The Inuit activist and Nobel Prize nominee Sheila Watt-Cloutier mentioned in her memoirs that the newly built school she had to attend at the age of six, in 1959, “was bigger than most buildings in town.” The town was New Fort Chimo, then a “tiny community” in Northern Quebec, now renamed Kuujjuaq and the administrative centre of the territory of Nunavik. Watt-Coutier’s account documents the rapid transformation of the Canadian Arctic (fig. 1) during the period covered in this article, a time in which schools were built, rebuilt, and expanded to answer the growing demographic needs of the region. The story of these schools is also that of the development of a modern Arctic, where in one generation “ancient traditions gave way to southern habits.” Built to educate, their design informs us about the intentions of the various stakeholders involved in their establishment, but also about their users, who lived “both in the ice age and the space age.”

The built environment of the Arctic is a subject that has barely been examined by architecture historians. Although the Arctic in general has received more published attention in recent years, the building types of the Far North remain, to quote Harold Kalman’s 1994 survey, “relatively understudied.” Moreover, this small body of scholarly literature (a shortage that may be due in part to the vast distances one needs to cover to actually see the buildings) fails to adequately represent the architectural diversity of the Arctic, which has undergone steady development since the Cold War. The irreversible process of
sedentarization, with its negative and positive consequences, has brought with it a proliferation of building types that have materialized the evolving intentions of the various government agencies operating in the region, from the assimilationist policies of the early post-war years to more recent approaches that aim to promote and integrate traditional knowledge. Among these building types, schools have held a privileged position in the architectural landscape of towns and settlements in the High North.6

In this paper, I consider school architecture in the Northwest Territories (NWT) and Nunavut through a selection of elementary and secondary schools planned by the federal, territorial, and Nunavut governments. The selected schools illustrate watershed moments in the history of education in the High North between 1950 and the early twenty-first century, across a geographic area extending from Inuvik to Iqaluit. The first part of this period overlaps with the last decades of operation of the residential schools, which were officially abolished in the 1990s. Although not directly covered here, the residential school system forms a backdrop to the developments in school design that are the subject of this paper.7

A consideration of the spatial programming of schools in the Inuit territories calls for the simultaneous analysis of three fields: education, architecture, and environment. The education policy in the North has been subject to continuous renewal, influenced by shifts in broader pedagogical and societal concerns. The area’s architecture and environment, meanwhile, have evolved in response to developments in construction methods, architectural forms, technology, and the climate. Imposed by the government as successors to the residential schools, the Arctic’s non-denominational day schools constitute a body of examples whose programming and construction (under extreme physical conditions) reflect both the educational trends and the socio-political and environmental changes that have marked the decades since the 1950s. This paper intends to show how schools in this region, evolving from models parachuted into the High North by Ottawa to more recent projects developed through ever-greater collaboration with the communities, have become better learning environments for students, teachers, and Elders who are their primary users. To situate this transition, I begin with a brief survey of the postwar architectural landscape of the region and trends in school design. A summary of the federal education policy in Northern communities follows, accompanied by a comparative analysis of two schools built under the supervision of the federal departments of Northern Affairs and Natural Resources (NANR) and Public Works. I then consider two schools designed under the NWT Department of Public Works, and conclude with a school planned after the creation of Nunavut. As with the federal schools, I examine changes in the education policy, which were influenced by the various movements for self-determination in northern native communities, and the impact of these changes on school design.8

The Canadian Arctic was long ignored by the federal government. The Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP), Canada’s national police force, maintained only a few scattered posts in the region, housed in semi-permanent structures.9 It was thus mostly the religious orders—Anglican, Protestant, and Roman Catholic—and the Hudson’s Bay Company that ventured to establish a field presence in this “hostile” region, the former to convert local populations, and the latter to engage in the profitable fur trade. It was not until after the Second World War, with the intensification of the Cold War, that the federal government began to modernize and militarize this vast area. Perceived as a strategic zone, the Arctic became a test bench for the deployment of new defence technologies and the building of modernist urban models. The intense militarization of the High Arctic began with the construction of the Distant Early Warning (DEW) Line, the Canadian segment of which spanned the distance between Inuvik, a newly established town, and Frobisher Bay (now Iqaluit), a small hamlet that was considerably transformed by the construction of an American air force base in the 1940s and by federal interventions from the 1950s on. This modernization and militarization of the Northwest Territories introduced a first wave of urbanization to the Arctic.

In the decades following the war, education reforms (which had already been percolating between the world wars) resulted in significant changes to school design, with modernist architects proposing innovations that remain in use today.10 Functionalism provided the spatial flexibility that the postwar
curriculum required, while the combination of technological advances and a pro-industrial modernist ideology allowed architects to erect educational buildings rapidly and cost-efficiently. The new one- and two-storey structures generally had angular forms, with clean lines, a flat roof, and an asymmetrical plan. In the Canadian Arctic, the impact of post-war education reforms on school design was felt as early as the mid-1950s, when the federal government established its program of Aboriginal education in the North.

Prior to the 1950s, the few representatives of the Canadian government to be even remotely involved with the populations of the Arctic saw Inuit as “destined to remain collectively insulated from the modern world.”11 State-organized schooling was considered at best an unnecessary expenditure, and at worst a threat to Inuit self-sufficiency.”12 The government saw no reason to establish education programs geared to helping Native communities adapt to the changes affecting their way of life; their schooling was seen as a “means to help Inuit become more efficient fur traders.”13 This double discursive framework of saving money and protecting the Inuit gave way, in the late 1940s, to a new discourse of facilitating
Inuit modernization. Rather than “keeping the native native,” 14 state-organized schools were to prepare students for the changes that would inevitably result from the introduction of a Euro-Canadian economy—or rather, as expressed in the official documents of the time, to prepare them to cope with the “advance of civilization.” Future generations of Inuit were thus “positioned as collectively in need of education,” 15 although there still remained an understanding that the government would support “the ability of Inuit to continue to live as hunters and trappers.” 16 It was not until the mid-1950s that the government displayed a clear shift in its discourse on Inuit peoples, education, and modernity. The transition came with the announcement by Jean Lesage, the federal minister of Northern Affairs and Natural Resources, of a new education policy intended to equip Inuit to access employment opportunities in a market economy. Lesage (who would later, as premier of Québec, play an instrumental role in the Quiet Revolution and support the Parent Report recommendations for a non-denominational school system) launched the construction of a network of federal schools in the High Arctic in 1955. This ambitious endeavour, which was based on a secularization of the curricula, proved difficult to implement, as the leading church organizations were reluctant to give up their educational prerogatives. The reform was thus introduced gradually, with the result that two distinct building types were constructed: the schools themselves, now under secular authority, and residential hostels managed by the religious orders. Next came the adoption of new school curricula, which, as noted by education sociologist Yves Lenoir, were heavily influenced by “professionalizing” 17 or vocationalist orientations that originated in the United States.

SIR ALEXANDER MACKENZIE SCHOOL: A NEW SCHOOL FOR A NEW TOWN

The first federal school under consideration in this paper, Sir Alexander Mackenzie School (demolished), opened its doors in the new town of Inuvik (fig. 2), a planned community built under the direction of two federal ministries, the Department of Northern Affairs and Natural Resources, and the Department of Public Works. 18 During this “colonial period,” which Heather E. McGregor situates between 1945 and 1970, the federal government 19 did not so much adapt as transpose to the North solutions and plans that were originally conceived for the South. Their implementation in the High Arctic also reflected a desire to dominate nature and orient—if not determine—the future of local populations, with a view to enabling their participation in the market economy. The construction of Inuvik was considered a tour de force for the administrators of the day. The city was intended to replace Aklavik 20 as the new administrative centre for the Mackenzie River Delta. To some, it was proof that the “Canadians can build at least as well as the Russians under Arctic handicaps.” 21 To others, it was the embodiment of lofty ideals, as reflected by the evangelical tone of the town’s commemorative plaque: “This was the first community north of the Arctic Circle built to provide the standard facilities of a Canadian town. It was designed...
not only as a base for development and administration but as a centre to bring education, medical care, and new opportunity to the people of the Western Arctic."  

As in the case of any colonial project of territorial occupation, certain decisions may well have been shaped by the specific context, but the overall vision was the product of a social order foreign to the local ecology. Inuvik was no exception to the rule. The initial plan, a small-scale model of a generic suburb, integrated the canonical zones of urban modernism: residential, commercial, industrial, and public (school, hospital, mission hospitals). It included recreational spaces with green zones, as well as winding roads and cul-de-sacs—features typical of the layout of most postwar, car-dependent suburban communities. There was at least one notable difference, however: the integration of a “utilidor” system, a network of aboveground utility conduits providing water and sewage disposal to the buildings connected to it. Notably, the system did not extend throughout the community. Contrary to the stated aspirations of its planners, the new town of Inuvik (fig. 3) developed along segregated lines, with two distinct residential areas: one benefiting from the utilidors and the other not. The former housed the transient Qallunaat (White people), and the latter the local population that had been either displaced from Aklavik or drawn to the new town by the prospect of better living conditions.  

A school zone located near the centre included Inuvik's first educational...
building, the federal school (designed by two Edmonton firms, Rule, Wynn and Rule and Rensaa and Minso), as well as two residential hostels administered by the Anglican and Roman Catholic orders. Like the school's design, which was foreign to the genius loci, its curricula and teaching methods failed to take account of Inuit culture and the Arctic way of life. They did, however, reflect postwar education reforms that had been endorsed by the Arctic's administrators in Ottawa. The education system thus established was standardized across the then Northwest Territories, but placed under the oversight of civil servants with no pedagogical expertise. In principle, the Inuvik federal school (later named Sir Alexander Mackenzie School, SAMS) was intended to prepare Inuit and Aboriginal pupils to enter the “modern” world through the teaching of societal values and practical skills. It did so in English only, and in a physical environment that imposed its own form of imported discipline. Opportunities for experiential learning, to use today’s jargon, were not provided in the curriculum, although it seems that the civil servants acknowledged the need for extracurricular activities such as muskrat trapping, which had “proven conclusively to be an important part of Arctic school activities.” But these were little more than token gestures, meant to “keep kids happy,” as the unidentified author of a report mentioned in a handwritten comment.

The school (fig. 4) was planned as a mixed institution serving Qallunaat, Metis, Dene, and Inuit students. Indeed, ethnic integration was among the progressive aspects of the education program introduced by Jean Lesage, although it could, of course, only be implemented in places with a mixed population. However, this inclusive approach did not extend to religious affiliation, hence the school's
two distinct wings—one for Anglican students, the other for Roman Catholic students. These were connected by the central pavilion, with its shared entrance hall. SAMS followed the Alberta school curriculum and the standard system of grade levels, from 1 through 9. In addition to its academic and pre-vocational programs, it provided preparatory classes for students not proficient in English, and opportunity classes for older children and young adults.28

The Inuvik school exemplifies the continued reticence of some architectural firms—and their clients—with regard to functionalism. While the construction industry now allowed for more flexible and streamlined structures, it was not unusual for clients and architects to opt instead for conventional architectural forms expressive of their attachment to the past. With its triangular pediment and monumental double staircase (probably intended to accommodate its two distinct groups of students), the building reinforced the authoritarian nature of the institution.

An aerial photograph of the town of Inuvik (fig. 5) taken in 1961 reveals its architectural homogeneity, which was likely due to the use of prefabricated construction materials and the need to build a new town in record time, employing a functionalist approach. Both the federal school and the hostels have forms, siding, and gabled roofs similar to those of the town’s family homes and apartment blocks, and of several buildings in the commercial zone. The functionalist approach, which was based on a needs analysis, enabled the rational and standardized organization of the social aspects of the new town. However, Claude Bergeron noted concerning the evolution of Canadian schools during that period that the application of functionalism in
the design of educational institutions also encouraged a redefinition of school itself, inspired by “new pedagogical concerns, such as the value of physical education, sanitary conditions, lighting, safety, manual work, a freer model of education, and both individual and group work.”

Whatever the architects’ intentions with regard to the school’s exterior, its interior layout reflected trends in postwar education reform.

The configuration of the federal school corresponded to one of the most fundamental school building forms: that of the “centralized resources with double-loaded classrooms wings” model, as classified by Bradford Perkins, author of several architectural handbooks. Built on piles because of the permafrost, its three wings housed spaces dedicated to administration, classroom education, and sports activities. Varying in size, these spaces all benefited from abundant natural light, provided by the continuous fenestration on all facades and clerestory windows in the two-storey gymnasium-auditorium (fig. 6). The distribution of the facilities was based on the relationship between the school’s educational and administrative activities, and as a function of its confessional division. Shared resources were centralized in the middle wing. As in many secondary schools of the time, one could access the auditorium-gymnasium, which also doubled as a community hall, without using the corridors leading to the classrooms. Beyond that perimeter, a central corridor was flanked by classrooms in the school’s two side wings, each serving one of the school’s religious communities: Roman Catholic students were taught in the shorter west wing, Anglican students in the longer east wing. The same organization was repeated on the second floor, with a science classroom located at the junction of the two wings. On the first floor, each of the wings contained “one pair of classrooms separated by partition walls, which could be opened to provide a room for small assemblies.”

Other modern facilities like washrooms and showers were located in all three wings. The classrooms were furnished with movable individual desks, a definite improvement over the previous long rows of fixed desks, which emphasized order and the teacher’s authority. As in the photographs of classrooms in Inuvik and Chesterfield Inlet (figs. 7-8), the latter being another federal school built around the same time, the classroom furniture could be rearranged, despite the seats being attached to the desks. Although such standardized furniture still imposed a certain physical discipline, it implied a more child-centred classroom, unlike the earlier pre-war model. While the building was not avant-garde, compared to functionalist models built in the South around the same time, that new federal school proved sufficiently flexible to enable different types of gatherings and activities, themselves representative of the latest educational approaches in use in the South. Unfortunately for Inuit generations to come, that alignment between curriculum and architecture had a limited reach. As Robert Carney writes, “the successive northern strategies and the vocational programs they elicited became increasingly beyond the grasp of those responsible for Inuit instruction, and as a consequence, beyond the grasp of the Inuit themselves.”

Those who would benefit most from the federal school system would be the transient White people temporarily settled in the Arctic in search for work.

NAKASUK: A FUTURISTIC, OPEN-AREA SCHOOL DESIGNED FOR THE MOON

Fast forward ten years, and it would appear that change had come at the speed of light, given this artist’s sketch for Nakasuk Elementary School (figs. 9 and 13) in Frobisher Bay on the east coast of Baffin Island (now Iqaluit). Like the Gordon Robertson Education Centre (GREC, now Inuksuk High School) (fig. 10), a comprehensive school whose architecture marked a radical departure from traditional construction methods, Nakasuk was conceived as a spaceship-like shell made of fibreglass. The two buildings, designed by Papineau, Gérin-Lajoie, Leblanc, Edwards from Montreal, were the subject of numerous articles in Canadian and international publications. How could these futuristic structures—praised as well-adapted to the lunar landscape of the Arctic, thanks to their modular panel assembly, white colour, and sobriety—have been approved? We need to go back to the 1940s and 1950s to understand the context that led to the adoption of this high-tech architecture, a prime example of top-down design imposed by Ottawa.

The city of Frobisher Bay lies on an inlet that, prior to the Second World War, was part of “an extensive network of hunting and trapping, anchored by seasonal and permanent camps.” The area was transformed by successive phases of construction that began with the establishment of a United States Army Air Forces (USAAF) airfield, Crystal Two, during WWII. Frobisher Bay gained in strategic importance with the advent of the Cold War, becoming a construction hub for the eastern section of the DEW Line communication system. As noted by Matthew Farish and P. Whitney Lackenbaeur, “Frobisher Bay was becoming a target on the multiple maps of the North American military modernization.”

Frobisher Bay was not a new town, strictly speaking. It was first and foremost a military base with high-performance service buildings, as well as dwellings carefully constructed to assure the comfort of
USAIF personnel. A first wave of Inuit workers, for whom no lodging had been foreseen, settled near the base, building makeshift housing from construction scraps left behind by the Americans. Scandalized by the lack of hygiene in these camps, the NANT decided to intervene by creating a new suburb, Apex Hill, only five kilometres from Frobisher Bay. It would become the site of the first day school serving this growing agglomeration. “As the home of most Inuit NANT employees, along with a number of ‘Eurocanadians,’ Apex Hill was understood to represent the future of Frobisher—a symbol of its transition to modernity.” In fact, Apex Hill nevertheless remained a satellite hamlet without a future, falling outside the scope of Ottawa’s priorities, which instead were to modernize the village of Iqaluit, next to the military base. The influx of Inuit to Iqaluit had resulted in overcrowding, which was considered to “[be a threat to] the health of all who lived there.”

If Frobisher Bay was to become the administrative centre of the Eastern Arctic, as Iqaluit had in the western region, something had to be done. The matter became more urgent when the Department of Transport (DoT) took over the management of Crystal Two in 1957. The southern experts nourished great hopes, and dreamed of transforming Frobisher Bay into an Alexandria of the North, perceived as being at “a new ‘crossroad of the world.’”

The ambitious project proposed in the late 1950s by the DoT and NANT was worthy of science fiction, with touches of Le Corbusier’s Radiant City (minus the automobiles) and Buckminster Fuller’s dome (fig. 11). Experts from the two federal departments proposed the construction of a group of apartment towers connected to a central dome, with heating and power provided by an atomic power plant—in short, an entire town sheltered from the elements, offering pleasant year-round living conditions. It was believed that such a structure would attract immigrants to come work in the region’s mines and help develop the local economy. Frobisher Bay would become an attractive modern city, designed to “overcome the hostility of a northern environment and catapult native northerners into conditions of modern living.”

Like the Soviets, who had undertaken to urbanize Siberia, Canada hoped in this way to continue colonizing the High Arctic, believing it had the means to do so. Although government officials were well aware that such plans could not get off the drawing board without substantial investment, they nonetheless enthusiastically promoted them. As for expert endorsement for this Qallunaat utopia, it was based on experience acquired through the construction of the DEW Line stations and a general confidence in new technologies. In its second special issue on the North, The Canadian Architect, a recently established industry publication that was itself an offshoot of this booming construction era, presented a celebratory feature on the project. A subsequent article in The Globe and Mail reinforced the belief that a new era was dawning in the Arctic. But the new era never materialized. As Rhodri Windsor-Liscombe wrote in his assessment of the federal proposal, “[t]he basic problems of transportation costs of volatile economic activity aborted the Frobisher Bay new town.” Today, the only surviving evidence of this utopian vision are the “modest incremental” contributions of the architectural firm Papineau, Gérin-Lajoie, Leblanc, Edwards, which took the form of “high-tech modular steel and fibreglass-reinforced plastic panelled” schools.

In the wake of Expo 67, Guy Gérin-Lajoie obtained a first contract to build an expansion for a federal day school in Pangnirtung. On his initial trips to the region, this architect from the South found the buildings he encountered to be poorly adapted to their environment. The only elements distinguishing them were their triple-glazed windows and “extra insulation.” The extension added to the school in Pangnirtung, built using “traditional wood and aluminum techniques,” convinced the architect of the need to address the question of building in the High North from a new angle. The “use of a new fibreglass-derived technology” would allow him to do so. Gérin-Lajoie’s intentions are well documented, thanks to the promotional articles and talks he devoted to his invention. He approached the challenges of the region with the enthusiasm of an inventor and the mindset of an industrial designer, at a time when the field of plastic manufacturing was making major strides. The climate was his primary design parameter, and it dictated the use of simple shapes, minimal overhangs, and limited glazing areas. Based on his observations of aircraft made of composite materials and their reactions to significant temperature changes, the architect, with the help of the scientific laboratories of the Public Works Department, developed a construction system based on fibreglass-reinforced polyester prefabricated panels. After a number of tries, modular panels were prefabricated and transported by boat to be mounted on the metal framework of the two schools in Frobisher Bay. Glazing was limited to just a few round windows that were integrated into the panels and triple-sealed for thermal insulation (fig. 12).

According to a publication of the time, that high-tech architecture was well “accepted by the Eskimo population.” The unnamed author (who may well have been inspired by the press release provided by Papineau, Gérin-Lajoie, Leblanc, Edwards) also suggested that the fibreglass used in the project was
Arctic is so unlike any other building situation and the requirements of construction are so unique that none of the physical solutions available in the South could be used. Design solutions had to be totally unique in planning, building forms and physical construction.\textsuperscript{54}

Nakasuk Elementary School (fig. 14) corresponds to the “centralized resources with classroom clustering”\textsuperscript{55} model in Perkins’ classification system. The classrooms are located on the perimeter of the hexagonal plan, around a central corridor. The administrative areas are clustered near the entrance. The gym, which has its own entrance, occupies one entire section of the hexagon. This capsule-like school also has features that reflect progressive trends in school reform of the 1960s. The open education movement, which originated in the United States, advocated for schools without walls, where students would gather in small groups in open-plan classrooms (fig. 15). Taking down walls and providing a more flexible environment, they believed, would promote a more democratic and less intimidating teaching style, supporting students in their individual growth and development. In the context of the political empowerment of previously marginalized groups, the egalitarian aspirations of a school without walls were appealing. And the approach may indeed, in theory at least, have addressed the concerns of Inuit communities at a time when they were beginning to assert their rights. But reality proved otherwise, and the concept of open-plan schools was soon abandoned. Ultimately, the architecture of these schools made demands on users that proved too radical. It was assumed, for instance, that teachers working closer to their students would not have to speak loudly any more to be heard; they would thus be perceived as mentors rather than authority figures. Likewise, it was thought that the background noise applied in the construction of schools, a scientific research laboratory (Igloolik), and the Iqaluit airport, were supported by the assumption, shared at the time by the federal Public Works teams, “that the
created by the ventilation system (and air conditioning!) would dampen sound, as would the carpeting—which, moreover, would provide a softer surface for students to sit on, alone or in small groups. Students would be free to move around, thanks to movable furnishings. Features such as these were intended to accommodate the various types of learners. But none of the program’s aims could be achieved without the adoption of a suitable curriculum. It also depended on the full support of teachers—who, in the Arctic, have tended to come and go like revolving doors. Alignment between the built environment and the curriculum was essential, and the absence of such coordination produced a wave of resentment, in the North as elsewhere, leading to a general abandonment of open-plan schools by the mid-1970s. As noted by architecture historian Margaret Hodge, “there is little evidence that the open school plan was successful in connection with new pedagogical goals.” Critics did not mince their words, as in the following excerpt from a report by the Canadian Education Association: “Open-plan classrooms were intended not so much to improve learning as to glorify the ‘progressive’ attitude of school administrators, educators, architects, and all others favouring this type of school facility.” Unfortunately, those who suffered most from the lack of alignment between these progressive concepts and the built environment were the users, who were not consulted in the planning process. In the words of the staff at Nakusuk:

The acoustics of the building are such that even in the smallest classrooms, communication between teachers and students is difficult; the quietest sounds echo and are magnified. The effect is rather like working in a drum. The existing classrooms are too small and confined for the present class sizes. The peculiar shape makes them very inflexible for various programs and activities. The lack of windows in the building necessitates use of artificial lighting which presents an overall cheerless and sterile effect.

Nakasuk was among the last schools to have been imposed from the top down by Ottawa, without the involvement of local communities in the design process. Change came in the 1970s, when jurisdiction over education was transferred to the government of the Northwest Territories. Although modifications were slow to come to the administrative structure, the integration of Inuit language and culture in the school environment became a priority from the time of the transfer. As well, architects began to work more closely with local communities, as in the case of Maani Ulujuk, an elementary and junior high school in Rankin Inlet.

MAANI ULUJUK: “LEARNING SHOULD BE FUN”

Rankin Inlet, or Kangiqiniq (“deep inlet”) in Inuktitut, is the only settlement in Nunavut to have been founded by a mining company, the North Rankin Nickel Mine. Prospectors discovered nickel and copper deposits in the area in 1928, but
mining only became economically viable in the early 1950s, when the Korean War triggered a rise in world nickel prices. The extraction of this non-renewable resource covered a period of only five years, from 1957 to 1962. Attracted by job opportunities, a number of Inuit settled in the village. Like many other Canadian mining towns, Rankin Inlet saw its built environment evolve incrementally as a function of the needs of the mining company. The closing of the mine plunged the community into an economic quagmire, from which it would only recover through federal and then territorial intervention. Arising from its ashes, the mining town became a small, tertiary agglomeration in the 1970s, when the territorial government made it the site of an administrative centre for the region of Keewatin (Kivalliq). A first school, built in the 1960s and extended in 1973, was completely destroyed by fire in 1978. The need to rebuild was thus urgent. This time, the community became actively involved in the planning process. Immediately after the school’s destruction, a committee was established, comprised of members of the community, school staff, and employees from all levels of the territorial government. Project managers, now more likely to adopt a participatory approach, could also look back and learn from past mistakes, sidestepping solutions that had proven inadequate.

The resulting program outline, prepared by the NWT Department of Education, provided the architect with a list of requirements and the following design philosophy statement: “The building design should convey to the community, students and staff that—‘Learning Should Be Fun.’ A sterile and institutionalized building is not desired. The architects are to be given considerable leeway in design within fiscal restraints, to accomplish this goal.”

Appointed by the firm Boigon and Armstrong Architects, Clive Clark went on site in 1979, set up a makeshift office, and launched a month-long consultation process, during which he met informally with all stakeholders—from the school principal to the nurse, and from students to parents and Elders. The firm also distributed a bilingual newsletter in Inuktituk and English to keep the community informed of project developments. Clark today acknowledges the limitations of the consultation process. However, he also notes that this visit to the Arctic allowed him not only to become familiar with the living conditions there, but also to “provide solutions for unresolved problems” in the standard building programs established by the Departments of Education and Public Works of the Northwest Territories.

Generally speaking, the room types are hardly distinguishable from those of a standard elementary school, but the activities described in the brief reflect the significant changes that the educational program had recently undergone. In the 1970s, a watershed period in which Inuit communities increasingly asserted their right to self-government, advocacy groups grew more insistent about the need for an educational model that would be more inclusive and respectful of their ancestral traditions. An official policy endorsed by the NWT government in 1972 required that schools teach children in their traditional language between kindergarten and Grade 3. Another new element in the curriculum was the “land-based program,” a cultural inclusion program that encouraged the participation of Elders in school-based education through the

FIG. 22. AQSAARNIT MIDDLE SCHOOL, GROUND FLOOR PLAN, 2000. | PSAV ARCHITECTS.
introduction of more culturally appropriate activities. Instead of taking appliance repair classes, students could learn how to build komatiks (wood sleds) and other hunting and fishing tools, service snowmobiles, or carry out basic construction tasks more appropriate to their needs. And, in addition to standardized workshops, students could now tan hides or butcher game within the walls of the school, in a purpose-designed skin preparation room.

Clark decided to place the gymnasium and stage in the centre of the building (figs. 17-18). As set out in the specifications, the gymnasium can be directly accessed through the senior students’ entrance. The architect was sensitized to the issue of bronchitis among young Inuit by the nurse, who recommended the inclusion of a space allowing students to run during the long winter months. Inspired by his own experience at Jarvis Collegiate Institute in Toronto, Clark included a corridor (fig. 19) that could serve as both a track for runners and a viewing gallery for spectators. The corridor was specially designed to reduce the noise of the runners.

As requested by the committee, the Adult Education Centre and Community Library were moved to the school in “order to encourage more community participation in the school facility.” Clark grouped all community-shared facilities in a section directly accessible from the junior students’ entrance (fig. 20). He connected this section to a lobby, lit by four skylights, that serves as an intergenerational gathering place. Display cases were added to the hall in response to the community’s request for “a safe place to exhibit historical artifacts and art works.” Also located near this public section of the
school is the kindergarten, with its own separate entrance. The senior students have a separate entrance as well, with a staircase leading to their main classrooms on the second floor. This circulation scheme is consistent with recent school design models that are “based on the respective ages of the student population.”

Unlike the other schools analyzed here, Maani Ulujuk does not have its administrative offices near the entrance. Their placement in a less strategic area distinguishes the school from traditional models, where institutional surveillance begins before students have even crossed the threshold into the building (in urban schools especially, administrative offices are typically located by the entrance). Maani Ulujuk’s lobby serves as the heart of the school—a place where all users can mingle. In an interview, Clark said that the parents welcomed the idea of the lobby, which helped position them as stakeholders in their children’s education.

Clark noted during his consultations that the parents still felt a deep mistrust of the school system, a result of the scars caused by years of acculturation and of inappropriate curricula that alienated children from their parents. While Maani Ulujuk would not be able to eradicate these memories, the friendly design of this section of the school opened the way to practices more respectful of Inuit culture, in which children learn by observing adults.

AQSARNIIT: A MIXED SCHOOL IN AN URBAN SETTING

The last school considered here, Aqsarniit Middle School (fig. 21), was constructed in 2000 and expanded in 2007. The fourth school to be built in Iqaluit since the late 1960s, it was planned at a time of rapid growth for the town, which was preparing to become the capital of Nunavut, Canada’s newest territory, established in 1999. With a population of five thousand in 2001 (following a demographic increase of forty-seven percent over ten years), the built environment of Iqaluit was undergoing considerable change, as was the rest of Nunavut society. The region was taking on significant identifying characteristics, as explained by anthropologists Frédéric Laugrand and Jarich Oosten: “In Nunavut, a major change came in 2000 with the progressive introduction of a new concept, Inuit qaujimajatuqangit (‘knowledge that is still relevant’), whose primacy has since been reaffirmed in all official documents of the new government.” The initial definition formulated on the eve of the creation of Nunavut presented the concept as encompassing “all aspects of traditional Inuit culture including values, world-view, language, social organization, knowledge, life skills, perceptions, and expectations.” Iqaluit was no longer a town under the control of a
distant government. It had become “the epicentre of Inuit power and authority,”\(^76\) attracting more Qallunaat than ever before. As the demographics of the town became more multicultural, so did those of the schools.\(^77\)

Built by the Yellowknife-based firm PSAV, Aqsarniit\(^78\) features a layout (fig. 22) that does not include spaces specifically designated for the teaching of a traditional culture program. This does not, however, exclude the adoption of a school program based on traditional knowledge: given the experiential nature of certain traditional activities, these are more likely to be carried out in nature, far from the city. Although the original Aqsarniit does not have an intimidating entrance in the manner of Sir Arthur Mackenzie School, its layout does imply certain forms of control typically observed in school architecture. Fairly conventional in design, the school has its administrative offices near the main entrance, with windows enabling administrators to monitor students as they come and go. The plan features regular classrooms and special-use rooms (science and computer labs), located in the perimeter of the building, and a gymnasium in a separate wing. Like Maani Ulujuk, Aqsarniit (fig. 23), has a central hall that is generously lit by clerestory windows. The school has no spaces specifically allocated to adult education and the Elders, which is understandable in the context of Iqaluit, where such facilities are provided through other resource and community centres.

Consultations during the planning of the first building involved only the school staff.\(^79\) The 2007 addition (figs. 23-26), however, was developed through closer collaboration with the various stakeholders, including the Elders. The resulting two-storey building comprises three pavilions and a separate entrance in the section connecting it to the original school. Like in the first building, the administrative offices of the middle school are near the entrance.

The central section has a spacious corridor (fig. 27) with benches that allow users to congregate informally, and bay windows that connect them with the outdoors. The corridor is no longer a simple, linear space through which students circulate in single file. As described by the architect, it was planned “for socializing in the sun during the winter.”\(^80\) It is also a learning path, capable of facilitating knowledge acquisition outside the box of the traditional classroom. The rotunda, a space designed for “traditional learning” according to the plans, was requested by the local communities. Its shape, reminiscent of an igloo, evokes the consensus-based decision-making process in Inuit culture. Although the design of Aqsarniit’s new wing offers an example of the positive outcomes of closer collaboration between users and experts, it would be illusory to believe that layout alone can resolve the issues confronted by schools in Arctic communities, such as high dropout rates. Still, one can hope that schools like Aqsarniit will nurture a feeling of belonging, helping to counteract outside factors that cause students to become disengaged from learning.

IN LIEU OF A CONCLUSION TO THIS WORK IN PROGRESS

This initial foray into the school architecture of the Canadian Arctic offers only a broad overview of a little-known aspect of the education of Inuit and Aboriginal peoples. Thanks to the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC), we have a better understanding today of the failures and abuses of the residential school system, which, as described by the Commission’s report, was anchored in a “policy of cultural genocide.”\(^81\) The walls of the federal schools in the Arctic did not witness the worst abuses of this dark chapter in our history.\(^82\) Although the first school buildings imposed by Ottawa were intended to propagate educational principles favouring Inuit assimilation, their design was also influenced by the progressive trends that were emerging in North American education at the time—albeit with little regard for context. Today, the models imposed by Ottawa have made
way for school buildings that integrate the principles of more recent curriculum initiatives, themselves an expression of the quest for self-determination on the part of Arctic communities. Gone are the authoritarian tendencies of the religious orders, which lingered on in the federal schools. Gone, too, are the models of the 1970s, whose advocates believed that a high-tech approach and the latest pedagogical trends could solve all the problems of modern teaching. Lessons have been—and continue to be—learned by all parties involved.
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