1	10	11
	Arviat	7	8	15
	Igloolik	3	10	13
	Iqaluit	4	38	42
	Taloyoak	0	5	5
	Total	15	71	86

Source: NAC files

Registrations

The following table summarizes the registration levels in NTEP and CTEP courses between 1998 and 2005. The numbers in this table are not of individual students, but correspond to a calculation used by McGill University that reflects total registrations as a multiple of the **number of students times the number of courses**. For example, a value of 44 would correspond to 11 students enrolled in 4 courses in a particular location over the semester.

As the table indicates, between 1998 and 2004 the community-based programs offered only slightly more registrations compared to the campus-based program with 1739 CTEP registrations compared to 1715 campus-based registrations in a total of 3454 registrations for courses in 11 communities.

Table 4: Location and Number of Registrations in NTEP/CTEP as of June 2005

Winter 1998	Kitikmeot	N. Baffin	Iqaluit							
	44	54	64							
Summer* 1998	Kitikmeot	N.Baffin	Iqaluit							
	37	44	48							
Fall 1998	Kitikmeot	N.Baffin	Iqaluit							
	55	37	62							
Winter 1999	Kitikmeot	N.Baffin	Iqaluit							
	45	26	90							
Summer 1999			Iqaluit	Coral Harbor	Pond Inlet					
			64	35	33					
Fall 1999			Iqaluit	Coral Harbor	Pond Inlet					
			121	42	27					
Winter 2000			Iqaluit	Coral Harbor	Pond Inlet	Cambridge Bay				
			72	24	63	53				
Summer (2000-S)			Iqaluit		Pond Inlet	Cambridge Bay	Rankin Inlet			
			31		45	14	19			
Summer (2001-F)			Iqaluit	Coral Harbor	Pond Inlet	Cambridge Bay				
			79	19	22	24				
Winter 2001			Iqaluit	Coral Harbor	Pond Inlet	Cambridge Bay				
			74	13	23	18				
Summer (2000-S)			Iqaluit		Pond Inlet	Cambridge Bay				
			54		23	18				
Fall (2002-F)			Iqaluit			Cambridge Bay	Rankin Inlet			
			108			18	15			
Winter (2002-H)			Iqaluit			Cambridge Bay				
			117			20				
Summer 2002-S			Iqaluit							
			54							
Fall 2002/09			Iqaluit			Cambridge Bay	Sanikiluaq	Taloyoak	Clyde River	
			63			23	24	63	21	

Winter 2003/01			Iqaluit			Cambridge Bay	Sanikiluaq	Taloyoak	Clyde River	
			108			37	6	62	36	
Summer 2003/05			Iqaluit		Pond Inlet	Cambridge Bay	Saikiluaq	Taloyoak	Clyde River	
			24		2	26	28	12	8	
Fall 2003/09			Iqaluit			Cambridge Bay	Sanikiluaq	Taloyoak	Clyde River	Arviat
			137			3	30	30	14	70
Winter 2004/01			Iqaluit			Cambridge Bay	Sanikiluaq	Taloyoak	Clyde River	Arviat
			171			2	26	26	21	63
Summer 2004/05			Iqaluit	Coral Harbor			Sanikiluaq	Taloyoak	Clyde River	Arviat
			82	4			16	19	17	17
Fall 2004/09			Iqaluit					Taloyoak		Arviat
			92					16		60
Winter 2005/01			Iqaluit					Taloyoak		Arviat
			85					20		45

* Summer = Spring/Summer

Source: Office of First Nations and Inuit Education, McGill University

Applications to NTEP are made through the registrar's office at Nunavut Arctic College. Prospective NTEP students must have completed Grade 12 or an equivalent level to meet academic requirements. This academic requirement was upgraded from an earlier requirement of Grade 7. Applicants must also provide a letter of application including references, and health and RCMP clearances. Mature candidates (21 years or older) who do not meet the academic requirements may be considered, provided they have achieved Nunavut Arctic College 130 Level in Inuktitut, English and Mathematics and have relevant work experience.

Application data have only been collected separately as of last year by Nunavut Arctic College. The available data are summarized in the table below.

Table 5: Number of Applications to NTEP/CTEP and Acceptance Rate, 2004

Community	Application Received	Accepted	Rejected	Withdrawn	Acceptance Rate (Accepted/ App. Received)
Iqaluit (NTEP)	33	16	11	6	49%
Arctic Bay (CTEP)	17	13	3	1	77%
Igloolik (CTEP)	18	13	-	5	72%

Source: NAC files, 2005

Withdrawals from the Program

Specific data on number of students who withdraw from the program after enrolment, and the reasons, are collected at Nunavut Arctic College. The table below outlines the number of withdrawals and the reasons given for the period between 2001 and 2004. Drop out rates for the 2001-2004 years were 6, 9 and 11 per cent respectively with an average of 9 per cent. These levels are notably lower than the NTEP drop-out levels in the mid-1990's of 20-30 per cent.¹⁰

Table 6: NTEP/CTEP Withdrawals and Reasons, 2001-2004

Reasons for withdrawals	2001-2002	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005	2001-5 Totals
Poor Attendance	1	2	1	10	14
Failed program – not continuing		1		6	7
Failed practicum		2			2
Medical				1	1
Obtained employment				1	1
One year dismissal				1	1
Personal reasons	1	2	4	5	12
Terminated	1				1
Enrolled in alternate program	2		1		3
Moved from community		2	1		3
Other		2	3		5
No reason given			2	3	5
Total Withdrawals	5	11	12	27	55

Source: NAC data

5.2.3. Community-Based Program Delivery

The first community-based programs began in 1991. Previous to that time, NTEP courses were offered at the campus in Iqaluit and as discreet courses in various communities throughout the Territory. In 1991, a community-based model was developed and piloted in the three Kivalliq regional communities: Rankin Inlet, Baker Lake and Arviat. This model involved the hiring of three full-time staff with differing specializations to teach the two-year program. These three staff with the help of contract instructors rotated between the three communities so that students did not have to leave their community in order to receive their Diploma training.

¹⁰ Source: Strategy For Teacher Education in the NWT: Past Experiences and Future Directions. Education, Culture and Employment by the GNWT, 1998.

The current community-based program is based on this earlier model. The CTEP delivery process begins with requests from community District Education Authorities (DEAs) to NTEP for community-based programs. The decision to have a program is then negotiated between NTEP and the community based on many issues such as program resources and whether there would be enough potential students to warrant a full-time program. When programs are offered in the communities, schedules are set according to NTEP program requirements and the needs of the students, and then instructors are hired on contract to teach the courses. If similar programs are starting in two locations at the same time, instructors with complementary backgrounds and interests are hired and they may rotate between each of the two communities with limited support from the main campus. Resources such as course textbooks are purchased for each community program based on requirements identified by the main program. The library at Nunavut Arctic College also acts as a resource and instructors are brought to the Iqaluit campus before the beginning of each term to gather additional materials they may need and to place orders for future requirements.

Support services for students vary depending on facilities in each community. Every student, however, receives Student Financial Assistance from the Government of Nunavut, which includes an amount to cover the costs of tuition, books, accommodation and food. The amount increases depending on the circumstances of the students and based on how many dependants they have. Students are not required to pay these grants back if they pass their program.

Table 7: List of communities where community-based programs have been offered, 1991 – 2004

Year	Community	Type of program
1991-1993	Arviat	Two year program
	Rankin Inlet	Two year program
	Baker Lake	Two year program
1992-1993	Taloyoak	One year completion program
	Cambridge Bay	One year completion program
1993-1995	Igloolik	Two year program
	Pangnirtung	Two year program
	Arctic Bay	Two year program
1994-1997	Cambridge Bay	Three year program
	Kugluktuk	Three year program
1995-1998	Cape Dorset	Three year program
1996-1999	Coral Harbor	Three year program
1997-2001	Pond Inlet	Three year plus B.Ed Year
1999-2001	Rankin Inlet	Program closed after two-years
1999-2003	Cambridge Bay	Three year plus B.Ed year
2000-2004	Sanikiluaq	Three year plus B.Ed year
2001-2005	Taloyoak	Three year plus B.Ed year
2002-2004	Clyde River	Program closed after two years
2003-	Arviat	Three year program
2004-	Arctic Bay	Foundation year
2004-	Igloolik	Foundation year

Source: NTEP files

Note: Programs beginning before 1994 were two year programs in contrast to later programs which were three year programs.

5.2.4. Relationship with McGill University¹¹

NTEP has worked in association with McGill University since 1981. Liaisons between Nunavut Arctic College and McGill University are generally through the NTEP Principal and the Office of First Nations and Inuit Education (OFNIE) in the Faculty of Education at McGill University. OFNIE provides general administrative and registration support to NTEP such as record keeping and assistance in finding instructors. OFNIE gives official accreditation to its programs, but does not provide program delivery services.

The present agreement between Nunavut Arctic College and McGill University has a term of 3 years beginning on September 1, 2004 and ending on June 30, 2007. For the current year, under the present agreement, Nunavut Arctic College pays \$149,500.00 to McGill University for its services. This amount is determined through a basic rate of \$271.82 per 3-credit registration with an assumption of 550 registrations throughout the year. Any number of registrations above this amount will be paid according to the amount in the agreement. By 2006-2007, the total amount paid will increase on a sliding scale to \$197,713.00 with a basic rate increase to \$359.45 per 3-credit registration. The above fees also include application and graduation fees of \$60 per student for each program.

The Principal of NTEP and the Director of OFNIE are jointly responsible for courses offered at the College, whether in Iqaluit or at other centres. The Principal is responsible for ensuring that courses meet the standards of the College, and the Director and the Principal are jointly responsible for ensuring that they meet the standards of McGill.

The specific roles and responsibilities of both NAC and McGill are outlined in the formal agreement between Nunavut Arctic College and the University. The following list outlines the sole and shared responsibilities of McGill University regarding the current agreement with Nunavut Arctic College. McGill University's sole responsibilities are to:

- Nominate suitably qualified instructors at the College for adjunct professorship at McGill University, with the accompanying right to use McGill facilities;
- Within the constraints set by available resources and at the discretion of the Director of OFNIE, provide support to the College in the form of consultation on course and program delivery and evaluation, and supervision of practice teaching;
- Provide for at least one visit per year by the Director of OFNIE or delegate to sites determined in consultation with the Principal of NTEP;
- Send a representative to College graduation ceremonies at which NTEP graduates receive the McGill Certificate or B.Ed.;

¹¹ Source: McGill University Office of First Nations and Inuit Education staff, McGill/NAC financial agreement documents, interviews and a paper prepared by John Wolforth titled, *Models of Community-Based Teacher Education* (Draft Paper for CTEP), 1994

- Assist the College, NTEP and the Nunavut school system with which NTEP works in addressing research questions identified by the communities concerned;
- Collaborate with the College in making graduate programs accessible to suitably qualified residents of Nunavut;
- Where financially viable, assist the College in developing new programs, or in facilitating the delivery of existing McGill programs to Nunavut residents;
- Shall entitle NTEP students to apply for McGill scholarships and bursaries, including the Jack Cram Memorial Prize.

Shared responsibilities of both Nunavut Arctic College and McGill University are:

- The Principal of NTEP and the Director of OFNIE are jointly responsible for courses offered at the College, whether in Iqaluit or at other centres. The Principal is responsible for ensuring that courses meet the standards of the College, and the Director and the Principal are jointly responsible for ensuring that they meet the standards of McGill. McGill and NAC will provide adequate supervision and mentoring in community programs, by ensuring sufficient onsite visits, regular communication and ongoing evaluations.
- The files of all students applying for admission to the program leading to the *McGill Certificate in Education for First Nations and Inuit* and the *B. Ed. for Certified Teachers* will be reviewed by both the Principal and the Director.
- By mutual written agreement between the Principal and the Director, students may be enrolled as "special students" in a limited number of courses before both being formally admitted to the Certificate program, their admission being dependent on their success in these courses.
- As is presently the case, NTEP Arctic College and the University will provide mutual assistance through administrative and support staff services to create and maintain NTEP student records at Arctic College and McGill University.
- Instructors giving courses carrying McGill credit will be approved by both the Principal and the Director before receiving a letter of appointment. Copies of their resumés will be available both at NTEP and at OFNIE.
- The Director will assist the Principal in identifying suitable instructors.
- Full-time instructors at NTEP and in community-based programs will be paired with a colleague at McGill, with the agreement of both parties, for professional support.
- All courses will be evaluated, as required by the McGill Senate, using an instrument agreed by the Principal and the Director. Copies of evaluations will be available both at NTEP and at OFNIE, as well as being made available to the instructor concerned. The Principal and Director, their delegates, will also supervise courses from time to time, with the agreement of the instructor.
- Community-based programs will be subject to internal and external review, the purpose of which will be to identify areas of improvement for subsequent programs.
- The Director will inform B.Ed. students, through the Principal, of courses offered at the McGill Summer School and will facilitate their attendance by providing support services while they are in Montreal. The cost, which would include course

delivery expenses, will be pro-rated among all summer school participants and the NTEP portion of costs will be billed to the College.

- The Director will assist B.Ed. graduates who wish to undertake post-graduate (M.A. or M.Ed.) studies by providing support on campus, including research or teaching assistantships where available.

- McGill and NAC will work together to mount the Certificate in Middle School Education in Aboriginal Communities. The provisions in Section 2 and all items in this agreement which refer to students in the Certificate in Education for First Nations and Inuit and the B.Ed. for Certified Teachers will also refer to students admitted to the Certificate in Middle School Education in Aboriginal Communities; and

- Supervise the annual tuition fee budget as outlined and agreed to in the new financial

agreement through the Director of OFNIE and the Principal of NTEP. The budget will be approved by the Director, Nunatta Campus and by the Dean of the Faculty of Education. All other responsibilities under the Agreement are the sole responsibility of Nunavut Arctic College.

5.3. Administration

NTEP currently has a full-time staff of seven, all working at the main campus in Iqaluit. These include a principal, a community coordinator (presently working for the Department of Education), and five instructors (one Inuk and four non-Inuit). The NTEP Principal is responsible for the NTEP program as a whole with duties including acting as the liaison with McGill University, overseeing program scheduling and content and maintaining communications between NTEP and NAC. The community coordinator position was established in 1998 to oversee the community-based programs and provide support to both students and instructors in the various communities. The five full-time NTEP instructors are responsible for delivery of courses at the Iqaluit campus-based program. Part-time instructors are regularly hired to deliver the community-based program. NTEP full-time instructors are recognized as adjunct professors at McGill University. The current number of full-time instructors is lower than in previous periods of the program - there were six full-time positions over 10 years ago.¹²

NTEP also has administrative support from various Nunavut Arctic College staff. At the Iqaluit main campus, the NAC Registrar keeps all student records. The NAC Director of Finance keeps financial records and a Director of Student Services is responsible for all non-academic matters related to the students at NAC including NTEP. There are also two counselors who are available for group meetings or private consultations to NTEP students.

¹² Source: NTEP Staff interviews

5.4. Graduate Data

Since its beginning, NTEP has produced 224 Inuit graduates from the Diploma program with 124 moving on to graduate from the Bachelor of Education program. Of these graduates, 112 have graduated since 1999. It must be noted that graduates from the Bachelor of Education program first receive their Diploma; therefore the number of Inuit with teaching credentials can be assumed to be approximately 224. The number of graduates by year is shown in the following table; however these are not separated into NTEP and CTEP graduates. These data are unfortunately difficult to compile from the files existing at NTEP offices and McGill files. It should also be noted in the following table that two certificate columns are shown. These refer to the old and new certificates offered through the programs. The middle column displays numbers for the Certificate in Native and Northern Education which corresponds to the 45 credit certificate no longer offered to new students. However, students continue to graduate with this certificate since many students are still continuing to finish this program. Since 1998, new students at NTEP must complete the 60 credit Certificate in Education for First Nations and Inuit shown in the third column of the table below.

Table 8: Number of NTEP Graduates as of June 2005

Year	B.Ed. for Certified Teachers	Certificate in Native And Northern Education	Certificate in Education Of Inuit and First Nations
Prior to 1983:		3	Not offered
1983		6	Not offered
1984		10	Not offered
1985	1	7	Not offered
1986	2	12	Not offered
1987	4	6	Not offered
1988	4	2	Not offered
1989	1	1	Not offered
1990	3	5	Not offered
1991	1	5	Not offered
1992	7	6	Not offered
1993	4	36	Not offered
1994	4	7	Not offered
1995	8	34	Not offered
1996	8	3	Not offered
1997	8	11	Not offered
1998	9	11	1
1999	5	5	4
2000	4	3	7
2001	11	2	1
2002	4	-	7
2003	10	-	9
2004	22	-	7
2005	4	1	6
Total	124	176	48

Source: Office of First Nations and Inuit Education graduate data, McGill University

Past graduates of the program were often guaranteed a teaching post at a Nunavut school because they entered the program from a current school position, either as teaching assistants or language specialists. This situation still exists if students leave a post at a school in order to enter the program, however increasingly students are enrolling in the program without previous experience or positions in a Nunavut school. These students, therefore, must apply upon graduation in the same way as all other applicants for job openings in Nunavut. However, anecdotal evidence from respondents of the evaluation suggests that Inuit applicants have little difficulty finding employment.

5.5. Funding

In the 2003-2004 year, all NTEP programs received a total of approximately \$2,263,000 in funding. Approximately \$686,000 of this amount came in the form of base funding from the Nunavut Arctic College budget specifically for the campus-based program. The table below shows how NTEP long-term, base funds from Nunavut Arctic College are allocated within NTEP. These levels are fairly consistent from year to year, although the amount for salaries and wages has increased each year.

Table 9: NTEP (Iqaluit) Expenses, 2001 – 2004

	Year		
	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04
NTEP			
Salaries and wages	\$499,107	\$531,313	\$522,630
Travel and Accommodation	\$27,900	\$33,000	\$12,000
Materials and Supplies	\$16,275	\$25,000	\$25,000
Utilities and Maintenance	\$0	\$0	\$0
Purchased Services	\$2,411	\$4,500	\$4,183
Contract Services	\$13,950	\$18,000	\$18,000
Fees and Payments	\$77,888	\$74,000	\$74,000
Minor Equipment	\$0	\$0	\$0
Personnel/Staffing	\$0	\$0	\$0
TOTAL BUDGET	\$637,471	\$685,813	\$685,813

Source: NAC financial files

In contrast to the campus-based program, which receives long-term base funding from Nunavut Arctic College, there is no base funding for the community-based program (CTEP). In 2003-2004 just over \$1,577,000 was used of the total NTEP budget of \$1,879,000 that came directly from the Government of Nunavut Department of Education specifically for the community-based program. Every year CTEP relies upon varying levels of contributions from the Department of Education. This year-to-year funding of CTEP is larger than the campus-based funding, yet makes long-term planning difficult since the amounts can change from year to year according to how many community programs are offered. The table below outlines CTEP funding levels and how these funds have been used since 2001.

Table 10: CTEP Expenses, 2001-2004

	Year		
	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04
CTEP			
Salaries and wages	\$434,159	\$849,877	\$659,223
Travel and Accommodation	\$142,454	\$341,984	\$397,570
Materials and Supplies	\$15,876	\$341,984	\$93,050
Utilities and Maintenance	\$16,922	\$5,681	\$0
Purchased Services	\$19,257	\$38,419	\$37,538
Contract Services	\$108,944	\$146,860	\$135,400
Fees and Payments	\$76,513	\$297,437	\$125,564
Minor Equipment	\$0	\$0	\$0
Personnel/Staffing	\$80,072	\$0	\$128,662
TOTAL BUDGET	\$894,197	\$1,879,000	\$1,577,007 *

Source: NTEP financial data files, 2005.

*Note: \$1,577,007 represents the actual expenses from the \$1,879,000 of base funding available that year.

A cost-per-student calculation can be made for NTEP using data collected from NAC and McGill sources. Table 11 divides the annual budget of each program by the number of students collected from NAC files shown in table 3 to get an idea of the costs per student. As shown in the table below, the annual costs per student for the entire NTEP (campus and community based) have been rising with the values between 2001 and 2004 being \$18,678, \$22,698 and \$24,073 respectively with an average for those years at \$21,216 per student enrolled.

It must be noted, however, that with these values comparisons of costs per student are hard to make between CTEP and NTEP since funds are fluid between the two programs during some periods and slippage occurred between years. For example, anecdotal evidence suggested that in some years CTEP funds were used to support NTEP campusbased programs, making direct comparisons of costs per student and per course between these two programs unreliable.

Table 11: NTEP/CTEP Costs per Student, 2001-2004

		2001-02	2002-03	2003-04
NTEP	Annual Budget	\$637,471	\$685,813	\$685,813
	Number of Students	43	62	52
	Cost per Student	\$14,825	\$11,062	\$13,189
CTEP	Annual Budget	\$894,197	\$1,879,000	\$1,577,007
	Number of Students	39	51	42
	Cost per Student	\$22,928	\$36,843	\$37,548
NTEP/ CTEP	Total Average Cost per Student Enrolled	\$18,678	\$22,698	\$24,073

In order to get a sense of how recent NTEP costs compare to earlier years, it is helpful to look at the 1997 work on costs of professional training done by Barbara Guy for the Government of the Northwest Territories.¹³ Compared to the cost of producing graduates through other GNWT initiatives at that time that prepared Aboriginal employees for professional jobs at that time, Teacher Education Programs (TEP) costs per student are not high. The 1997 average annual per person cost for TEP was \$29,101 versus up to \$70,000 per trainee in other GNWT programs. The 1997 study also showed that the average number of years of study funded through TEP to produce one graduate was 4.03 versus 7.14 for FANS. Costs per student now are actually lower than they were almost ten years ago. The average cost per student for the period between 2001 and 2004 computed from the above table was \$21,216 compared to \$29,101 for TEP in 1997. Little data are available to explain why this change in cost per student has occurred.

¹³ Source: Guy, Barbara, *The NWT Teacher Education Strategy: Costs of Success – Status of the Goal. Education, Culture and Employment*, GNWT. 1997.

6. Overview of Other Indigenous Teacher Education Programs

6.1. Background

Over the last three decades, numerous indigenous teacher education programs specifically designed for and delivered by indigenous peoples have been established throughout Canada and the world. Many of these programs have been effective at training indigenous teachers through a system that respects and reflects indigenous language and culture. As part of the evaluation of the Nunavut Teacher Education Program, a summary was compiled of noteworthy indigenous education programs in Canada and abroad, in order to provide potentially useful models for NTEP. The section below outlines seven such programs in Canada (2), Alaska (1), New Zealand (2), Hawaii (1) and Norway (1). Where institutions offer more than one teacher training program, summaries only cover those for the elementary levels.

6.2. Indigenous Teacher Education Models

6.2.1. Kativik School Board¹⁴

Originally established in 1975, the teacher education program offered through the Kativik School Board is a community-based program. The program vision is based upon the following principles:

- Teacher training must be designed in such a way as to minimize disruptions to family and community life that are fundamental to Inuit values. This is accomplished by designing intensive academic courses that can be offered to trainees in Northern communities. A team involving academic staff from McGill University and senior Inuit instructors prepares the courses. The result of this collaborative process is that teachers-in-training receive their courses in Inuktitut

¹⁴ Source: www.kativik.qc.ca and interview with Kativik School Board regional staff

- Just as it is crucial for Inuit children's self-esteem and cultural identity to have teachers of their own culture, it is equally important for teachers-in-training to be taught by Inuit instructors in their mother tongue.
- The content of the teacher education program must be continuously evaluated and revised. As with course development, program and course evaluation is conducted on an ongoing basis by teams of social scientists from McGill University and senior Inuit educators.
- The development of teaching materials and their evaluation, as well as all educational research being carried out, must be an integral part of the program.
- Courses in special needs education must be emphasized early on so that teachers can help all students, including those with minor learning disabilities.

Teachers enrolled in the program are homeroom teachers in the early primary grades where the language of instruction is Inuktitut or they are subject specialists who teach at the upper primary and secondary levels in Inuktitut. There is also a physical education concentration in the certificate program.

Trained Inuit instructors teach the courses in this program in Inuktitut. Graduates of the 60 credit program receive the Brevet d'enseignement du ministère de l'Éducation du Québec (provincial teaching diploma) as well as the McGill Certificate in Education for First Nations and Inuit. The teaching diploma is the teacher's legal qualification to work in schools where the language of instruction is Inuktitut. Graduates of the certificate program may apply for admission to the McGill B.Ed. for Certified Teachers program. Courses in the B.Ed. program are also offered in Inuktitut in Northern communities.

To be eligible, candidates must:

- Be recommended by their local Education Committee and by the Teacher Training Department; and
- Hold regular teaching or trainee positions, or be regular substitute teachers; and
- follow courses organized by the Teacher Training Department on a regular basis; and
- Work with itinerant or local counselors throughout the year; and
- Speak, read, and write Inuktitut fluently, and in the case of teachers teaching in French or English, show mastery of the second language; and
- Be at least 21 years of age, or hold a D.E.S.

Academic courses are offered twice a year. In the summer, there is a three and a half week session during which a student can accumulate up to eight credits. In the winter, a three-credit course is offered in a seven or eight-day intensive session. Normally, a person interested in a teaching career spends the first year as trainee in the classroom of an experienced Inuk teacher. During that time the trainee will take up to four three-credit courses and will also have the opportunity to plan and teach lessons on a regular basis. If the trainee is successful she/he will become eligible for available teaching positions.

Throughout the year, the teachers-in-training work closely with pedagogical counselors for practical work in the classroom. Each school in Nunavik has a pedagogical counselor position (small schools have a half-time position).

Once in the program, credits for certain courses are given only after successful application in the classroom. A minimum of 60 credits is required to complete the program. All teachers take the following:

The Aboriginal School and Classroom (6 credits)

- 433-245: Orientation to Inuit Education
- 411-202: Educational and Administrative Institutions in the North

Language (6 credits)

- 433-249: Inuktitut Orthography and Grammar
- 433-342: Intermediate Inuktitut

Psychological, Social, and Physical Development of the Child (12 credits)

- 433-246: Cultivating Language and Thought
- 414-211: Social and Emotional Development and Behaviour
- 414-212: Perceptual-motor Development and Teaching
- 414-341: General Methods in Special Education

Practicum (12 credits)

- 435-444: Field Experience Elementary School
- 435-422: Field Experience Aboriginal Education I
- 435-423: Field Experience Aboriginal Education II
- 435-394: Field Experience Elementary and Secondary School

The remaining 24 credits are chosen from among the following courses. The choice of courses is different for homeroom teachers, subject specialists at the primary and secondary, and physical education teachers.

Content and Teaching Methods (at least 18 credits)

- 426-242: Cultural Skills
- 433-223: Language Arts Part 1
- 433-241: Teaching Language Arts
- 433-248: Reading and Writing Inuktitut
- 433-243: Reading Methods in Inuktitut
- 433-242: Teaching Mathematics
- 433-230: Elementary School Mathematics
- 433-372: Teaching Elementary Science
- 433-270: Elementary School Science
- 433-382: Teaching Social Studies
- 433-312: Activities for the Kindergarten
- 416-304: Measurement and Evaluation
- 455-243: Teaching in Multigrade Classrooms

Options (6 credits)

Students make up the total of 60 credits with courses from the following list:

- 416-377: Adolescence and Education
- 425-365: Experiences in Communication
- 455-220: Curriculum Development
- 433-240: Use and Adaptation of Curricula
- 432-200: Applications Software
- 431-247: Second Language Education in Aboriginal Communities
- 433-344: Advanced Inuktitut
- 455-403: The Dialects of Inuktitut
- 433-340: Special Topics in Inuit Culture
- 414-340: Education of Exceptional Children
- 414-342: Organization of Special Education Programs
- 414-444: Materials in Special Education
- 433-247: Individualized Instruction
- 433-290: Cooperative Learning
- 455-200: Introduction to Inuit Studies
- 426-241: Basic Art Media for the Classroom
- 433-291: Cultural Values and Socialization
- 433-441: First Nations and Inuit Education: Toward Effective Education in Nunavik
- 455-244: Issues in Aboriginal Education

Relevance to NTEP

The Kativik model is deserving of attention since it is primarily a community-based program in a region similar to Nunavut with many small communities where students are generally unwilling to travel to other communities to study for long periods of time. Even though most teachers take longer to get through this program compared to NTEP students (for example, there was one graduate of the Bachelor of Education program and four graduates of the Certificate program this past year), Kativik students are generally taught in their home community and continue working in schools throughout their period of study. This structure allows for easy transfer of knowledge gained in courses into classroom practice. This in-class training model is supported by the pedagogical counselor position in each school; these counselors act as local liaisons and support for the teacher education program. This system has also developed an extensive network of well-experienced Inuit instructors capable of instructing most courses. Since the program is offered in Inuktitut, there is greater potential for strong collaboration between NTEP and Kativik compared to other indigenous models.

6.2.2. University of Alaska Fairbanks¹⁵

The University of Alaska Fairbanks (UAF) is located in Fairbanks, Alaska with approximately 10,500 students currently enrolled. Established in 1935 at its main campus in Fairbanks, UAF also provides educational opportunities for rural Alaskans

¹⁵ Source: University of Alaska Fairbanks website, www.uaf.edu and *Transforming the Culture of Schools* by Jerry Lipka and the Ciulistet Group, LEA publishing, 1998.

(Alaskan Natives) through five community campuses: Chuckchi, Northwest, Kuskokwim, Bristol Bay and Interior Aleutians. Each campus serves a specific area of the state.

The UAF School of Education trains educators to work in urban and rural Alaska and to work with K-12 students from many backgrounds, with a particular focus on Alaska Native languages and cultures. This teacher education program is both campus-based and community-based. The goals of the programs and professional development courses offered through the School of Education are to:

1. Increase the number of qualified educators for Alaska's schools by:
 - o Providing licensure programs at undergraduate and graduate levels;
 - o Providing education programs to place-bound educators in rural Alaska;
 - o Recruiting Alaska Native candidates; and
 - o Aligning programs with state and national standards and the candidate proficiencies identified in the Conceptual Framework.
2. Enhance the professional skills of Alaska's K-12 educators by:
 - o Providing professional development opportunities throughout their careers;
 - o Providing graduate degree programs state wide; and
 - o Developing partnerships with public schools.
3. Develop and support ongoing systemic educational collaborations with Alaska schools and communities to:
 - o Respond to the needs and interests of youth, families, and communities;
 - o Better serve Alaska's diverse populations; and
 - o Enhance learning opportunities for individuals with exceptionalities.
4. Conduct collaborative research on cross-cultural and multicultural education to provide on-going support of:
 - o The quality of Alaska's K-12 schools;
 - o The curriculum of the UAF School of Education; and
 - o The preparation of educators who incorporate into the learning environment the varied cultures and languages of Alaska.

The School of Education offers Bachelor degrees for both elementary and secondary education. The section below outlines the elementary level program offered to Alaskan Natives (Inuit and First Nations).

The Bachelor of Arts in Elementary Education (BAE) is a degree and elementary certification program available to students on the Fairbanks campus and by distance delivery to students in rural areas of the state. The coursework, fieldwork and year-long internship requirements prepare students to meet the UAF and Alaska Teacher Standards for preparing culturally responsive, effective practitioners. All degree requirements are designed to align with the American national standards of the Association for Childhood Education International (ACEI) and the National Council of Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE).

The integrated major/minor degree provides breadth in the content areas necessary for successful teaching at an elementary level. Students take courses in content areas that prepare them for successful teaching at an elementary level. The BAE provides numerous opportunities for students to connect theory and practice in a variety of real classroom, school and community contexts.

BAE students benefit from collaborative efforts with academic units at UAF and from School of Education partnerships with a wide range of Alaska's rural and urban schools and districts. The degree has four central components:

- Content area coursework in the designated UAF core requirements;
- Additional content area coursework in those areas important for successful teaching at an elementary level;
- An integrated set of education courses and fieldwork in schools and the community to provide the foundation for a successful professional internship year; and
- A capstone year-long school internship with a mentor teacher, with concurrent enrolment in professional coursework that focuses on the integration and application of theory, research, and practice in real school environments. Student interns follow the calendar of the school or district in which they complete their internship.

The year-long internship experience in the elementary teacher education programs provides students with the opportunity to be immersed in the real world of teaching and learning, and to follow the progress of a group of elementary students for a full academic year. Internships begin in August or September on the date when teachers return to school (this varies across districts). Interns follow the calendar of the school in which they are placed (not the calendar of UAF). The internship is both intensive and extensive and, therefore, interns do not have outside work during this professional year.

The academic skills of prospective students enrolled in distance learning in Alaska are similar to those of students in Nunavut. Ninety per cent of all students entering rural programs in Alaska test as under-prepared for full college level academics. In order to summarize how the distance learning structure at UAF deals with this situation, the section below describes the program delivered in Kuskokwim region.

Through a campus in the regional centre of Bethel, Alaska, the program offers a combination of real-world workplace skills, internships, and on the job training, with basic skills improvements in reading, writing, and mathematics.

The program is delivered through the use of itinerant advisors that travel to the villages as well as providing on-campus services. Training is given through one or two-week intensive training courses in the regional centre of Bethel, through village based training, audio-conferencing, web based instruction or campus based instruction in Fairbanks.

Recently, nine Kuskokwim regional partners agreed to establish an educational and vocational learning center called Yuut Elitaurviat (People's Learning Center) in Bethel to serve the region. The Yuut Elitaurviat will provide services to both youth and adults needing additional skills to enter high skilled, high wage jobs or further baccalaureate or graduate programs.

Relevance to NTEP

The teacher training programs offered to Alaska Natives through the University of Alaska Fairbanks are extensive and well established. They are known for their comprehensive training, supported by an extensive breadth of services and programs available to students. These are offered through the large faculty and services of the school of education at the university, of which many staff are specialized in indigenous education.

Of note in this program is the full-year internship in the final year. This internship allows students to put their training to practice within a full-year cycle in the classroom. Also noteworthy are the numerous forms of training delivery used for the program both in Fairbanks and in the rural communities, including intensive course work, internships and audio/video conferencing and web-based instruction.

Another important part of the program is the integrated nature of educational research throughout. Staff members, as well as students, are fully engaged in research specifically addressing the experiences and future needs of indigenous teachers in the classroom. The results of this specific research are then used to improve the regional systems of teaching and teacher training. One example of how this research process works is the establishment of the Ciulistet Group made up of Yup'ik Eskimo educators. This research group, supported by the University of Alaska Fairbanks, has worked closely with local teachers and elders to integrate Yup'ik culture into all aspects of the classroom.

6.2.3. First Nations University¹⁶

The First Nations University was established in 1976 as the Saskatchewan Indian Federated College (SIFC) in association with the University of Regina and renamed the First Nations University in 2003. The First Nations University is independently administered to serve the academic, cultural and spiritual needs of First Nations' students. The university offers programs and services on three campuses: Regina, Saskatoon and Prince Albert (Northern Campus). Within the university, there are ten academic departments and/or schools that offer a variety of programs and courses with the Northern Campus in Prince Albert maintaining responsibility for coordinating and delivering community based and distance education programs. Currently, the university maintains an average annual enrolment over 1200 with an alumni base of over 2500.

Since its beginnings, the First Nations University has had an Indian Teacher Education program. It currently offers Indian Education Programs for both elementary and secondary level teaching. The university also offers an eight-semester B.Ed. (Indian Education) program through the Department of Indian Education. The elementary level program offers a four-year elementary B.Ed. (Indian Education). The program includes components of the University of Regina Faculty of Education elementary program as well as features unique to Indian education. The First Nations University of Canada elementary program prepares teachers as generalists and has an emphasis on language arts with a required concentration in Indian education. Students take methodology courses in seven teaching subject areas.

First Nations University students take most of their education courses through the First Nations University of Canada Department of Indian Education. These courses have been adapted to include First Nations content and processes and the teaching of First Nations pupils. Cultural components are integrated throughout the program with an off-campus cultural component offered in the second year. Field experiences are taken in band and provincial schools, as well as in rural and urban locations. In year three, students take a required field component in a First Nations school on a reserve. The final year field experience is a sixteen-week school placement in an urban, rural or reserve school.

Academic regulations follow those of the University of Regina, with some specific guidelines established by the Department of Indian Education. Students enter the program through general admission to the University after high school graduation. Students' progress from one semester to the next is dependent upon achieving positive assessments in faculty reviews of both academic and professional development.

¹⁶ Source: University of Regina website, www.uregina.ca and the First Nations University website, www.firstnationsuniversity.ca

Relevance to NTEP

The First Nations University represents an educational institution of similar size to Nunavut Arctic College that has moved from a college model to a more autonomous university model principally serving indigenous students. This shift has allowed the University to tailor programming to suit its students' needs and cultures and provide its own accreditation that is recognized throughout Canada. This model demonstrates one possible way in which NTEP may situate itself within the recently evaluated Nunavut Arctic College structure. Also of note are the four-month final year practicum experiences and the field experience design structure in which students are expected to teach in multiple locations at different periods of the program.

6.2.4.Sámi¹⁷

The Sámi are an indigenous people living within a region of northernmost Europe called Sápmi. This homeland stretches across approximately 300,000 – 400,000 km² of four nation-states – Norway, Sweden, Finland and Russia. The Sámi way of life has and continues to be strongly connected to reindeer herding and the land of Sápmi. The roughly 100,000 Sámi living throughout Sápmi speak a diversity of Sámi languages. North Sámi is the dominant Sámi language in with an estimated 70 to 80 per cent of all Sámi speaking this language.

There are three colleges in Sápmi that are specifically mandated to serve Sámi people and to also teach Sámi culture and language: Sámi Educational Centre in Jokkmokk, Sweden, the Educational Centre of the Sámi Area in Anár, Finland and the Sámi University College in Guovdageaidnu, Norway. This section will cover the Sámi University College as a model, since the North Sámi language is the principal language of instruction at this institution and it also delivers a Sámi teacher training program.

Sámi Allaskuvla (Sámi University College), Norway

On January 1 1989, the Sámi Department of the Regional Teacher Training College in Alta, Norway was re-established as the Sámi University College (Sámi allaskuvla) in Guovdageaidnu, Norway. It became an independent and fully funded state college under the Norwegian Ministry of Education, principally to train teachers. However, more importantly, this college immediately set out to become the primary source for Sámi education since it remains the only university or college, out of thirty-seven in Norway, sanctioned to base its programming on Sámi culture. In general, content is to be based on the Sámi language and culture and it is to provide courses and programs in higher education relevant to Sámi people. From the beginning, the principal language of instruction was the North Sámi language.

¹⁷ Source: Master's Thesis by Blair Stevenson - Modern Indigenous Curriculum: Teaching Indigenous Knowledge of Handicraft at Sámi Colleges in Finland and Norway, McGill University, 2001.

In its first academic year 1989/1990, approximately 50 students were enrolled. Two years later, there were 160 full-time and part-time students. Most of the present students come from the surrounding Norwegian regions of Sápmi, such as the Kautokeino commune with a population of 3,121 (1999 data) that is primarily Sámi, although some come from Finland, Sweden and Russia. All students and staff must be fluent in the Sámi language since the principal language of instruction is Sámi. No permanent appointments are made to the faculty until the candidate's language fluency in Sámi is proven.

The college also has links with the Nordic Sámi Institute. Through this connection, the college staff is actively engaged in research and development related to Sámi society. Two of the central foci for research at the college are working with Sámi terminology in different subjects and working with the contents and form of the Sámi education system.

The core courses and programs offered at Sámi allaskuvla are: a four-year classroom teacher-training program; a three-year preschool teacher-training program; a one-year pre-program for students of journalism; courses in Sámi language; and courses in duodji (Sámi handicraft). The college is also working to add separate programs in resource management, duodji and drama in the future.

The teacher training program includes compulsory and chosen courses and requires twenty credits per year for graduation with one credit representing approximately two course / study weeks. The number of credits for each course is included in parentheses in the following lists of courses. The compulsory courses include - Sámi language (20); Norwegian/ Swedish/ Finnish language (10) including five credits on multi-lingualism and second language learning; pedagogical theories (10); nature, society and environment (10); mathematics (5); religious studies (5); and practical and aesthetic Subjects (10) with ten credits in Sámi duodji or five credits in duodji and five in music. All the compulsory courses include practice teaching in a local school twice a year. The last ten credits can be chosen among either physical education (5/10), music (5/10) or Sámi duodji (5 supplementary). The three-year preschool teacher-training program requires 60 credits for graduation. There were 33 students in both the classroom and preschool teacher training programs in the academic 2000-2001 year.

Norwegian national guidelines are strict for teacher training. The college in Guovdageaidnu includes Sámi culture as an integral part of its teacher-training program, however this inclusion is in addition to the national curriculum structural requirements. The addition of Sámi studies, therefore, puts time constraints on the program itself since there is a rigorous amount of Sámi cultural material in the program. This creates a situation in which optional credits are no longer available as they are in the national curriculum.

One way this situation could be remedied is through the development of Sámi-specific curriculum. There is, at present, a movement to develop a separate national curriculum for Sámi teacher training through discussions with the Norwegian department of education. If successful, this would allow much more flexibility to Sámi allaskuvla to

structure and provide teacher training instruction based on Sámi culture and language. Sámi allaskuvla has also developed a project to increase the presence of Sámi culture in the college programming. This project, called *Varracohka*, has been initiated to transform the way teaching and learning is done at the college. The *Varracohka* project is an on-going process being directed by the school staff to integrate more traditional knowledge within the academic subjects at the college. The eventual goal of this project is to restructure the entire programming of the college to be more in accordance with the natural Sámi cycle, rather than with more conventional, European-influenced teaching practices. If these goals are reached, then this project should offer an ideal balance between academic and traditional knowledge in teaching. This will result in the college being better able to not only provide more Sámi content, but also to develop programming more structurally based on Sámi language and culture.

Relevance to NTEP

The Sámi allaskuvla model is significant since it is a fully Sámi institution in which the principal language of instruction is Sámi and all staff are Sámi as well. The Sámi University College also has strong links with the Sámi Research Council (in the same community) which allows for formal research connections and the implementation of ongoing educational research projects in which college staff take part. In many cases, Sámi University College staff are encouraged to design and conduct research projects as well as to continue their own studies, supported by a generous leave program.

The recent process of the college's curriculum redesign at the Sámi University College is also an important component of this institution's ability to build a training program fully based on indigenous methods and structures. It is too early, however, to gather long-term results that point to the influence of this redesign process. Also worthy of note is the fact that the college also provides nationally recognized teaching certification in which teachers trained through this program are eligible to teach anywhere in the country.

6.2.5. Māori

The Māori are a Polynesian indigenous people living in New Zealand. In the 2001 New Zealand census, 526,281 people stated they were Māori, representing approximately 15 per cent of the New Zealand population. Nearly nine in ten Māori live on the North Island of New Zealand. While approximately 25 per cent of Māori speak the Māori language, nearly one half are under 25 years of age¹⁸.

There are a number of quality indigenous teacher training programs in New Zealand focusing on training Māori teachers. This section outlines two programs in particular that have well-established and unique Māori teacher education programs built around the unique Māori model of the 'wananga' or traditional Māori centre for learning. These two institutions are the Te Wānanga-o-Raukawa and Te Whare Wananga o Awanuiarangi.

¹⁸ Source: Māori.org.nz

Te Wānanga-o-Raukawa¹⁹

Te Wānanga-o-Raukawa is a unique centre of higher learning devoted to the world of Māori knowledge, (Mātauranga Māori) located in Otaki, New Zealand. Te Wānanga-o-Raukawa is a reformulation of ancient Polynesian institutions known as the whare wānanga, which were tribal centres of higher learning. The method of teaching at Te Wānanga-o-Raukawa is based upon Māori traditional knowledge. Courses are taught using a holistic approach and are based on group learning or 'hui' rather than through individual learning.

The Poumanawa Matauranga Whakaakoranga is a three-year teaching degree designed to produce teachers to teach at primary level in tikanga Māori learning environments (full Māori immersion). The course is delivered in te reo Māori (Māori language). The aim of the program is to produce graduates who will teach children to see the world through Māori eyes, will have a good working knowledge of tikanga Māori, and are able to teach the curriculum using the Māori language.

Students are required to attend nine residential seminars throughout the year. These residential seminars range from four to six days in length. Five seminars focus on teaching and research skills, three on Māori language and one on computer competency. All students are required to own a computer and to complete a computer qualification during their study. A student is able to continue with full-time work and reside outside the local area while studying at Te Wananga-o-Raukawa.

Te Whare Wananga o Awanuiarangi²⁰

Te Whare Wananga o Awanuiarangi was opened in Whakatane, New Zealand in 1992 and officially became a wananga (traditional Māori centre for higher learning) in 1997. Awanuiarangi is one of only three institutions designated as wananga under the New Zealand Education Act of 1989. Since its beginnings, the institution has offered a range of qualifications, from certificates to postgraduate degrees.

The Bachelor of Teaching and Learning program offered is a three-year full-time program or may be taken as a part-time program, to be completed within six years. It is mainly campus-based in Whakatane with opportunities for one-on-one instruction and collaboration. Regular practicums are an essential part of the program learning. There is also an increasing on-line component. A kaupapa Māori philosophy underpins all aspects of the degree. Frequent visits from practitioners in the teaching sector and indigenous educationalists also enrich the learning experience.

The institution also provides a Bachelor of Māori Education (Tapiri:eWanangaTe Tohu Paetahi Matauranga Māori). The Bachelor of Māori Education is an accredited one-year

¹⁹ Source : <http://www.twor.ac.nz>

²⁰ Source: <http://www.wananga.ac.nz>

degree program designed for students who already have a New Zealand Diploma of Teaching or equivalent qualification to build on their practical teaching experience and to extend the teaching and learning theories for pre-service teacher-training. In addition, the kaupapa Māori-based delivery and content provides an enriching experience for teachers from both mainstream and Māori immersion schools.

This one year program beginning in January can be completed in either one or two years, depending on the student's circumstances, and is delivered via distance education so students can continue to work and study from home. Most study takes place online at the university's e-learning site, which includes message boards and a chat room (students must have a computer). The online environment allows students to keep in regular contact with tutors and other students for support and feedback. As part of the program, the student also completes four compulsory five-day intensive noho marae (live-ins) at the Whakatane campus. The noho marae are held in the first week of each school holiday and provide an intensive learning environment in which students can catch up with other students and meet with lecturers and tutors face-to-face.

The one-year program is made up of the following courses:

Compulsory courses

- Māori Science and Technology;
- Theory of Academic Research;
- Issues of Equity in Māori Education;
- History of Critical Theory in Education;
- Sovereignty Issues and Ethnic Identity;
- The Treaty of Waitangi in Education; and
- Māori Philosophy.

Optional Courses

- Issues in Māori Society and Polynesia;
- The Treaty of Waitangi and Models of Iwi Development;
- Contemporary Cultural Studies;
- Tikanga Māori in Aotearoa and Beyond; and
- Individualised Academic Research.

Relevance to NTEP

These two Māori programs are noteworthy because their unique structure and content are based completely on the Māori language, culture and worldview. From a physical learning environment built to reflect Māori traditions (e.g. incorporating spaces for dance and performances) to content and delivery structures designed to reflect Māori culture (e.g. group work rather than individual work), these programs have made the transition to a post-colonial education program for indigenous people. All staff are Māori and in most cases Māori language is the principal language of instruction. These teacher education programs have also been designed to support the successful development of growing numbers of Māori language immersion school students throughout New Zealand.

Te Wānanga-o-Raukawa is a significant institution because of the program's full integration of a computer-based distance learning component which enables students to continue working in their school positions. Most program content is Internet-based, allowing students to continue studying while working in distant communities. All students are expected to have a computer to access the on-line instruction, communication tools and course content. The use of intensive 'live-in' courses in the Te Whare Wananga o Awanuiarangi program is also a noteworthy model that allows for face-to-face dialogue and training opportunities to support its on-line training component making it and the Te Wānanga-o-Raukawa program strong models for NTEP to consider for its own future directions.

6.2.6. *Hawaii*²¹

Almost all of the people of Hawaii live on the eight bigger islands. Of the total population of 1.2 million people, the largest group (22.1 per cent) is Hawaiians or part-Hawaiians, although only about 4 per cent are of pure Polynesian origin. Other large groups are people of European descent and people of Japanese ancestry. The Hawaiians are the fastest growing ethnic group, but are also among the poorest. Hawaiian is a Polynesian language closely related to that of other Pacific islands, such as New Zealand (Māori), Tahiti, and Easter Island. Although there are some dialectical differences between the eight islands, there is one single Hawaiian language. For nearly a century the Kingdom of Hawaii conducted its affairs in the Hawaiian language – including courts, schools and the legislature. From the 1820's a written version of the language existed, and many books, newspapers, textbooks and other documents were published in Hawaiian. English books by Shakespeare, Jules Verne and others were also translated to Hawaiian. All of this created a rich legacy of written materials, and 90 per cent of Hawaiians were literate by the end of the 19th century.

Aha Punana Leo²²

This is a grassroots non-profit organization started in 1983, which by 2002 listed around 250 employees in its annual report. Although salaries are low, employees are motivated by their belief in the Aha Punana Leo vision that 'the Hawaiian language shall live'. The organization 'initiates, provides for and nurtures various Hawaiian language environments... families are the living essence of those environments.' It is governed by a Board of Directors and has an advisory board. Punana Leo means 'nest of voices' in Hawaiian. The organization was established following the Māori Language Nest model, and opened its first Hawaiian language immersion preschool on the island of Kauai in 1984. Many of the founders are also professors at the University of Hawaii in Hilo.

²¹ Source: research conducted in Hawaii by Greg Smith in April 2005, including visits to the University of Hawaii, Aha Punana Leo and the 'Nawahi' Immersion School in Hilo.

²² Information is from Aha Punana Leo website, brochures and documents provided by the organization, the 2001-2002 annual report, and interviews with the organization's management and staff.

Revenues come mainly from federal grant programs, with smaller amounts from tuition, sales and donations. There is no guaranteed core funding.

Aha Punana Leo is involved in four key areas:

- Administration of eleven Hawaiian language pre-schools; and co-administration of two K-12 immersion schools with the state Department of Education and the College of the Hawaiian Language of the University of Hawaii;
- Teacher training, curriculum and technological support for Hawaiian language immersion students and for second language courses in Hawaiian;
- Management of a post-secondary scholarship program for Native Hawaiians; and
- Design, publication and distribution of high quality print and non-print curriculum.

Hawaiian Language Centre, University of Hawaii

The Hawaiian Language Centre is also part of the College of Hawaiian Language at the University of Hawaii in Hilo. This centre provides professional and material resources to support the use of the Hawaiian language in the classroom and various aspects of daily life. The Centre provides services in the areas of:

- Curriculum development;
- Publication of an annual Hawaiian language dictionary;
- Indigenous in-service teacher training and accreditation;
- Training for university students;
- Language outreach, on-line resources, and publication of literature for media; and
- Research and development for a seamless pre-school to senior high school language program.

For some curriculum development the staff works with scientists (e.g. for biology) and astronomers from the observatories at Mauna Kea. When the first class graduated from Grade twelve in 1999, they started to review and revise curriculum that had been developed as the students moved up through the system.

They also use and embrace new technology as a means to keep the language alive and adapting to new circumstances. This includes working with Apple and Microsoft to develop keyboard layouts, fonts, on-line resources etc., all in Hawaiian.

The Indigenous Teacher Education Program is a three semester post baccalaureate program, meaning that applicants must have a B.A. or B.S. degree from an accredited college or university with an approved major and Hawaiian language and culture course work. The program is primarily delivered in the Hawaiian language and is designed to

nurture the Hawaiian identity and prepare medium school teachers to teach in Hawaiian language schools, Hawaiian language and culture programs in English schools, or schools serving students with a strong Hawaiian background.

Teaching is based on Hawaiian concepts of direct experience, and on-site learning and practicum are highly valued. A holistic indigenous approach integrating academics, classrooms and the outside environment is used to balance theory and applied learning. The teacher education is based on a format learning system developed by the director, which divides learners into four types e.g. doers and dreamers, and encourages teachers to prepare lesson plans which address all four types, and to build up strength in each area for all students. The program also is aimed at supporting teachers by working with the curriculum development and literacy staff to create relevant materials from the Hawaiian point of view. This includes such things as a series of world maps with traditional Hawaiian place names and different views of the earth, with Hawaii at the centre.

Core course work begins in the summer semester, and students then spend the next two semesters gaining student teacher experience at Hawaiian language schools around the state. The program is accredited by the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education Certification, and if students are successful they are recommended for licensing by the Hawaii Teacher Standards Board.

Relevance to NTEP

The Hawaiian model is significant because of the strong partnerships that have been established between regional organizations working on language revitalization programs and curriculum design and the teacher training program. These relationships lead to many teachers in the program being active in the creation of language materials and formally reviewing existing curriculum used in Hawaiian language schools. Students also spend considerable time working in language schools during their program of study. This model is noteworthy to NTEP since similar relationships could potentially be strengthened between its program and existing curriculum and material developers in the Government of Nunavut Department of Education.

7. Evaluation Findings

The following section is structured according to the 26 questions used in the evaluation. A summary of the findings for each question is included in the corresponding box.

7.1. Rationale and Relevance

1. Does NTEP continue to be relevant?

A large majority of respondents agreed that NTEP remains relevant, however many believed that a number of areas demand serious and immediate attention.

Based on the literature review, as well as comments from stakeholders, it can be seen that there is ample evidence of the importance of supporting teacher training in Nunavut. Nunavut continues to have an on-going need for Inuit teachers and teaching materials to provide culture-based education in Inuktitut for all communities, act as role models, facilitate communications between schools, parents and communities and help students deal with the health and social problems many of them experience.

Nunavut schools still have not staffed the majority of their teaching positions with Inuit. In fact, since 2000 there seems to have been a drop in the number of Inuit teachers. If Nunavut is to achieve the goal of 85 per cent Inuit employment, a dramatic increase in the number of qualified Inuit teachers is required. Another important issue to consider is that increasing numbers of Inuit teachers are preparing to retire, so these will have to be replaced by new graduates of NTEP. A large majority of respondents stated that NTEP was the best way to maximize the number of Inuit teachers trained and in the classrooms.

Another area of concern suggested by four respondents was that the current program only provides Inuktitut elementary teachers, while there is a need for Inuktitut speaking teachers through the entire system. If the Government of Nunavut *Pinasuaqtavut 2004-2009* goals are to become reality, Inuktitut needs to be integrated into the education system at a much broader level than it is now.

2. Are NTEP programs culturally relevant for teachers and students?

A majority of respondents believed that the programs are including more Inuit culture and language to the extent that more courses are now taught in Inuktitut; however basing the structure and delivery methods of the program on Inuit culture remains unaccomplished.

A majority of respondents stated that the use of Inuktitut to teach the program was the most notable reason why the program was culturally relevant to Inuit. All respondents believed that Inuit should be taught in their own language by their own people and a number suggested that teaching people in their own language is the key to maintaining a culture.

Two respondents stated that language preservation and promotion is critical for Inuit and this could be improved by linking to resources from other organizations and departments in Nunavut, such as the Nunavut Research Institute in Iglulik and the Department of Culture, Languages, Elders and Youth (CLEY). A more coordinated approach was suggested, since many believe that there is some duplication of programs and efforts in support of Inuit language and culture.

Four respondents stated that younger people are getting involved in the NTEP program. This differs from the past when most NTEP students were older, mature students. This change in the student body demographics should influence how the program focuses its efforts on recruitment and on the delivery of the program content. For example, NTEP could involve more elders to teach land and traditional skills. These same respondents stated that NTEP will need to consider how Inuit youth have redefined Inuit culture and identity, and to incorporate and adapt this into its program content and structure.

Other issues relating to language brought up by student and instructor respondents focused on the difficulties of translating from English to Inuktitut. They stated that some things can't be discussed in Inuktitut since the words simply don't exist. As a result, students with better English found the program easier.

Five of the six current NTEP staff stated that NTEP is doing the best job of incorporating Inuktitut and Inuit culture of all Nunavut Arctic College programs. However, all NTEP staff, including six DOE and NAC respondents, believed that there must be more Inuit instructors. As well, none of the NTEP textbooks are in Inuktitut, and five respondents stated that the program structure itself is not based on Inuit culture, traditions, language, values and principles. One informant stated that the program is made up of McGill courses with the addition of more culturally relevant material tacked on. These statements are supported by the fact that the content and structure of the program is based primarily on McGill University teacher education program requirements.

NTEP instructors, however, do have options regarding how much cultural material and content they wish to include. The *Inuuqatigiit* document was mentioned by three respondents as being a useful source for NTEP program content. However it is not

viewed as curriculum but rather as a guide for curriculum. One informant from outside the program questioned whether incorporating Inuit culture into course delivery has been made mandatory. They stated that it should be mandatory through integration into textbooks, program and curriculum.

There was consensus that in order for NTEP to be successful, Inuit culture and language have to be fully integrated into the courses, materials and structure. One regional respondent stated that the strongest teachers are bi-cultural and NTEP needs to work towards integrating these skills. Another respondent suggested that elders should be connected with the program and be recognized as faculty. This would ensure that the program had a solid base in culture. Other suggestions included increasing land experiences in curriculum to ensure that everyone has the necessary background. There shouldn't be an assumption that participants in the program have these skills simply because they are Inuit.

7.2. Design and Delivery

3. What are the program history, goals and objectives?

NTEP has a long history. Current program goals and objectives however have been communicated poorly and are up for renewal.

A majority of DOE, NAC and DEA respondents believe that NTEP is one of the most successful professional training programs offered in Nunavut. Those respondents familiar with the program history spoke of how NTEP evolved out of a similar NWT program. One respondent believed that the informal goals of the program in the early years were to get Inuit teachers into the classroom as quickly as possible. Four respondents stated that the entry-level criteria in the earlier years of the program were quite low in some cases, resulting in a wide range in the quality of the teachers produced. These same respondents believe that this earlier range of quality resulted in public misconceptions about program quality as a whole. However, as one respondent noted, the NWT TEP changed the public's way of thinking about how students should be taught by developing local teachers rather than having them brought in from the south.

In the 1998 Government of the Northwest Territories review document, *Strategy for Teacher Education in the NWT: Past Experiences and Future Directions*, lessons learned from the early year of NTEP are outlined. The report suggested that:

- A Bachelor of Education is the desired standard qualification.
- The NWT Standing Committee for Teacher Education was an effective planning and monitoring body.
- Program partnerships ensured programs were meaningful, current and relevant to employers and students.
- Instructor support is needed within the community and wider program.

- Entrance criteria should be clear and the promotion of the program to qualified candidates is a critical element of success.
- Program resources need to be available and kept updated and supplemented where required.

The document summarized goals for NTEP beyond 1998:

- Increase the number of diploma graduates in all regions.
- Establish B.Ed. program in all regions.
- Implement part-time B.Ed. studies.
- Implement a Middle and High school component at the B.Ed. level.
- Implement an Aboriginal Literacy Certificate Program.
- Complete establishment of a Nunavut Educational Leadership Certificate Program.
- Introduce a teacher induction model for the first two years of teaching for all teachers.

The strategies necessary for meeting the above goals were also recommended. Those set out for Nunavut were:

1. Nunavut will need 317 teachers to meet the goal.
2. A total of 108 degrees will be provided – 52 at the community program, and 56 at the campus-based program.
3. Eighteen courses will be offered with approximately 10 students per course. 108 B.Ed. courses will be offered on a part-time basis.
4. Specialization within degrees will be required and math, science and Inuit/social studies will be added to the fourth year of the degree program in order to train middle and high school teachers.
5. Training for Language Specialists will be through a one-year Aboriginal Literacy Certificate with 62 graduates completing the program by 2005.
6. Recommended research, partnerships and funding structures were suggested.
7. An induction model based on the Saskatchewan model, *Building for Success*, and supported by various partners, would fulfill this need.

NTEP has partially accomplished the highest priority 1997 strategy of increasing the number of diploma graduates, yet the numbers achieved are less than half of those projected. Since 1998, 64 Diploma students have graduated from NTEP compared to the goal of 136 Diploma graduates between 1998 and 2005. However, this comparison may be deceiving since the number of both B.Ed. and Diploma NTEP students in that same period was 133 (69 B.Ed. and 64 Diploma). This total is much closer to the 1998 target of

136; however it is unclear from the McGill graduate data how many of the B.Ed. graduates were also Diploma graduates in the same year. Ultimately, however, NTEP has not reached its target number of graduates.

The second and third priority strategies call for the establishment of Bachelor of Education programs in all regions and the implementation of part-time Bachelor of Education studies. NTEP has been successful in implementing these two strategies.

For teacher training, there are still some areas for improvement in order to achieve the above goals:

- *Total number of Inuit teachers*: the total number of Inuit teachers employed in Nunavut is low at 218.5 compared to the goal of 317.
- *No induction (graduate mentorship) program*: the 1998 review document specifically outlined the need to support new graduates in their classrooms. This was to be done through the creation of a graduate support program in which NTEP graduates were to be paired with a mentoring teacher for the first two years of their employment. The lack of this type of program is still seen as an area of concern for a majority of respondents.
- *No specialization degrees*: NTEP still does not offer specialization degrees in areas such as mathematics and language arts, as called for in the NWT review.
- *Research and partnership funding structures*: there are no formal research or partnership structures present within NTEP. These types of structures were called for in 1998 in the areas of curriculum and teaching materials design and research into Inuit classrooms. A majority of NTEP, NAC and DOE respondents strongly urged that such structures be formalized within NTEP.

4. What is the program scope, and how is it managed, designed and delivered?

NTEP staff members suggest that the campus-based program is working well with the resources it is given, however some respondents stated that the community-based program can become more efficient. These statements concerning the community programs are supported by analysis of the financial data available. If NTEP is to expand into training for the middle and high school levels, significant increases in resources will be necessary.

The majority of information on the program design and delivery structure came from the file and document review, the results of which were presented in section 5.2. This question was only asked of eight key Nunavut Arctic College and NTEP respondents. All stated that the campus-based program is working well with the resources it is given. Three respondents stated that the only area for improved efficiency by necessity was in the community-based program as there had been funding slippage in some years. These statements are supported by an analysis of the financial data available that shows that in previous years funds have lapsed within the CTEP budget suggesting that management of these funds were not as efficient as it could be.

Responses on the expansion of the program's scope are outlined below under question 24. The consensus from a majority of respondents is that if NTEP were to expand its scope, it would require a significant increase in resources.

5. What is the program content and how does this reflect DOE curriculum frameworks, pedagogical approaches and changes in K-12 curriculum development?

There is little communication between NTEP staff and DOE staff on use of current curriculum and approaches designated by DOE.

Few respondents outside of the NTEP staff knew about the specific program content. Of those that were familiar with the program content, three stated that the college should redefine its roles and responsibilities. One informant asked whether the content reflects a real Inuit method of teaching or is simply Inuit teaching a southern-based model. One stated that the teachers appear to be adequately prepared to teach the curriculum as provided by the Department, and overall there seems to be a good fit between the various parts.

Among the seven NAC staff that responded, there was consensus that NTEP courses are reflective of Nunavut curriculum. However three stated that the Nunavut curriculum is out-of-date and not well suited. For example, teaching science in Nunavut is through the Western-Canadian Curriculum Framework which is not a curriculum. Two NTEP instructors also mentioned *Inuuqatigii* as a well-used guide for NTEP program content. Two others spoke of a lack of vision for the use of Inuktitut and Inuit culture in the schools, stating that Inuit culture, traditions, language, values and principles should be the foundation for the program. Inuit instructors shouldn't have to try to 'Nunavutize' southern content.

Four NTEP staff were concerned that there is not much of a relationship between with DOE curriculum unit and NTEP. This was seen as unfortunate since much more curriculum needs to be produced for teachers. Five respondents stated that there is a lot of pressure on the teachers to design their own class content and materials, and that this was cited as a particularly difficult task by several recent graduates of NTEP.

Students believed that the program content was relevant for their needs. One had developed more confidence in their teaching ability during the final year even though there was no practicum in that year. They stated that the material in that year was much more relevant for teaching in the class, while the first three years seemed to offer only background information.

6. How are practicum organized, are there sufficient placements in practicum, and what issues are there relating to these?

There is a broad consensus that there should be more practicum time at all stages of the program, especially for the fourth year B.Ed.

All respondents stated that practicums are an essential part of the program. Eight stated that the practicum portion of the program should be expanded: four suggested this should be done by developing a practicum for the B.Ed. fourth year. Five DOE and NAC respondents and three principals stated that it would be more beneficial if Iqaluit NTEP students were able to have one of their practicum back in their home community. This would allow them to see how another classroom worked and to become reacquainted with their community school. Two of these respondents also mentioned that it would be more rewarding if community-based students had a chance to experience more than one classroom as well. One NTEP graduate found it better to have different instructors who are professionals in their respective fields as they helped her to develop confidence and find out what teaching was really like. One principal noted that the practice of only having practicum in one classroom does not give NTEP students the breadth of experiences they need. One informant also mentioned that students in Iqaluit should be able to go home for at least one year, and community based students should be able to come to Iqaluit for one year.

For community-based programs, four respondents stated the practicums were working well, mostly because students are working in schools in which they are known in the community. However, a number of concerns about issues affecting the success of practicum were identified. The largest group of respondents (5) identified a lack of consistency for practicum. They stated that it was hard to maintain a high standard among supervising teachers as some were not being good role models and lacked professionalism. Three of these respondents stated that, in general, there were few teachers that could be appropriate mentors. One example of problems inherent with practicum given by a principal was that of a regular teacher who went on medical leave, leaving the NTEP student, who had limited teaching skills, unsupervised in a classroom. Two respondents raised an issue relating to the practicum in Iqaluit. This was that some cooperating teachers are getting tired of having trainees in their classrooms, since the campus-based program relies on only certain teachers to repeatedly supervise NTEP students.

Four NTEP staff and one NAC informant also spoke of the need for a full-time position in Iqaluit to coordinate all practicum. This type of position could also help with communications between NTEP and the communities since, as one principal mentioned, schools do not receive enough information about practicum.

Another principal commented that the first year program should include observation days with experienced teachers throughout the year rather than an extended practicum, as the vast majority of student teachers are unprepared for the demands of a practicum in their first few months of school.

The 1992 article, “Reforming Teacher Education: Toward an Alternative Model of Practicum”²³ outlined a set of principles on which an alternative model of field experiences for practicum programs can be designed. These are:

1. Field experiences should develop teachers who are reflective as well as proficient;
2. Field experiences should develop teachers who share the norms of collegiality and experimentation;
3. Field experiences should be school-based rather than classroom-based within selected schools that foster reflection, collegiality, and experimentation;
4. Field experiences should actively involve school administration, especially as instructional leaders;
5. Field experiences should be a collaborative undertaking between teacher education institutions and the field;
6. Field experiences should involve participants in ways that enhance supervision and increase opportunities for leadership; and
7. Field experiences should be informed by theory and practice.

7. What partnerships and other relationships have been developed as a result of NTEP, and what issues have arisen in relationship to these?

Stronger partnerships should be developed between NTEP and all stakeholders, especially the DOE curriculum unit and schools.

Note: The partnership with McGill University will be addressed in the section under question 16, below.

All NTEP staff and five DOE and NAC respondents stated that there could be stronger partnerships with a number of organizations, the most important being the DOE curriculum unit. All stated that there were not enough Inuktitut materials, and that there must be greater collaboration between the DOE curriculum unit and NTEP since many NTEP students are working with Inuktitut materials in their program. Two student respondents were also concerned that the Department of Education is not keeping them updated on new developments, specifically on new textbooks and classroom materials. The students also mentioned that they often have to develop their own materials for the classroom, as there is such a critical need for Inuktitut/Inuinnaqtun materials, and the Department of Education doesn't recognize this work.

²³ Source: Taylor, Gerald, Borys, Andrea, and LaRocque, Linda. ‘Reforming Teacher Education: Toward an Alternative Model of Practicum’. International Journal of Educational Reform, Volume 1, No. 4, October 1992.

Two respondents suggested that a close formal relationship between NTEP and the curriculum unit could lead to the creation of a Centre of Excellence model. A number of programs such as NTEP could be brought together from across sectors to develop a central and separate facility that would both train professionals and develop materials for them.

Three principals stated that there should be more of a relationship between NTEP and the schools. Five respondents from the DEA focus groups also voiced this opinion.

There were fewer responses regarding other organizations. Two informants stated that the relationship between NTEP and the teachers' unions seems to be relatively positive. Another suggested that there could be more of a partnership between NTEP and Aurora campus of Arctic College to support teachers in the Kitikmeot region. Two respondents also stated that there is little communication between NTEP and the regional Inuit organizations. These could help market NTEP if they had more information from the program.

7.3. Effectiveness and Efficiency

8. Are NTEP programs accessible to Inuit, and what barriers exist?

Perceived major barriers to program access include the low academic standards of some students entering the program and issues relating to the relocation of students to Iqaluit to study.

Eight respondents from all groups surveyed believed that the sub-standard academic level of some students entering the program is a major barrier to the success of the program. Some students are not well prepared when they enter. This has led to the creation this year of a NTEP foundation year. The Department of Education provided additional funding for the foundation year for the community program but not for the campus-based program. One principal stated that the program needs to ensure that the entry standards are set up for success, not failure.

A large majority of respondents believed that having to travel to another community to take NTEP is also a barrier. Students either have to leave their families or bring them along at considerable expense; therefore not every one wants to leave their community for training. Accommodation can also be difficult to find in Iqaluit and smaller communities. For example, recently students from one small community had no place to stay when they went to another small community for a course. Generally, however, respondents stated that it was understood that most training would continue to be delivered in the larger communities.

Six respondents also mentioned the expense of housing in Iqaluit as a barrier. According to one NTEP staff member, each year NTEP turns away several applicants interested in taking the program due to a lack of student housing in Iqaluit. There is currently more demand for the program than the available housing can accommodate. Three respondents stated that the level of financial assistance available is not sufficient for families to live in Iqaluit.

One respondent also stated that if the spouse of an NTEP student moves to Iqaluit, they may not find employment and this can lead to the exacerbation of social problems. Three respondents stated that there is not enough support for those students that need help and a better support system is needed.

Two respondents stated that uncertainty among potential students about their chances of finding a job upon graduation was a potential barrier. However four stated that NTEP graduates had little trouble finding a job. A potential difficulty for some graduates occurred in schools where there is a slower turnover, forcing them to wait for a position to open. One stated that there should be more coordination between the organizations regulating the supply and demand of teachers.

Two respondents mentioned that some trained teachers leave the profession to go into better paying government jobs. Since the establishment of Nunavut, other programs and departments have been ‘poaching’ trained teachers, leading to a decline in the numbers available for recruitment into the profession.

Students generally found the program to be accessible with no barriers. Students in Iqaluit adapted well and had looked forward to entering the program, although two stated that they found accommodation in Iqaluit to be very expensive.

Four respondents stated that the current NTEP community-based structure was also a barrier because many Inuit who want to study must potentially wait for several years before a program will come to their community. Currently, the programs are only available in the Nunatta campus and generally in two additional Baffin communities, one in the Kivalliq and one in the Kitikmeot region each year. This situation therefore limits many potential students, who may have to wait for the next program to be delivered in their own community.

Seven NAC, DEA and principal respondents suggested that the program should be available to more communities by increasing funding to deliver community programs or through the use of distance learning techniques. NTEP should be available to the majority of the communities so students can enter and complete the program, starting at year one each year. One principal stated that is important because there is more success when the students are able to take the program in their home communities.

9. Is NTEP achieving its intended goals and objectives for attracting and developing Inuit teachers and providing them with the appropriate skills? What barriers are there to recruiting and retaining Inuit students and teachers?

NTEP has partially fulfilled some goals such as the production of a limited number of graduates, however many other goals remain unattained.

As outlined in the results section under question 3, NTEP has been partially successful in accomplishing the highest priority strategy of increasing the number of diploma graduates, yet the numbers achieved are far less than projected. Since 1998, 64 Diploma students have graduated from NTEP compared to the goal of 136 between 1998 and 2005. This difference has been somewhat offset by the number of Bachelor of Education graduates in that time.

Approximately half of respondents stated that NTEP is fulfilling the goal of creating Inuit teachers. However, many noted that the program hasn’t attained all of its goals. Overall numbers of Inuit teachers on staff (218.5) has fallen short of the 1997 target of 317. Fifteen respondents from all sectors expressed concern about the academic standards of NTEP students before they enter the program, and of NTEP graduates. The majority of NTEP staff stated that the entrance levels were very low and that the Inuktitut entrance

exams were too easy. Most stated that students have poor academic skills when they enter.

Two respondents stated that new graduates should not be ‘dumped’ into placements and then expected to function perfectly right away. There should be some support from current teachers for new teachers in the first few years. Three respondents mentioned that most NTEP graduates are ready if they have the proper teaching materials when they start, however most don’t have these. It also appears that NTEP does not have sufficient curriculum and textbooks available that are culturally and linguistically relevant to Nunavut circumstances.

Seven principals, Regional School Operations staff and DEA respondents stated that NTEP is not adequately preparing its students. Two stated that it does not prepare new teachers as well as southern universities. They stated that NTEP teachers relate very well to students, but do not appear to have the same academic strengths as southern staff and the program is not producing students that can teach higher-level sciences and math.

Two respondents stated that it seems as though NTEP is geared towards providing skills for the grade one level. For example, when recently asked which grade they would like to teach by a principal, all NTEP grade teachers in that school said grade 1. It was suggested that many NTEP graduates are not comfortable with the higher elementary levels, especially the grade 6 content. Among this group of respondents there was consensus that NTEP graduates are ill prepared, have huge expectations and don’t get enough support. However, the small group of students surveyed agreed that the program was preparing them well for eventually becoming a teacher and that finding employment would be no problem. Two students also stated that studying in NTEP in Iqaluit opened up their minds by seeing more teachers and the challenges they faced.

Three respondents stated that NTEP should provide accreditation that is recognized throughout Canada, not just Nunavut. By doing this, NTEP would have to maintain standards. This should be the standard to which the program is measured – Nunavut needs to produce teachers that are as good as anywhere else.

Another informant stated that the Language Specialist training should be academically up-graded.

10. How effective are current NTEP staffing and staff development practices?

There is consensus that there should be more Inuit instructors and that current instructors should be given more chances for collaboration, research and professional development including Inuktitut training. It was also suggested by a notable number of respondents that internal conflicts between staff in the program have lead to challenges in the implementation of some initiatives.

Seven respondents stated that there should be more Inuit NTEP instructors to better reflect the Nunavut Government's obligations under Article 23 of the NLCA for a representative Inuit workforce. Efforts have been made in the past to establish an Inuit instructor internship program; however one suggested that these efforts have not been lasting since recent Inuit instructor trainees left to take up government positions. A formal, long-term process should be put into place to recruit and support Inuit instructors. Eight respondents also mentioned that past and current internal staff conflicts lead to the failure of the previous instructor internship program and other attempts at program initiatives.

Four NTEP staff stated that there should be long-term planning for professional development since at this point there is no formal professional development. NTEP staff members in Iqaluit hold longer term positions and thus are more likely to be eligible for staff development programs. After three years, staff can take various professional development programs, and after six years they can take full paid leave. Staff members in the community-based programs tend to be short-term employees, so are generally not eligible to take these professional development programs.

Three NTEP staff requested more opportunities for relevant training and workshops such as making more advanced Inuktitut language courses available to Inuit staff. They also stated that instructors should have more time for their own research and collaboration with other staff. One informant stated that NTEP instructors are considered adjunct professors to McGill, however are called instructors at NAC. Another informant stated that NTEP staff is governed by two unions which leads to a lack of focus on the specific needs of NTEP staff or staff development.

Three respondents stated that, for the community-based program, funds should be available for community instructors in-service as well as an increase in the number of visits by Iqaluit instructors to the communities in order to support standards of practice. They also suggested that community-based program staffing is problematic since advertising for positions is often left too late, leaving the quality of short-term staff in doubt.

11. How effective are current NTEP community relations?

Opinions of NTEP community relations were mixed. Most respondents stated that NTEP should communicate more with the communities and DEA on a regular basis.

Five respondents from the Department of Education, NAC and principals stated that NTEP was doing a good job of communicating with the communities. However, seven from Regional School Operations, principals and DEA stated that communication with the communities could be improved. Four others stated that they have had no communication with NTEP staff, and that there was communication with NTEP only when a community program was starting up. This group also agreed that there was no

on-going communication and follow-up and there should be a joint mechanism to improve this.

Four respondents also stated that they have heard comments from parents concerned that Inuit teachers are not teaching as well as non-Inuit. In response to this, one informant stated that negative opinion about the program is based upon its past history when some graduates were not well prepared to be teaching in the classroom.

For more information on communications, see findings under question 23 of this section.

12. How effective are current NTEP student services and relations?

Most staff and the limited number of students that responded stated that student services at the campus were adequate; however there could be more services available to students in the communities.

Four DOE and NAC respondents and two students stated that student services in Iqaluit were generally good, with the Director of Student Services and an on-site registrar providing good support. Two NAC respondents and two students also stated that the NTEP community coordinator position was very helpful. Services to students in the community-based programs, on the other hand, were seen by some students as varying considerably depending on the quality of instructor.

Two NAC respondents also stated that many teachers need to work too hard to find information from NTEP. Two NTEP staff stated that there should be more NAC counsellors in Iqaluit as the present number is insufficient. One also stated that there should be a student liaison position.

13. Are students satisfied with NTEP?

Those NTEP students consulted were generally satisfied with the program.

Note: The above statement is not statistically reliable since so few students were consulted. As a result, the following comments are not representative of the student body in general and are used only to provide a rough sense of the issues influencing student satisfaction.

Student respondents agreed that the program is good and had few criticisms. Two voiced concerns about the 'out-dated' style of teaching used by NTEP instructors. Most students preferred having different instructors and being exposed to different teaching styles. The NTEP students were also concerned that they were not invited to events such as the Nunavut-wide teacher conference recently held in Iqaluit. These students felt excluded and stated they could have gained a lot of insight into teacher's daily lives if they had been able to attend this conference.

14. How effective is program content?

A slight majority of respondents stated that while some content is adequate, course content in general is in need of renewal especially regarding the design of Inuit culturebased content.

Four NAC and student respondents stated that the program content was adequate. While three principals stated that NTEP content was good, five others stated that changes were needed such as:

- Content should be made more relevant to local cultures;
- Evaluation methods of instructors should be more transparent;
- There should be more emphasis on classroom management and assessment;
- There should be more basic educational psychology courses; and
- There should be more focus on teaching the content of specific subject areas.

Overall, eight NAC respondents including NTEP staff stated that NTEP courses should be up-dated, including reforms such as integrating more IQ into courses such as child psychology. Four NTEP staff stated that there are different content standards between the community-based and Iqaluit programs and that there should be a formal process established to build a common vision for content and to decide on which courses are still relevant.

Three NTEP staff stated that there should be a comprehensive and up-to-date materials binder for each NTEP course since many now are incomplete. Another stated that most course textbooks are beyond most students because their English language abilities aren't strong enough. Another suggested that there should be an additional child psychology course geared towards classroom management and one stated there could be a unilingual Inuktitut program for teachers that want to work as language and cultural studies instructors.

The four additional DOE and NAC respondents that stated that NTEP instruction is out-of-date suggested that it not be based on a lecturing style but rather a style using a holistic approach, to make courses more relevant for Inuit. These respondents suggested that there should be more health courses, for example, and less English Language Arts. NTEP instruction should model itself on preferred practices and content should be activitybased. One recent project mentioned as a good example had been the hiring of 1st year students as classroom assistants once a week in Iqaluit school classrooms. It was also stated that NTEP should do its own research and use this to support its own content potentially leading to an extra 'Inuit Studies' year. Another informant mentioned that teachers want tool-kits to teach with integrated curricula and that there needs to be a plan built to have measurable achievement. Previously English instruction was more

structured than Inuktitut and demands were less from Inuktitut. Challenges included when curriculum course materials were in English, but the course was spoken in Inuktitut.

15. Are community-based programming and delivery effective?

A slight majority of respondents stated that the community-based program is essential and in some cases a preferable model to the campus-based program. Quality assurance of the program content and evaluation, however, was a major concern.

Fourteen respondents stated that the community-based program is effective with five stating that this is the preferred method of delivering teacher training compared to the campus-based model. When students don't have to leave their communities to take their training, there are fewer family disruptions for the students. It was also stated that the community programs are better equipped with cultural resources, such as elders. The community-based program, however, is limited to few communities at this time leading five respondents to suggest that the program be expanded. These respondents stated that an expanded community-based program could take the form of a mentorship model in which master teachers performed the main training duties with regional workers providing support. One informant stated that it is easier to find cooperating teachers in the communities. Another commented that the preference for community-based programs is politically based.

A number of these respondents also stated that the success of the community-based programming most often depends on the quality of the instructors. Programs need instructors who are flexible, tolerant, and genuinely sympathetic to the differences and challenges of Inuit culture and educational norms experienced in the communities. Two respondents suggested rotating instructors through the various communities to allow for more variety of styles and expertise. Two suggested that it would be better if there were more permanent Inuit instructors in the communities working with temporary instructors from the south.

On the other hand, many respondents stated that they were concerned about the quality of instruction in community-based programs since the quality of instructors and cooperating teachers can vary. Three principals stated that the community-based programs need 'an overhaul', mainly because instructors seemed to be hired at the last minute, communication from Iqaluit was extremely poor and the slow arrival of course documents and materials was detrimental to the smooth delivery of programs.

The majority of NTEP staff also echoed these concerns, stating that community instructors are isolated and there should be far more support for and communication with them. Three NTEP staff stated that community instructors are left on their own and that there is too much work for one instructor. Although there was considerable support from the community coordinator position, many stated that the type of support offered depended on the individual in that position. Two other NTEP staff stated that it was

unfortunate community students didn't have the opportunity to come to Iqaluit to study, even for a short time.

There was a consensus that there is concern with the quality of instructors found for the community-based courses, and that since there was very little verification of the program, DOE can only assume that delivery is occurring. Three respondents stated that they had observed varying standards between instructors and large discrepancies between the programs, leading to suggestions that courses, exams and assessments in the community and campus-based programs should be standardized.

Two respondents also suggested that the community program should be of 3-year duration in the community and one year, or at least one semester, in Iqaluit. This was supported by another informant, who stated that instruction is better in Iqaluit and it is a unique environment because there are students from all over Nunavut and this builds teacher self-confidence.

16. How effective is the partnership with McGill University and what alternative options exist?

There is general consensus that the relationship with McGill University is too expensive, provides too little in return and that a new agreement be renegotiated either with McGill or another university

Almost all respondents (11) that are familiar with the McGill University partnership view it as too expensive. They stated that these costs could not be sustained for the long term and that is time to begin a process to see what other potential partnerships may be available. Two stated that the relationship is good, yet expensive.

Six respondents stated that the partnership has been good in the past and has offered a lot to NTEP, however the relationship is much poorer now. Two stated that it had been useful since McGill University is internationally recognized and thus brings a certain credibility to the program and its graduates. Four NTEP staff stated that the relationship is only on paper and a financial one, and that the personal relationships that existed at one point have now disappeared. There was consensus among NTEP and NAC staff that McGill has virtually no presence in the program, that communication within the relationship is poor and that there is little support for NTEP instructors from McGill. Students who responded were somewhat aware of the McGill role, but didn't have a distinct opinion about it. One stated that the best instructor they had was from McGill.

The above statements by respondents are supported through an analysis of the responsibilities outlined in the agreement between Nunavut Arctic College and McGill University in which it can be seen that some responsibilities of McGill University are not currently being fulfilled. For example regarding NTEP staff support, the agreement states that "full-time instructors at NTEP and in community-based programs will be paired with a colleague at McGill, with the agreement of both parties, for professional

support” and that NTEP staff will have access to McGill facilities. However, NTEP and NAC respondents stated that these types of support do not presently occur.

As well, the agreement states that McGill University shall “assist the College, NTEP and the Nunavut school system with which NTEP works in addressing research questions identified by the communities concerned. As heard from evaluation respondents, this research support service does not occur as well.

In April 1998, NTEP and the Department of Education established the NTEP-University Partnership Committee, and began a survey of Canadian universities in order to search for a replacement for McGill University. The objective of this search was to find a university partner, which offered a four-year, direct entry Bachelor of Education comparable to the existing NTEP/McGill degree and that a new partner should recognize the NTEP 4-year degree and provide the support and accreditation services required at a significantly lower cost than the present agreement. Two visits each were made by NTEP staff to the following four universities:

- University of Alberta, Edmonton
- University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon
- University of Regina, Regina; and
- Lakehead University, Thunder Bay.

Most universities were willing to negotiate an arrangement that included an annual flat fee lower than the fees to McGill University. For example, the University of Regina offered an annual flat fee of \$35,000 to \$40,000²⁴. Although the decision was made to stay with McGill University at that time, it is unclear from the information available, which university, if any, was recommended by the committee and the reason for the eventual decision to stay with McGill University. If this search process were re-established, any of the potential partners outlined above could be contacted to discuss their interest in replacing McGill University. Given the numbers of potential partners, the process of finding a new partner could be presented in the form of a tender request for a limited period, such as 3-5 years in order to ensure a competitive process. As a first step, potential candidates could be asked to provide an expression of interest.

Two respondents also suggested potential models to look at were the relationship between the University of Saskatchewan and Aurora College, and the partnership between Memorial University and Labrador Inuit.

²⁴ Source: NTEP University Partnership Committee Report on Second University Visits, November 3, 1998.

17. Are NTEP programs being efficiently managed and delivered?

NTEP staff suggested that the campus-based program is working well with the resources it is given, however concerns remain regarding the efficiency of the current communitybased program delivery structure. There is also a perceived lack of long-term planning leading to a number of options suggested for new delivery models. All respondents also stated that the steering committee should be re-established.

Five DOE, NAC and NTEP respondents stated that NTEP is doing well within the resources it has at hand. However, significant concerns were raised. They stated that there is a lack of vision and leadership at the upper management level of NTEP and NAC. Two suggested the high turnover of management staff was one potential reason. Most respondents stated that the NTEP staff structure was fine, but there is a lack of support and coordination from NAC management. Many respondents stated that NTEP seems quite independent and agreed that this was a good thing. NTEP staff spoke of challenges with the NAC head office. One stated that they have ‘come to expect nothing’.

A majority of NTEP staff stated that the campus-based program is managed well, but that there are concerns with how well CTEP is run and that management could be ‘tightened up’. Two specifically stated that the two programs could be tied more together into a single, seamless program for funding, management and delivery. Three respondents stated that the distance education and the use of technology offered opportunities to tie in classes being offered Iqaluit with the smaller groups or even individuals in the communities. This would be enhanced soon when broadband Internet arrives in the territory.

Three community respondents stated that there seemed to be great pressure to pass some students, even though their skills may be sub-standard. This led to a situation where students were sent through the program without learning the skills, and then expected to be competent teachers afterwards. These comments are related to earlier concerns that the standards of delivery are too low and that some instructors are too lenient.

Four respondents stated there is an inconsistency in delivery between the community-based and campus-based programs. For example, syllabuses for the same course could be different depending on who is instructing the course. They stated that NTEP graduates lack knowledge about classroom management and lesson planning. They stated that there needs to be a standard of skills similar to that for southern teachers, and that teachers need a lot more in-service training once they are out of the program. One informant suggested that this may be explained in part by the fact that the campus-based program is base-funded so teachers are hired for a longer period, while CTEP hires instructors every year. This leads to a lack of continuity and higher staff turnover.

There was a strong consensus among respondents that the previous NTEP Steering Committee should be re-established. They stated that by doing so, a formal mechanism would be put into place to quickly improve communication among stakeholders and to provide vision and direction to the program.

Other specific suggestions for improvements to program management and delivery from respondents included:

- Instructor evaluations at the end of each course;
- Exit interviews for NTEP staff that leave the program;
- All NTEP and CTEP funding should be combined into an annual long-term agreement;
- More two-way communication between NAC head office and NTEP staff; and
- More time for NTEP staff to collaborate with each other both in Iqaluit and the communities.

Seven respondents suggested that it is an opportune time to revisit NTEP goals and objectives to determine whether they are consistent with current societal and educational directions. This could be done through the implementation of a comprehensive review of the program. One informant stated that there is a real need to discuss beliefs about Inuit learning and pedagogical methods that best suit Inuit. This must include a discussion on how IQ should be incorporated into every aspect of the school system and NTEP. Elders and community experts should be part of this discussion.

18. Is NTEP cost efficient?

When compared to cost-per-student data from eight years ago, current NTEP programming is more cost efficient.

Two DOE and NAC respondents stated that there was potential room for more efficient Use of resources within NTEP. However all NTEP respondents stated that the campus-based program is short staffed and stretched thin, especially as there is only one Inuit instructor. They stated that there is little time to support CTEP staff or develop resources. Two NTEP staff stated that NTEP is actually working with less staff than before since there now only five instructors when there used to be six.

Two NAC respondents stated that there is a potential cost saving from the movement towards distance learning using broadband technology, however this option would have to be studied carefully to ensure that it was cost effective.

As noted previously in section 5.5, above, there is evidence that NTEP is more cost efficient than it has been in the past. The annual costs per student for the entire NTEP program (campus and community based) between 2001 and 2004 have been \$18,678, \$22,698 and \$24,073 respectively, with an average for those years of \$21,216 per student enrolled. Costs per student now are actually lower than they were almost ten years ago when in 1997 they were \$29,101. These data, however, are limited and further study will

needed in order to gain more detailed insight into how cost efficient the program is, especially in order to compare the campus-based and community-based programs.

19. Overall, how are NTEP's current structure, delivery and effectiveness compared to earlier years of the program?

There is consensus among respondents that NTEP structure and delivery has changed little. Few respondents had opinions on current effectiveness compared to earlier years. Resulting from this lack of response and a general lack of clear performance indicator data, further study is needed in order to compare specific indicators throughout the history of the program.

Four respondents stated that overall the program and its structure are effective and that the program has changed little over the years and that the delivery model is 'tired'. One stated that NTEP is more effective now because it has a greater focus on the quality of the teachers it graduates, compared to earlier years, as a result of the shift from a two-year program to a four-year program.

Three respondents also stated that the establishment of the community-based program was a positive change in the delivery of NTEP.

It must be noted that little clear performance indicator data has been compiled making trend analysis difficult.

20. What else is essential to know about the NTEP program, what works best, and what could be improved?

Several respondents stated that the lack of long-term planning for the program was a concern. Several stated that this could be addressed through a long-term planning symposium open to all stakeholders.

Four respondents restated their concern about the lack of a current and long-term vision for NTEP. They stated that this situation could be corrected through the development and implementation of a visioning event, which would bring all stakeholders together. They also stated that many of the outstanding issues raised in earlier sections, above, could also be addressed during such an event.

One informant stated that the best thing about NTEP is that the program looks after the students and supports them when they are going through challenging times. Another stated that the best thing about the program was that students are virtually guaranteed a job upon completion, and there are also many opportunities to work in high-level government positions.

Three respondents stated that there is a substantial difference between students in Iqaluit and the communities - the expectations are the same for each group, but they don't have the same tools to work with. They recommended a consistent grading system. Two stated that better financial assistance for students was another important area of need.

7.4. Future Directions

21. What are the primary issues affecting the success/limitations of the program?

Many issues affect the success and limitation of the program.

Many issues affect the success and limitation of NTEP. Various respondents reiterated issues raised in the above sections. These include:

- Students need to be academically ready for the program;
- The relationship between the instructors and the students is critical for student success;
- NTEP should better track what courses students need to finish the program and ensuring that students are kept up to date;
- The GN needs to get serious about its commitment to Inuit languages and culture and commit more financial resources to teacher training;
- The program should be expanded to produce Inuktitut speaking elementary and secondary teachers, not just primary teachers;
- Recruitment efforts must be improved, especially to attract more male teachers;
- The NTEP curriculum, programs and resources such as textbooks should be rewritten to include Inuit culture, traditions, language, values and principles as their foundation;
- More student housing should be provided for both singles and families;
- More student support should be provided in Iqaluit and the communities;
- The program should be expanded to be delivered in many more communities;
- Co-ordination between regional school operations and the NTEP are needed to ensure there is a closer match up between people going through the program and placement in jobs;
- A one-year training program in specialty areas should be introduced for instructors;
- Permanent one-year programs offered to para-professionals in Special Needs Student Support areas should be created;
- Certificate programs should be expanded to include more programs for middle and senior high schools; and
- NTEP should meet the demand for a Master's Degree program even though this would not likely increase the number of teachers, but could help retain people already in the system or encourage more Inuit instructors into NTEP.

22. What alternative models for indigenous teacher education exist and could be useful for NTEP to consider?

Some indigenous teacher education programs in Canada and internationally offer strong models, which NTEP could learn from.

Five respondents were somewhat aware of other models, principally in Norway, New Zealand and other parts of Canada (including the Kativik program). There was much interest in learning more about how these programs are working, and to promote NTEP as a success. Two respondents also recommended creating both student and instructor exchanges.

See section 3, above, for more detailed information on other indigenous education programs relevant to NTEP.

23. What recommendations can be made for an effective NTEP communications strategy to attract more students?

There is currently no formal communications strategy at either NTEP or NAC. Most respondents suggested that a formal communications strategy for both internal and external communications be developed.

Analysis of the information gained through interviews and document reviews indicates that the NTEP has not been promoted or advertised through a well planned communications strategy. The most successful means to promote the program identified thus far have been via word-of-mouth and through anecdotal descriptions of the program passed on by current students and past graduates of the program.

Research conducted for the current evaluation shows that similar programs in the south have developed more defined and assertive communication strategies to advertise and promote their programs. Lakehead University, for example, has a well recognized Native Teacher Education Program and uses a number of techniques to recruit people from Aboriginal communities:

1. The program is promoted within the regular promotional and information materials put out by the university – brochures, web site, advertisements in the paper etc;
2. Program representatives attend and set up booths at Aboriginal career days;
3. Staff attend conferences where audience members may be interested in the program;
4. School presentations in the region are conducted when requested;
5. The program also partners with other programs in the university to take its message to schools etc;

6. Word-of-mouth remains the most common and effective means of promoting the program; and
7. The university web site is a good way of helping to inform people about the program, particularly since its clientele is spread out in smaller communities.

For NTEP, there are a number of potential elements of an effective communications strategy. These include:

- Word-of-mouth will remain an effective means of getting the word out about the program. Anecdotal evidence suggests that a person that has had a very good experience with the program will be the best salesperson for NTEP. NTEP should encourage all graduates to share their NTEP and teaching experiences with other people they know who might be interested in a teaching career. In particular, they should be encouraged to talk to high school students either informally or during events such as career days;
- NTEP should focus its communication efforts on the younger generation currently in high school. While its “traditional” source of recruits has been older people with families and most likely some experience in the educational field, it is important that the younger generation be introduced to teaching as a viable career early on, when they are just beginning to consider what careers they would like to have;
- Through presentations at schools and career days, NTEP graduates, current students and the NTEP coordinator should participate in promoting teaching as a viable career, one that is important and makes a considerable contribution to the community;
- The Department of Education needs to promote teachers as role models through a poster campaign that illustrates some Nunavut success stories. For example the current Deputy Minister of Human Resources is an NTEP graduate;
- The advent of broadband infrastructure within Nunavut will make the Internet even more effective as a means of getting the message out. To ensure the maximum benefits are achieved, web site material must be kept current and made user friendly;
- The Premier or the Minister could make presentations on NTEP to students and perhaps become the primary public boosters of the program, in coordination with other communication efforts;
- Radio show promotion of NTEP may be a good idea although generally it is not the young people that listen to community radio. However, it may still be an effective means of advertising the program to its more traditional target group;
- Ensure the principals and teachers in the schools are aware of the success of the program and that their assistance in the promotion of teaching as a career would be a valuable recruitment tool. Ensure they have up-to-date promotional materials and are aware of specific communication initiatives as they are developed;

- Make a stronger effort to recruit northern/Inuit instructors – more Inuit instructors would be a great recruitment/advertisement for the program; and
- A communication strategy should also address the need to increase information flow from the program to the general public and NTEP partners to generate greater public support and interest in the program. A primary means of ensuring current and accurate information about the program is put forth could be the proposed establishment of the Steering Committee.

A majority of DEA respondents also stated that NTEP staff should come and visit their schools. Other suggestions by DEA members for communications activities included: high school students job shadowing teachers, and developing a more visible poster campaign in the schools.

24. How can the NTEP scope be broadened beyond the elementary school level to junior and senior secondary levels?

A majority of respondents stated that expanding into the junior and senior levels is important, however NTEP should concentrate on the elementary level first. If NTEP were to expand, it would need considerably more resources.

A majority of respondents stated that eventually training more teachers for the higher grades is important. However, eight from various sectors stated that this should not happen yet since many program goals at the elementary level have yet to be achieved. A stronger base at the elementary level should be the program priority.

Currently some students are interested in teaching in higher grades. Four respondents stated that a targeted system could be put into place for these few students, in which they would study at a southern university in certain subject areas before returning to NTEP for further teaching training. For math and science, this type of system could lead to a combined B.A. or B.Sc. and B.ED. similar to most universities today.

Another suggestion from two respondents was for NTEP to encourage existing graduates to extend their skills and training to enable them to teach at the more senior levels. This could appeal to both existing teachers who want a change or new teachers who may not wish to wait for an elementary position to open up.

Even if an expansion of the program were implemented and sufficient funds provided, a number of issues would still have to be addressed. One of the major issues affecting the shift to the higher grades is that Inuktitut isn't equipped yet to handle certain math and science terminology. Extensive language development work and teaching materials and curriculum design would have to occur. Also, further study would be required to explain why the middle years certificate offered through McGill University has attracted little interest among Nunavut students.

25. What management and governance structure is recommended?

Overall, respondents suggested that the NAC/NTEP management and governance structure should be clarified. Respondents also stated that, for a program expansion into the higher grades, a targeted approach would work best. Others commented on the need to expand the community-based program with long-term base funding to allow for greater access in more communities.

Nine respondents agreed that funding for NTEP should increase and be converted to long-term base funding. Currently there is base funding for the Iqaluit program, but not for CTEP. Every year, CTEP relies upon contributions from the Department of Education that can vary, which makes long-term planning more difficult. These respondents stated that there should also be base funding for this program, as it would enable CTEP to maintain instructors for a longer term and thus increase the quality and stability of the program.

A change in the funding regime would also have potential benefits for the recruitment and maintenance of instructors. All NTEP staff stated that it is hard to find sufficient instructors to deliver community programs and that recruitment focuses in southern areas since not as many people in Nunavut have the required skills and background. One other informant stated that southern recruitment had led on occasion to the hiring of some instructors who did not embrace the importance of critical elements of the program such as the inclusion of Inuit culture and language.

Seven DOE, NAC and NTEP respondents stated that there is a gap between NAC and NTEP on management and communications. One area where more cooperation could be beneficial is the potential sharing of certain courses that could be offered both at NAC and NTEP.

Five respondents stated that the NTEP/NAC management and governance structure needed to be clarified. They spoke of the need for longevity and consistency in the program at the higher levels of management. Three stated that NTEP should be established as a stand-alone institution. This re-examination of the NTEP governance structure could also be part of the program visioning event suggested by other respondents as described above. One commented that since NTEP has seemed separate from the college from its inception, its movement towards a separate centre of excellence model seems more feasible than for other NAC programs.

Two other respondents stated that NTEP could have its own dean who would be responsible for overall management of the program within NAC. Another spoke of the need to review whether the principal of NTEP should report to the NAC Iqaluit Campus Director or be elevated to report to the NAC President.

26. What other changes and improvements could be made to expand NTEP, make the NTEP more effective, and ensure that the program adheres to national academic standards and the transferability of credits - e.g. how would an “ideal program” look?

Recommendations are included in the final section of this report.

A majority of respondents stated that an ideal program would be well resourced with easy accessibility for students. It would have support mechanisms to help students succeed, be based on Inuit language and culture, have increased financial support for students, and easier access to housing. Three mentioned the NAC Law School as a good model, although they stated that realistically this would be too expensive. Three respondents also mentioned that high academic standards must be achieved regardless of what partnerships may be formed with universities.

Those principals that responded also made recommendations. An ideal program would be:

- One that would have the required programs from the south but with Inuit cultural practices fully integrated;
- One in which graduates feel very comfortable in both worlds and where they could teach culture from the traditional Inuit perspective;
- Producing well qualified, experienced teachers with administrative experience if possible, affiliated with different universities' education departments, include study modules for different areas of the program, incorporate a good evaluation system and frequent classroom evaluations, and teach students based on a mentorship system.

Two principals also stated that the teaching methodologies taught at NTEP are out-of-date and the college needs to investigate cutting-edge techniques and teach these to the new students. Since Nunavut is moving towards a bilingual education system, teachers also need to be more aware of the research literature on bilingual education and how to teach effectively in both languages.

DEA respondents also made recommendations for an ideal program. These included that:

- There should be ongoing follow-up of NTEP graduates, especially when they begin a teaching position;
- It would be good to have regular assessment and or evaluation on how well the students are doing in their positions;
- If adjustments or changes are going to be made to NTEP, then appropriate funding should be provided for this;
- NTEP should encourage participants to study for their bachelor and masters degrees;

- A greater effort made to deliver more CTEP and to regionalize the NTEP delivery;
- Jobs for students should be guaranteed in their home communities;
- DEA's should be getting progress or status reports on how well students from their communities are doing;
- More emphasis should be put on marketing, including going to the high schools and promoting the program;
- NTEP should be looking at where it wants to be 20 years from now. A visioning exercise on this should take place;
- NTEP and CTEP programs should be blended to give all students the same amount of instruction and practicum; and
- Students should be better prepared to go into the classrooms.
The Regional Operations Staff suggested the following:
 - There should be more training on the application process to help teachers get a teaching position after they graduate;
 - Students should be in the classrooms more often, potentially through a master teacher program for one year of the NTEP program. The master teacher model and community-based program were the best since there is a lot of team-teaching and in-class training and these are intense and useful;
 - There should also be a community-based program in each community with ongoing job-sharing and master-teacher programs. The current community-based program is insufficient to meet the need;
 - Kitikmeot teachers should be able to go to Yellowknife to study since few Inuit from the Kitikmeot region want to go to Iqaluit; and
 - There should be some type of visioning session between NTEP management and all stakeholders to develop the program vision and expectations. This process could lead to a centre of excellence model that would be more directed and accountable to the community.

NTEP staff had specific recommendations as well. These included:

- Increased support for the foundation year to help identify student needs earlier;
- The four year B. Ed. should become the standard for teaching rather than just the certificate;
- There is a lack of cohesion between campus and community-based programs, therefore some Iqaluit-based instructors should teach in the communities. NTEP Iqaluit instructors feel disconnected from the communities. The Coordinator and Principal need to be out more promoting and communicating NTEP to the communities;

- There should be an Inuit instructor apprenticeship program to meet the need for more Inuit instructors. Starting a part-time Master's program for Inuit instructors could help support this program. It would also require designated funds;
- The level of Inuktitut taught in the program should be increased;
- A strong liaison should be created with Nunavut Sivuniksavut in Ottawa, including advance standing for their graduates if they enrol in the program; and
- NTEP should be under one umbrella, and not be separated into NTEP / CTEP.

Three other respondents stated that NTEP should keep the program in the communities and have dedicated instructors for the program.

Along with recommendations provided by respondents, the report titled *Aajjiqatigiingniq – Language of Instruction* submitted to the Government of Nunavut in December 2000 contains sections specifically addressing teacher education. The major recommendations from these sections include orientating all Nunavut teachers towards full bilingualism, the development of a separate Nunavut College of Education and the establishment of an Inuit Educators Association (IEA)²⁵.

26. What additional resources would be required to meet program goals?

A number of recommendations for additional resources were made by respondent

All respondents supported the program. Recommendations for improvements included the following:

- CTEP could be enhanced by looking at alternative delivery methods including distance education systems;
- NTEP should look at developing cheaper alternatives for accommodations such as buying some buildings or entering into partnerships with other agencies;
- An increase in funding would be beneficial since NTEP is currently under-funded. Going outside of the Government of Nunavut to find funding is unrealistic;
- Hiring more elders, including an elder in residence, would bring up the cultural content;
- More housing is needed to accommodate more students;
- There should be an assistant for the principal to assist in the execution of the principal's responsibilities;
- There should be a designated NTEP practicum coordinator; and
- NTEP needs a five-year plan with a detailed financial plan to support it.

²⁵ Note: see page 59 of this report for the details of these recommendations.

8. Conclusions and Recommendations

8.1. Conclusions

NTEP has had a long history, producing 224 Diploma graduates with 124 moving on to graduate with a Bachelor of Education as of this year. Inuit teachers can now be found in most schools of Nunavut. However, there remains much work to be done if Inuktitut is to become the principal language of instruction in all Nunavut schools and Inuit teachers are employed in representative proportions. NTEP has a strong role to play in continuing to train qualified Inuit teachers. There is consensus from stakeholders that the program remains relevant and should be significantly enhanced in order to reach *Pinasuaqtavut* goals for Inuit employment and a fully Inuit culture and language-based program.

There is consensus that there should be more practicum time at all stages of the program, especially for the fourth year B.Ed and that campus-based students should have some practicum time back in their home community. There was also consensus that more courses are now taught in Inuktitut, however the presence of Inuit culture in the structure and delivery methods of the program can be significantly improved. A majority of respondents stated that course content is in need of renewal. A majority stated that the community-based program is essential, with some stating that it should be expanded and that maintaining quality of instruction in the program is an on-going concern.

NTEP administration issues include the need for stronger partnerships between NTEP and all stakeholders, especially the DOE curriculum unit and schools, since there is minimal communication between NTEP and its stakeholders. A majority of respondents also called for the re-establishment of the NTEP Steering Committee. Low academic standards of some students entering the program are another major concern.

Areas where structural changes could take place include the university partnership and the delivery model of the program. There is consensus that the relationship with McGill University is too expensive and provides too little in return. If a new partner is sought, as a majority of respondents suggest, they state that NTEP must maintain the flexibility and unique nature of its program in any new arrangement. A majority of respondents stated that both the campus-based and the community-based programs needed to be integrated more fully and that the entire program should be expanded to reach more communities across the territory. There is consensus that the NTEP structure has remained the same

for a number of years and there is a perceived lack of planning for potential new content and structural options.

8.2. Recommendations

Based on the review and analysis of all data the following recommendations to NTEP are made (recommendations are not in order of priority):

1. **NTEP should integrate both the campus and community programs into one seamless program.** This administrative change will allow for easier long-term planning, sharing of instructors between Iqaluit and other communities, pooling of funds and the development of new delivery models to increase practicum time for both programs and consistent content based on Inuit culture and language. The option for a NAC foundation year would also be part of this integration of content and delivery. The establishment of formal student and staff exchanges with regional and international teacher education institutions would also occur through this process.
2. **NTEP policies and procedures should be clarified and include the development of a formal communications policy and professional development policy.** This process would include measures to clarify both internal and external procedures for reporting and communications, management protocols and administrative policies. They should be developed in conjunction with the larger review process of Nunavut Arctic College and be consistent with broader Nunavut Arctic College policy and Department of Education directives.
3. **The NTEP Steering Committee should be re-established as a Nunavut Arctic College program advisory committee.** This committee would have clear terms of reference with its costs spread across all stakeholders involved. Committee members would be made up of representatives from: Department of Education, Nunavut Arctic College, NTEP staff, regional school operations, DEAs, principals; unions; university partner; Inuit organizations; and students. The proposed communications strategy would also be designed and implemented in conjunction with this committee.
4. **A formal plan should be created for the recruitment, training and retention of full-time Inuit instructors.** Specific targets should be set within this plan that conform to Article 23 requirements, e.g. that all NTEP instructors will be Inuit by 2010. Adequate, multi-year funds should be devoted to the implementation of this plan. This plan would also allow for greater incorporation of Inuktitut and Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit, and create a critical mass of Inuit instructors able to work collaboratively on curriculum and teaching materials projects. The implementation of this plan would be closely related to the content recommendations stated in recommendation 7 and rely on partnerships between Nunavut Arctic College, Inuit organizations and the Department of Education.

5. **NTEP should be expanded to allow for access to the program by greater numbers of communities and students.** Increased numbers of new students as well as existing teachers that have yet to graduate should be encouraged to enroll so that NTEP can support NLCA Article 23 goals. Options to increase accessibility include the hiring of full-time community-instructors and pedagogical coordinators to act as support for students and cooperating teachers and allowing for campus based instructors to teach in the communities as well. Distance learning technologies should also be used to reduce the effects of barriers such as a lack of available housing and challenges associated with relocating to a new community. This increase in accessibility would rely on a significant infusion of new base funding to the program and restructuring of present funding allocations.
6. **A formal long-term plan should be developed within a year of publication of this report, and all NTEP stakeholders should be involved in the development of the plan.** This plan would include reviewing and establishing long-term goals and objectives and performance indicators. A key objective of this long-term plan would be to significantly increase the number of K-12 Inuit teacher graduates. The development of these long-term plans should correspond with the re-establishment of the NTEP program advisory committee. One recommended step to aid in the development of such a plan would be a symposium similar to the Teacher Education Symposium held at Arctic College in 1994.
7. **NTEP program content, delivery structure and pedagogy should be redesigned to be more fully based on Inuit culture and language; this should be achieved through the establishment of a curriculum development committee under the leadership of a full-time coordinator.** Through this process, which would coincide with the development of the long-term plan proposed above, a curriculum development committee would be established to review all current NTEP programming and to develop revisions so that content and structures are more substantially based on Inuit language and culture. Potential members of this committee would include experienced Inuit educators, Inuit policy makers, elders and youth. Any renewal of NTEP content and delivery structure should also conform to requirements under Articles 23 and 32 of the NLCA, and conform to Nunavut Arctic College policy, DOE curriculum standards and principles of Inuit Qaujimagatuqangit. The curriculum development committee would report to the Nunavut Arctic College Board of Governors.
8. **NTEP data should be more consistently collected and compiled at one NAC administrative site.** Record keeping standards should be established to simplify and consolidate data collection and storage at a single point at Nunavut Arctic College. This would allow for easier access to records by students and staff and compilation of existing and future long-term performance data.

9. **NTEP should re-examine its university partnership and establish clear conditions for future agreements.** Conditions for any new university partnership should include: greater flexibility for NTEP content and structure to reflect Inuit culture and language; cost-efficiency; implementation of programs for middle and high school level teachers; as well as a graduate level program and increased services to be provided by the partner university. If the current agreement can not be renegotiated to accommodate these conditions, a new university partner should be sought through a tender process, beginning with requests for expression of interest.

Appendix I –List of Individuals Consulted

Name	Position
Nunavut Department of Education	
Peter Geikie	Assistant Deputy Minister
Phoebe Hainnu	Assistant Deputy Minister Adult Programs
Cathy McGregor	Director, School Services
Bruce Rigby	Special Advisor Adult Learning
Louise Flaherty	Policy Analyst
Nunavut Arctic College	
Malcolm Clendenning	President
Colleen Baker	Registrar-Nunatta Campus
Marcelo Parungao	Director of Finance-Nunatta Campus
Peesee Pitsiulak	Campus Director, Nunatta Campus
Mike Shouldice	Campus Director-Kivalliq Campus
Bob Leonard	Chair, Board of Governors
NTEP Staff	
Ooloota Maatiusi	Principal
Noel McDermott	Instructor/Acting Coordinator CTEP
Leigh Clark	Instructor NTEP
Neil Christopher	Instructor NTEP
Andrea Canady	Instructor NTEP
Saa Pitsiulak	Instructor NTEP
Sharmain Wagner	Instructor NTEP
Unions	
Leo Budgell	FNT
Doug Workman	President, NEU
McGill University	
Michael Doxtater	Director of OFNIE, McGill University
Susann Allnutt	Programs administrator, OFNIE

Name	Position
Inuit Organizations	
John Lamb	Chief Executive Officer, NTI
Terry Audla	Executive Director, Qikiqtani Inuit Association
Fred Elias/Ikey Evalik	Executive Director, Kitikmeot Inuit Association
William Logan	Executive Director, Kivalliq Inuit Association
Other Stakeholder Interviews	
Carol Horn	Teacher, Past Review Committee Member
Lena Metuq	Teacher, Panel of Experts
Regional School Operations Staff	
Trudy Pettigrew	Executive Director of School Operations, Qikiqtani
Bonnie Spence-Vinge	Executive Director of School Operations, Kivalliq
Millie Kuliktana	Executive Director of School Operations, Kitikmeot
Becky Kudloo	Kivalliq DEA Officer
Peggy Adjun	Kitikmeot DEA Officer
District Education Authority Chairs	
Kitikmeot DEA	
Simon Kuliktana	Kugluktuk
Rob Esser	Cambridge Bay
Ovide Alakannuavk	Kugaaruk
Iola Takolik	Taloyoak
Peggy Adjun	Kugluktuk
Kivalliq DEA	
Mano Nattar	Whale Cove
Dino Bruce	Coral Harbour
Simeon Kringuar	Baker Lake
Becky Kadlu	Baker Lake
Bernie Putulik	Chesterfield Inlet
South Baffin DEA	
Alan Rumble	Sanikiluaq
Gordon Saunders	Qikiqtarjuaq
Tomasie Nuqingaq	Qikiqtarjuaq
Mary Audlalkuk	Pond Inlet
Sarah Tautuarjuk	Pangnirtung
Donna Pinguaktuq	Cape Dorset
Ejesiak Peter	Cape Dorset

Name	Position
Andrew Tagak	Iqaluit
North Baffin DEA	
Jacob Jaypoody	Clyde River
Minnie Killiktee	Grise Fiord
Mary Audlaluk	Pond Inlet
Lucassie Ivalu	Iglulik
Jacopie Ikipiar	Hall Beach
Norman Simonie	Pond Inlet
13 Principals of Nunavut Schools	

Appendix II - List of Documents

Aajjiqatigiingniq: Language of Instruction Research Paper, A report to the Government of Nunavut by Ian Martin, December, 2000.

Aaqqigiarniq: An External Review of Nunavut Arctic College, Prepared for the Nunavut Department of Nunavut by Michael Rudolph, October, 2004.

Amittuq-Tununirusiq Community-Based Teacher-Training Program: A Proposal Submitted Jointly by the Eastern Arctic Teacher Education Program and the Baffin Divisional Board of Education. 1992.

Bilingual Education Strategy for Nunavut: 2004-2008, Nunavut Department of Education, Iqaluit, 2004.

Department of Education, Culture and Employment, GNWT. Teacher Training in the NWT, 1993.

Guidelines for Preparing Culturally Responsive Teachers for Alaska's Schools. Presented to the Assembly of Alaska Native Educators by the Alaska Native Knowledge Network 1999.

Inuuqatigiit: Curriculum Document, Education, Culture and Employment, August, 1996.

Lipka, Jerry, and Gerald Mohatt and the Ciulistet Group, Transforming the Culture of Schools: Yup'ik Eskimo Examples, LEA Publishers, New Jersey, 1998.

McGregor, Catherine. Reinventing Inuit Identity: Transforming the NETP. Unpublished paper, University of Alaska Fairbanks, 2002.

Noordhoff, Karen, and Judith Kleinfeld. Preparing Teachers for Multicultural Classrooms. Teaching and Teacher Education. Vol. 9. No. 1, pp. 27-39. 1993.

Nunavut Arctic College, Calendar of Courses, 2003-2005.

Nunavut Teacher Education Program, 1998-99 Funding Proposal for Community-Based Programs for July 1998 to March 31, 1999. Iqaluit, 1998.

NWT Teacher Education Strategy: Costs of Success – Status of the Goal. Guy, Barbara, Education, Culture and Employment, GNWT. 1997.

Proceedings and Recommendations from the Teacher Education Symposium: Iqaluit – June 7 & 8 1994, Arctic College document.

Purpose & Principles NTEP – 1997, NTEP document, Iqaluit.

Qulliq Quvvariarlugu: Policy Options for Bilingual Education in the Territory of Nunavut, A report to the Government of Nunavut by David Corson, November 2000.

Reddy, Strini. A Discussion Paper on Teacher Education in the Northwest Territories, GNWT Department of Education, November, 1991.

Strategy for Teacher Education in the NWT: Past Experiences and Future Directions, Education, Culture and Employment, GNWT. 1998.

Taylor, Gerald, Andrea Borys, and Linda LaRocque. Reforming Teacher Education: Toward an Alternative Model of Practicum. *International Journal of Educational Reform*, Volume 1, No. 4/October 1992.

Wolforth, John. Models of Community-Based Teacher Education. Draft Paper for CITEP, 1994.