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The EAPRO LESC Initiative was a component of UNICEF’s Learning for Peace, Peacebuilding, Education and Advocacy (PBEA) Programme, a four-year global initiative (2012–2015/16), funded by the Government of the Netherlands and designed to strengthen resilience, social cohesion and human security, to encourage practical interventions to alleviate conflict and advance peace through the education sector, as well as to support research into conflict analysis and information about education and peacebuilding. The overall vision of PBEA is to strengthen policy and resilience in society, to foster social cohesion and human security in countries at risk of conflict, experiencing conflict or recovering from conflict.

The research and activities of the LESC Initiative, designed and implemented by Prof. Joseph Lo Bianco, of the University of Melbourne with the support of the Myanmar Country Office of UNICEF and three country-wide partners, the Pyoe Pin programme of the British Council, the Nyein (Shalom) Foundation and the Thabyay Education Foundation, alongside a large number of local education, civil society and culture and language associations across states and districts, examined the role of language policy and planning in education reform and peacebuilding. The key approach was participatory action research, a method of working which makes use of deliberative processes to foster a culture of dialogue to help solve problems in education.

At the heart of Myanmar society is a very complex sociolinguistic profile, comprising more than approximately 135 spoken languages (Bradley 2015), along with sign languages, dialects and foreign languages (Bradley 1997; Lewis, Simons, and Fennig 2013). The nature of cross-language bilingualism/multilingualism, and knowledge of foreign languages, knowledge of and use of ‘proximal’ languages (Chinese and Indian languages), are distributed in a highly variable pattern following the urban/rural divide and shaped by education levels, occupation and mobility. As part of a general national reform agenda whose principal aim is to raise economic and social development, Myanmar has embarked on a Comprehensive Education Sector Review (CESR) to transform its education system.

An overarching objective of the LESC Initiative has been to foster a coordinated and comprehensive, evidence-based approach to tackling problems in languages education, some of which have been controversial for decades. This has involved early childhood education, primary schooling and post-primary education, all cognisant of the sociolinguistic and ethnic diversity of Myanmar’s population and its diverse ethno-linguistic groupings. The LESC activities have utilized concrete methods of language planning to support multilingual education in ethnic minority languages, in Myanmar (also known as Burmese) and in strategic foreign languages.

The findings and proposals arising from the LESC Initiative in Myanmar have been informed by rich, participatory research and fieldwork activities. These include a large number of bilateral meetings and
focus groups, interviews, consultations and Facilitated Dialogues with many hundreds of individuals belonging to over 150 organizations, institutions and governmental departments across the country (see Appendix 2 for a listing of many of the participating organizations).

The above process represents a complex, multi-layered and long-term process of action-situated research, whose aim has not been restricted to generation of knowledge, but has extended to supporting local people and agencies in their reform agenda promoting peaceful coexistence after many decades of continual conflict. This has required engaging a range of mechanisms and concepts that more broadly inform and shape the research procedures being undertaken, for example, field testing the viability and feasibility of likely recommendations before proposing them. In conceptualizing this range of collaborative and participatory activities the chief researcher has drawn on a range of language planning and policy concepts, itemized below and discussed throughout this report:

i. Language status planning (supporting local actors)
ii. Identifying language problems and seeking solutions (in research or dialogue)
iii. Training in language planning
iv. Public education on contentious issues
v. Mitigating conflict (through Facilitated Dialogues and mediation)
vi. Writing guidelines and developing theory and understanding
vii. Document analysis

This report provides an overview of the LESC Initiative in Myanmar, with a special focus on Mon state. An extended discussion and analysis of the overall work of the LESC Initiative in Malaysia, Myanmar and Thailand is available in a separate publication: Lo Bianco (2015) Synthesis Report Language, Education and Social Cohesion (LESC) Initiative in Malaysia Myanmar and Thailand, UNICEF, EAPRO, Bangkok, Thailand.

1.1 LESC activities: Facilitated Dialogues

The essential aim of ‘Facilitated’ Dialogues is to support groups debating, or contesting social issues to canvas policy alternatives, especially when these are the cause of conflict, tension or policy paralysis. Facilitated Dialogues have been developed in accordance with approaches to decision-making that are influenced by ‘deliberative democracy’, which stresses the process of decision-making as much as the final result. These are part of a surge in thinking about the limits of policymaking as it has been practiced for many years in which policy is left exclusively to public officials or technical experts without involvement from key community stakeholders. Four Facilitated Dialogues were conducted for the Myanmar LESC Initiative, in Mae Sot (Thailand), Mawlamyine (two Facilitated Dialogues), and Naypyidaw. These dialogues were designed and facilitated by Prof. Lo Bianco and have led to a major extension of the LESC Initiative in Myanmar, when from late 2014 the UNICEF Myanmar office commissioned him to lead the preparation of a ‘peace promoting national language policy’.

1.1.1 Language Policy Forum, Eastern Burma Community Schools. Mae Sot, Thailand, 12–14 February 2014

The Mae Sot Facilitated Dialogue was attended by 68 representatives from 22 organizations representing
12 different ethnic groups. The participants explored a range of fundamental challenges, including what communities envisioned for the educational and economic future for their children, their languages and their culture, and their participation in Myanmar society. The Dialogue was conducted in six languages and was highly innovative in its methods and successful in its outcomes (Michaels 2014).

Many significant achievements emerged from the Mae Sot Facilitated Dialogue, beginning with the issuing of A Declaration of Ethnic Language and Education, drafted during the gathering, accompanied by a press release issued shortly after the meeting, declaring the launch of a new organization, the Myanmar/Burma Indigenous Network for Education (MINE). The press release introduced MINE as an advocacy and action group for indigenous communities, and described its mission and petitions on behalf of Myanmar’s many indigenous groups.

Some months later, building on the sense of agency fostered during the Dialogue and the skills and knowledge of language planning and policy mechanisms they acquired, MINE members released a bilingual English/Myanmar document, Ethnic Languages and Education Declaration, on 15 June 2014. The document “describes the current situation of schooling for Indigenous children and youth in remote, ethnic nationality areas of Myanmar/Burma and then sets out a framework of recommended actions to be taken” (Appendix 5, p. 2).

A long-term working plan based on ongoing language planning and policy work and regular meetings was also developed and released, focusing on advocacy for mother tongue education; multilingual education; decentralization of educational decisions; intercultural education; policy decision-making and participation; and all inclusive education.

1.1.2 Language, Education and Social Cohesion Facilitated Dialogue. Mawlamyine, Mon State, Myanmar, 27–28 May 2014 (36 participants)

The Facilitated Dialogues conducted in May and November in Mawlamyine, Mon State, focused on the specific sociolinguistic and education challenges of the state. The main and important outcome was a widespread agreement that a specific state language planning and policy process would be beneficial for the four main ethno-linguistic populations of Mon State (Mon, Pa’oh, Karen and Burmese speakers and learners). The unique grouping of languages, the specific educational setting with its mix of school systems and monastic education provision, and the relatively compact dimensions of the State suggested that this could become a model of participation based ‘bottom up’ language policymaking. Some difficult issues needed to be resolved in the Dialogues and so two teams of local writers, policy and technical in nature, were formed. These met on a regular basis to develop the outline and priorities of the policy.

Both Mawlamyine Dialogues had the intention of exploring alternatives to the mandated use of Myanmar as exclusive medium of instruction in state schools. Participants in the Dialogues and the writing teams were drawn from a wide range of interested organizations, including government officials, researchers and academics, Civil Society Organizations (CSOs), representatives from minority language and culture groups, women's organizations, community development and non-formal education structures as well as ministerial participation from the state parliament. An outstanding achievement resulting from the Facilitated Dialogues and extensive commitment and work of those involved was a fully developed consensus, despite considerable initial misgivings among some, and commitment towards the adoption of a comprehensive multilingual language policy for the State. Participants shaped the future
development of the policy by writing a ‘Mon State language policy preamble’, developed initially at the May 2014 Dialogue and elaborated upon during the second, more technical Dialogue and extended by the writing teams.


The key objectives of the Naypyidaw Facilitated Dialogue were to provide a national perspective to discussions of language policy emanating from local levels as in the Mon State Dialogues discussed above. The July Dialogue comprised 26 representatives from a wide range of organizations and included senior government officials from Planning and Training, Education, and Social Welfare departments; language committees, and parliament; researchers and academics; CSOs, including language and literacy groups, ethnic organizations and educational committees, as well as representatives from Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs). The facilitator provided research evidence on language learning and education from different parts of the world and models of provision for complex multilingual sociologies similar to the Myanmar setting. From these perspectives, inputs and recommendations from participants discussion focused on questions of social cohesion; skills and competitive exams in modern education; employment issues and external trade as linked to language policy; service delivery in health and legal domains; and issues of international connections and relations concerning language needs. These discussions formed the basis for the facilitator to propose a series of ‘principles’ to guide language policy writing across Myanmar.

A significant outcome from the Naypyidaw Facilitated Dialogue was the persuasion of public officials that a comprehensive multilingual language policy could be prepared in a collaborative way, with significant national benefits in the education of minority children, improved social cohesion and greater impact on peacebuilding through relationships between all sectors of society. Significant work was undertaken to achieve the drafting of a set of policy principles and a preamble for a Union-wide language policy.

1.2 Processes for alleviating tension and conflict

Although language status and language education can often be a cause of tension and a threat to social cohesion, one of the major outcomes of the LESC Initiative has been to highlight how language questions are also a doorway to the resolution of social conflict, even when such conflict is not directly associated with questions of language. In effect, language is more amenable to resolution than other causes of tension such as religion, ethnicity and socio-economic disparities. Language-based tensions are more amenable to dialogue-based resolution when this is supported through local and relevant international research and exploration of practical school models of Multilingual Education (MLE) (For a wider discussion of the link between language and conflict see Lo Bianco 2015, Synthesis Report on the LESC Initiative in Malaysia, Myanmar and Thailand).

The process for alleviating misunderstanding, frustration and anger which often arises in contest over limited resources in education and language settings can be alleviated by exploring viable and transferable models of practice from other settings, and though local innovation. Significant progress was made across State-level, as well as Union-wide contexts in Myanmar, confirmed by the extension of the initial LESC Initiative,
the large number of participants engaged in exploring alternative courses of action, the collaborative nature of these discussions, and the extremely positive evaluations given by participants of the outcomes of the Dialogues. All this confirms that language problems and conflicts can be relieved through focused and well-prepared interventions, particularly when framed in the general interest of enhancing social cohesion, resilience and fostering national unity. The Facilitated Dialogues and other activities undertaken in Myanmar have shown an extremely high level of success in addressing these by a method of examining realistically achievable objectives against policy declarations and education documents and by exploring areas through which language issues and tensions can be accommodated and facilitated.

1.3 Outcomes

There is considerable evidence from the LESC research that supports the notion that language status and language education contribute to tension and sometimes conflict, at both a societal and educational level (Lo Bianco 2015). The LESC Initiative has shown that language policy processes can play a vital role in generating understanding of the perspective and position of one group of stakeholders for the views of others, and even as far as full consensus, trust, and collaborative approaches to decision-making and enactment, which can lead to greater educational outcomes for children and improve social cohesion. The content and process of language problem alleviation, however, is dependent on focused and well-prepared interventions and research-based guidance, negotiated through guided discussions and collaborative processes of decision-making. In particular, the organization of the forum of safe, but guided discussion through the Facilitated Dialogues:

- allowed for constructive and positive relationships to be formed between many stakeholders (several of these have linked senior policy officials to indigenous community representatives for the first time);
- established a dialogue space where MLE was discussed (these discussions were framed as problem-solving through evidence and comparison of available models to support local innovation);
- created a sense of ownership and agency around languages and education (this is clear from the enthusiasm of participants to continue discussion, their active engagement with follow-up activities, their flow on discussions within their own communities; their contribution of new ideas and their evaluations and rankings of the various activities in confidential evaluation processes);
- stimulated a demand for policy development on the part of government (this has led to the shared convening of an international conference on language policy and peacebuilding in Mandalay, February 2016); and
- moved past acrimonious debates beyond past entrenched positions and towards constructive and deliberated common ground around education law reform and multilingual provision in education.

1.4 Recommendations

The most important outcomes emerging from the LESC Initiative are for the preparation of a peacebuilding and social cohesion promoting national language policy for Myanmar and for the holding of an international conference on language policy in multilingual and multicultural settings in Mandalay in February 2016. The first of these outcomes can now build on a set of shared, agreed and endorsed principles known
as the Naypyidaw (NPT) principles (see 6.3.1) which are the basis for the preparation of both state level and national language policy, while the conference has seen extensive collaboration across Myanmar society, from official to local levels, and across all ethnic groups, to jointly plan a new set of language understandings for the country and new policy settings for their cultivation and management.

Building on the initial inputs of the LESC Initiative the main outcomes of these new initiatives should include:

- The development of Union level language policy
- The development of several state level language policies coordinated with the Union level policy through the NPT principles (see 6.3.1)
- The development of model policies for other states and districts of the country based on the above
- Integrated implementation plans at state and Union levels, responding to a series of identified language and communication challenges
- A suite of integrated policy documents, envisaged to consist of two volumes
- Documented outcomes from the conference, and
- Other publications and information provision, including research reports, language maps, and other material as required.

1.5 Further developments

The proposal to extend the original LESC Initiative, based on the recognized success of the initial LESC project in Myanmar, was submitted to UNICEF in late 2014 and accepted in early 2015. A key objective of the LESC extension is the preparation of a peacebuilding and social cohesion promoting national language policy for Myanmar, which itself will consist of three key components:

1. Development of the language policy principles (NPT principles, see 6.3.1) through consultation with the relevant working groups and the incorporation of feedback and questionnaire feedback and the adaptation of these at state and locality levels.

2. Dialogues and consultations – this component of the project will involve carrying out

   a. Facilitated Dialogues in a number of states
   b. Union-wide Facilitated Dialogues; the first to seek feedback and discussion of draft principles for language policy and their endorsement and a second dialogue to discuss, modify and endorse the final policy draft
   c. Field trips at the state level for policy input negotiations
   d. Consultations in relation to a special needs component to the language policy.

3. The commissioning of four specialist inputs to inform the above steps through detailed papers written by experts on a sociolinguistic map of the languages of Myanmar, English and its role in Myanmar society, special needs and inclusive education provision, as well as a case study and photo essay of MLE practices in Myanmar.
The UNICEF Peacebuilding, Education and Advocacy (PBEA) Programme and the LESC Initiative

The Peace, Peacebuilding, Education and Advocacy (PBEA) Programme is a four-year global initiative (2012–2015/16) funded by the Government of the Netherlands and designed to strengthen resilience, social cohesion and human security, to encourage practical interventions to alleviate conflict and advance peace through the education sector, as well as to support research into conflict analysis and information about education and peacebuilding. The overall vision of PBEA is to strengthen policy and resilience in society, to foster social cohesion and human security in countries at risk of conflict, experiencing conflict or recovering from conflict.

The focus of PBEA is twofold: first to encourage practical intervention (tools and methods) to alleviate conflict, and second, to support research into conflict analysis (increasing understanding of the ways in which education can hinder or support social cohesion). The overall vision is to strengthen policy and resilience in society, to foster social cohesion and human security in countries at risk of conflict, experiencing conflict or recovering from conflict. The strategic result and primary objective is to improve the lives of children in conflict-affected contexts.

An overarching commonality for the LESC Initiatives is research exploring policy and planning, current practices and prevailing attitudes and values related to language throughout education systems. The aim of this research is to understand language issue and problems in their context in civil society, public policy and the labour market so far as these condition and shape language and ethnicity issues and to develop pragmatic intervention tools to alleviate conflict, introduce more effective and widely supported policies and thereby improve the lives of children and communities.

In 2012, UNICEF East Asia and the Pacific Regional Office (EAPRO) commissioned a desk review of existing documents on the relations between ethnicity (especially ethnic minorities), education (policies and practices related to minorities and minority languages) and social cohesion/peacebuilding in three countries – namely Malaysia, Myanmar and Thailand. Specifically, the desk review explored work on MLE and mother tongue-based education; policies and practices relating to ethnicity and education; as well as views and opinions of key stakeholders at national and local levels (see Lo Bianco 2015 for a detailed description of this activity).
Building on this initial work, the LESC Initiative has involved an in-depth study of how language policies and practices in education can promote social cohesion in Malaysia, Myanmar and Thailand. A key assumption of all this work has been the imperative to make language policies responsive to local contexts and purposes, with the aim of improving the lives of children and the wider community, to foster social cohesion and harmony in place of tension, and to improve national communication. These goals are also linked to national economies, since literacy, education and language capabilities support innovation in technology, economic productivity and competitiveness. To this end, in conjunction with UNICEF country offices and relevant governmental agencies, context-specific aims were identified in each country.
In highly multilingual and multiethnic Myanmar, language status and language education are often a cause, but also a consequence of tension. The sociolinguistic profile of Myanmar is very complex. The nation is divided into seven states and seven regions. Chin, Kachin, Kayah, Kayin, Mon, Rakhine and Shan states are all largely populated by their corresponding ethnic identities, although there is significant overlap between the states. By contrast, the regions – Ayeyarwady, Bago, Magway, Mandalay, Sagaing, Tanintharyi and Yangon – are populated predominantly by ethnic Burmese. The major ethnicities in Myanmar are Burman (68%), Shan (9%), Karen (7%), Rakhine (4%), Chinese (3%), Indian (2%) and Mon (2%). Based on a ruling by the State Law and Order Restoration Council (SLORC) in 1988, there are 135 official ‘national races’ in Myanmar.

The correspondence between the 135 ethno-linguistic groups, the official ‘national races’ of Myanmar, and its languages is very complex. As part of the process to support a peace promoting and social cohesion enhancing language policy detailed research examination of this connection is being assembled. At present it can be stated that there are some 135 languages, but by some estimates 116 languages.

Around 78 per cent of people speak Tibeto-Burman languages, 10 per cent speak Tai-
Kadai languages and 7 per cent speak Mon-Khmer languages. There are seven main ‘ethnic’ language clusters in Myanmar. These include Chin, Kachin, Kayah (Karenni), Kayin (Karen), Mon, Rakhine and Shan, spoken by a combined number in excess of 23 million people. These ethno-linguistic groups are predominantly based in, but not limited to, their correspondingly named State administrations. Other important immigrant languages in Myanmar, many of which are the languages of descendants of colonial administrators, include Chinese, Malay, Bengali and Sylheti, Hindu/Urdu, Tamil, Bisu, Eastern Tamang, and Iu Mien (Bradley 2015; Lewis, Simons, and Fennig 2013; Watkins 2007).

Another group of about 11 languages can be identified with speaker populations exceeding 100,000 each. Within this great diversity exist a large number of nested dialects and many highly variable multi-literate realities, including many languages lacking orthographic standardization. The nature of cross-language bilingualism/multilingualism, knowledge of foreign languages, and knowledge of and use of ‘proximal’ languages (Chinese and Indian languages) are distributed in a highly variable pattern of such as the urban/rural divide, as well as being shaped by differing education levels, occupation and mobility (Bradley 1997; 2015; Lewis, Simons, and Fennig 2013).

The national language, Myanmar, is represented across the national territory, claiming 32 million speakers but with highly variable rates of knowledge of its standard forms and literacy. The Burmese script is used to write Myanmar language, Karen languages and Mon, which is a member of the Mon-Khmer group of Austroasiatic languages spoken in Myanmar and Thailand (Lewis, Simons, and Fennig 2013). Myanmar is the sole language of government administration and the mass media and overwhelmingly the language of instruction for education. However, exceptions do exist for medium of instruction for schooling including the use of English and Chinese in private schools and the use of mother tongues in certain local contexts. The Myanmar Language Commission, a department of the Ministry of Education, is responsible for the development of Myanmar. Broadly speaking, a distinction can be made between the ethnic Burmese situated in the central areas of Myanmar who are predominantly monolingual, and the multilingual and ethnically diverse peoples in the border areas, many of whom also know Burmese/Myanmar language (Bradley 2015).

There are two important tensions which characterize the sociolinguistic profile in Myanmar. The first is the drive to establish and maintain a Burman nationalist identity liberated from all colonial ties and foreign interest. The second tension derives from the position of the plethora of minority languages in relation to the notion of a singular Myanmar nation and the majority Burman ethnic group who comprise around 68 per cent of the population (Watkins 2007). Language and ethnicity have been central to violent civil conflicts in Myanmar’s recent history. Such conflicts have often arisen in response to attempted creation of a singular Myanmar identity by centralized military governments. Ambiguity towards the notion of a singular Myanmar identity can be explained, in part, by the boundaries of the countries of the region only being fixed during the British colonial period. Many of the ethnic and linguistic groups exist inside and outside the country, divided by the artificial imposition of national boundaries (Watkins 2007).

Many decades of civil war and open conflict have been linked to demands by what are called ‘national races’, the main indigenous/ethnic populations seeking various measures of autonomous governance, with grievances linked to language and culture (Ganesan and Hlaing 2007). Denial of language and ethnic rights by successive military governments has resulted in intergenerational educational and economic
inequalities and disadvantage for many of Myanmar’s minorities (Callahan 2003; Lall, and South 2014). Aye and Sercombe (2014) identify an overarching national policy of ‘Myanmarization’, or the enforcement of a single national identity, of the large and geographically distinct main ethnic clusters. This has been reinforced through constitutional measures, but recent developments have achieved some recognition of a pluralist vision of the nation, and recognition of sub-national languages, a process in which the LESC Initiative has played a significant role.

3.1 Language rights

Although English became the official language of Myanmar during British rule, indigenous groups were all allowed to speak and learn their languages. During this time, writing systems for many languages such as Chin, Kachin and Lahu were developed by missionaries. The first constitution of the Union of Burma (1947) guaranteed that all citizens could practise their own cultures and religions. Public schools taught in some of the major ethnic languages such as Chin, Karen, Kayah, Mon and Shan, but some Buddhist monasteries and Christian churches taught in some of the smaller ethnic languages (Hlaing 2007).

In 1962, Burmese became the only language of instruction for university and pre-university classes (except for English language classes). However, there was some allowance for the teaching of minority languages at the early primary level, with the Ministry of Education publishing textbooks in a small range of minority languages up until the early 1980s. While the government was not against ethnic minorities possessing multiethnic identities, they were opposed to activities that impacted negatively on the national unity they were striving to create. As a result, by the 1980s many schools had stopped teaching in minority languages, owing in part to the complexities surrounding language, identity, compliance, a lack of education finances and an inability to staff the programmes. In some instances though, local officials were willing to continue to work for education in minority languages, along with some Christian schools and Buddhist monasteries. Some public schools in more remote areas continued to use the mother tongue as the language of instruction (Hlaing 2007).

In areas of insurgency, called ‘liberated areas’ by insurgents, but ‘black areas’ by the Myanmar government, schools continued to teach in the minority languages. Myanmar has been taught as a second or foreign language, often presented and viewed with enmity (Hlaing 2007). However, language planning in highly multilingual contexts is complex and changes at a societal, as well as a governmental level, require the reinterpretation of language and identity in constantly evolving contexts. Hlaing (2007) notes that the National Council for the Union of Myanmar (NCUB), which consists of Burman, Kachin, Karen, Rakhine, Shan and other ethnic groups, currently use Myanmar as their language of communication. While there is a desire among these communities for English to be an official language as it is viewed as neutral, this option is severely limited by the lack of English skills and trained English teachers in Myanmar.

Although there has not been a blanket prohibition of the teaching and promotion of minority languages in Myanmar, many ethnic groups are inhibited by the government’s lack of support for their languages and the decline of the education system, which has crippled mother tongue education across the country
A key objective of Myanmar’s ethnic minorities is a greater share of the revenue, as well as the government allowing mother tongue education and the integration of local languages into government communications, place names and official documents (Della-Giacoma and Horsey 2013). As discussed below in 3.3, the legal framework for minority languages has been tolerating but ethno-linguistic conflict has persisted.

3.2 Multilingual Education (MLE)

Education is not only a fundamental human right, it is also hugely important in alleviating and preventing poverty, increasing health, political participation and social tolerance. Equitable universal education is thus a key goal of creating a fair, healthy and socially inclusive world. As the Education for All Global undertaking emphasizes, “education enables people to escape from the trap of chronic poverty and prevents the transmission of poverty between generations” (UNESCO 2014, p. 144). Moreover, there is a strong link between education and healthier populations due to a range of factors including the willingness to seek professional help in health issues, including vaccinations, and awareness of basic health standards in relation to the transmission of, and protection from diseases. Perhaps most importantly for Myanmar and the LESC Initiative, education has been shown to be instrumental in promoting tolerance and social cohesion (UNESCO 2014).

In multilingual societies, the question of language of instruction becomes all the more pertinent. In attempting to redress educational inequities, language issues are invariably raised, as language can function as a means of exclusion. Students whose home language is different from the language of instruction face a difficult challenge of partaking in schooling in their second language. Indeed, schooling in an unfamiliar language partially accounts for the “comparative lack of academic success of minoritised and indigenous children” (Ball 2011, p. 24). With regards to social cohesion, the exclusion of learners’ native tongues can also lead to feelings that their cultures, histories and customs are not valued in education environments. This creates a divide between minority and majority languages and the respective cultures that these languages both reflect and shape.

From a practical side, teaching early learners in unfamiliar languages presents difficulties for teachers and other students. Significant time can be wasted trying to convey the most rudimentary literacy skills at the expense of children's learning capacities. This can disadvantage the entire classroom, as the communication difficulties inhibit children learning in their second language (L2), and prevents adequate attention and development for children learning in their first language (L1) (MLE WG 2013).

Large-scale research studies and case studies have shown that mother tongue learning programmes that support transitional approaches to national language acquisition can lead to significantly better educational outcomes for minority children (e.g., Chumbow 2013; Taylor and Coetzee 2013; SEAMEO and The World Bank 2009; UNESCO 2006, 2007, 2008). However, mother tongued-based education is not without significant challenges, as recognized throughout these reports, including political, pedagogical, resourcing and financial impediments. Movement towards a consensus around MLE is in and of itself a complex process in any nation, and is an issue that forms an important focus on the LESC work in Myanmar.
3.3 Legal framework

Since independence in early 1948, every Constitution has recognized rights for national races, including the indigenous ethnic minority groups. In the 1948 Constitution, these rights included non-discrimination and the presence of local national ethnic group members in a national political Chamber of Nationalities with over half of the members representing five ethnic States, as well as others from ethnic groups in two States designated subsequently. In the 1974 Constitution, more specific provisions for mutual respect and development and use of ethnic languages, traditions and customs were included and the 2008 Constitution, this was extended to language, literature, fine arts and culture (Bradley 2015). The 2014 National Education Law and the 2015 Ethnic Rights Law use and development of ethnic groups’ languages, literature, culture, art, traditions and historical heritage are supported. In the former case the LESC Initiative played a constructive role in several meetings with the drafting committee of the law.

Myanmar language (Burmese) has always been the official language and the main medium of education, government and the justice system (1948 Constitution Article 216, 1974 Constitution Article 102 and 152(b), and 2008 Constitution Article 450). English was co-official from 1948, English was demoted in 1974 English and in 1974 and 2008 the use of ethnic minority languages as a supplement to Myanmar in the justice system and education was permitted, greatly reinforced by the 2014 education law.
4.1 LESC and the Comprehensive Education Sector Review (CESR)

LESC research and intervention activities have taken place in the context of the Government of Myanmar initiative, supported by diverse Development Partners, to undertake a CESR as part of a general national reform agenda whose principal aim is to raise economic and social development. An overarching goal of this process and related reform agendas currently underway is to foster the development of a "modern developed nation through education" (Myanmar Ministry of Education, vision statement, 2004) and the wider 30 Year Long Term Basic Education Development Plan, 2001–2031. Critically relevant are the overarching constitutional provisions for the national language, for multilingualism and for the distribution and outcomes of education provision, and employment and economic opportunity.

The CESR processes and its reports are identifying a detailed account of all aspects of educational practice and policy, from which areas of needed reform and improvement can be identified. The achievement of Myanmar's education and social goals, including the Myanmar application of the Millennium Development Goals, will be influenced by the quality, comprehensiveness and credibility of the CESR and the recommendations it provides for productive policy development.

The CESR Review, Phase 1, Rapid Assessment Reports (The Republic of the Union of Myanmar Ministry of Education 2013) have provided a comprehensive overview of education legislation, basic education, non-formal education, early childhood care and development, teacher education, technical and vocational education, higher education, education funding, stakeholders, and textbook publishing and distribution. CESR Phase II is building on and adding to the recommendations of Phase I. The CESR arises in a situation in which central government control of educational curriculum is strongly entrenched in the 1948, 1974 and 2008 constitutions, with the Ministry of Education in complete control on a nationwide level, the only exceptions being higher education institutions run by other ministries, such as the Ministry of Defence, Ministry of Religious Affairs and Ministry of the Interior.

The 2014 education law is a major step forward, arising partly from CESR as well as other influences, devolving some curriculum control to lower administrative levels including the central Divisions, the seven ethnic States, and the self-administered areas designated for certain other ethnic groups (Article 44). It also not just permits but supports the introduction of ethnic languages into education, starting at the earliest level and gradually being extended upwards, with majors in ethnic culture, history and literature, though not languages, planned for universities (Article 42(b)). Nevertheless, the default medium of education is still Myanmar, though since 2014 English and ethnic minority languages (Article 43(b)) are also permitted, the latter only alongside Myanmar at basic levels. The examination system and
approval for non-government schools and higher education institutions remain under central control, and the vast bulk of primary, secondary and higher education is carried out in government schools.

Since the British period, education has consisted of one year of pre-primary education followed by 10 standards from beginning primary to final secondary level, each assessed by centrally set examinations; progress to the next standard is only possible after passing the examinations. This often means that children in remote areas and children from ethnic minority backgrounds whose mother tongue is not Myanmar language need to attempt a particular standard more than once before they can pass. It is particularly problematic that it is believed there were quotas for passing Tenth Standard, the normal entry qualification for higher education, determined centrally according to the capacity of higher education institutions rather than the actual level of student performance in the Tenth Standard examinations. Thus Myanmar is quite unlike India, China and many other neighbouring countries, which have positive discrimination to increase the number of ethnic minority students who can progress to higher education, through entry quotas and/or through bonus marks on examinations (Bradley 2015).

The 2014 education law proposes to increase the duration of secondary education by two years, which will require substantially increased resources for schools and potentially create a two-year gap in students qualified to start higher education. Apart from the brief Japanese interlude in the early 1940s, since 1885 English has been the main foreign language in the education system, with co-official status from 1948 to 1962 and reintroduced as a possible medium of education, alone or in combination with Myanmar, from 2014 (2014 Education Law, Article 43(a)). Standards of English declined after 1948, and especially after 1962, but are again improving. Many other foreign languages are taught in higher education, with varying success, and in private institutions.

4.2 A conceptual outline

As noted above, the Myanmar sociolinguistic profile is very complex, comprising spoken languages (accompanied by an unknown number of sign languages), within seven main ‘ethnic’ language clusters – Chin, Kachin, Kayah (Karenni), Kayin (Karen), Mon, Rakhine and Shan – spoken by more than 23 million people and distributed predominantly within correspondingly named State administrations (Lewis, Simons, and Fennig 2013; Bradley 2015). Another group of about 11 languages can be identified with speaker populations exceeding 100,000 each. Within this great diversity there are a large number of nested dialects and many highly variable, multi-literate realities, including many languages lacking orthographic standardization (Burin 2003). The national language, Myanmar, is represented across the national territory, but with highly variable rates of knowledge of its standard forms, and of its literacy.

The nature of cross-language bilingualism/multilingualism, and knowledge of foreign languages, knowledge of and use of ‘proximal’ languages (Chinese and Indian languages), are distributed in a highly variable urban/rural pattern and shaped by education levels, occupation and mobility. A true sociolinguistic profile needs to be sensitive to levels and distribution of sign languages, communication systems for the language disabled, and other communication questions that impact on access to education or training, and prospects of access to remunerated employment.
The LESC Initiative has taken a comprehensive, language planning approach, involving early childhood education, primary schooling and post-primary education, aiming to offer concrete methods of language planning to support MLE in ethnic minority languages, in Myanmar (national language) and in strategic foreign languages (i.e., English as primary grade subjects, and as medium of instruction in grades 10 and 11) guided by the following principles:

- Language and literacy education must be integrated. This implicates a wide range of matters including medium of instruction; the relation between first, second and additional languages; the linking of literacy and curriculum content; pedagogy; notions of bilingualism and conceptual development; identity and interculturalism; transition points and sequencing in multilingual curriculum, etc.);
- The beginning point is to explore outcome proficiency skills desired by the community of interests (speaker groups, policymakers, researchers, etc.) in relation to the likely communicative outcomes from current provision with proposals for overcoming gaps and deficiencies identified;
- The work has been sensitive to questions of literacy, concept development and school participation; equity and access; dropout and discontinuation and re-entry possibilities; identity and citizenship; and economy and labour market questions;
- The approach has been guided by principles of effective language outcomes; language rights and opportunities; social cohesion and national unity in the context of the recognition of diversity and pluralism; and the opportunity for all, mainstream and minority populations alike, to gain the spoken proficiency, literate and cultural knowledge and skills to support equal opportunity and full participation in national life;
• A priority for exploration is a shift from English to bilingual (Myanmar/English) medium of instruction in mathematical and science subjects in upper secondary grades; this too, and related questions of assessment, training and materials development, should comprise part of the comprehensive approach.

(See Appendix 1 for a full copy of the original concept note for the LESC Initiative in English and in Myanmar).

The LESC Initiative in Myanmar has been informed by participatory action research and fieldwork activities involving over many hundreds of individuals belonging to some 200 organizations, institutions and governmental departments across Myanmar. (See Appendix 2 for a list of many of the offices and organizations involved in the LESC Initiative in Myanmar. In some instances, multiple personnel from an organization participated in various aspects of the initiative.)
5.1 Language status planning

Status refers to the legal and general social standing of a language. The legal standing of languages was referred to in 3.1, above, the social standing or status of languages can be different from the official recognition they are granted in legal texts. In Myanmar, language status questions are relevant to issues of social cohesion in respect of both the juridical standing of minority languages and their real presence in the institutions of society. A considerable part of conflict around language in Myanmar has come from the disparity between official and actual positions, or such issues constitute a contentious subject from time to time. The question of the status of languages is addressed in the LESC through general policy work in Myanmar, with the example of the role of Mon and Karen languages and the work so far conducted during 2015 in Kachin state. The high demand for English is an important factor in language policy in general and potentially destabilizing of nationalism-based language planning, unless English is brought into a comprehensive national language planning exercise, as proposed below. Comprehensive language policy represents systematic efforts of collective, dialogue-based expert language planning which seeks to address in a single and coordinated process top-down and bottom-up activities of language decision-making.
5.2 Solving language challenges

This activity was taken forward in the LESC programme through specially designed ‘Facilitated Dialogues’ (see below for further explanation). Four of these were conducted, in Mae Sot (Thailand), Mawlamyine and Naypyidaw with the aim of addressing a range of language issues and responding to them in evidence-based mediated seminars, aiming to foster consensus and collaboration on difficult, controversial issues around language. These were designed with the specific audience of a multilingual population in mind and, according to all evaluations and participant comments, proved very successful. The Facilitated Dialogues also had a deeper and more subtle objective of fostering a culture of dialogue and collective reflection on policy writing, in place of the traditional pattern, in most countries, in which community members are typically not included in policy activity as this is reserved for public officials alone. When contentious issues are involved, and specifically here when language questions that have been a source of often acrimonious dispute, and even violent conflict over long periods of time, the Facilitated Dialogue process has proved to be very beneficial to community relations, beyond the specific outcomes achieved.

5.3 Training in language planning

Specific training in methods of writing language policies was communicated to officials and community organizations throughout the project and successfully enacted in all Facilitated Dialogues, as detailed in the following section. In an Asia-wide regional effort organized by UNICEF and the University of Melbourne, evidence and experience-based methodological guidelines for problem-solving local dialogues and a regional strategy for their broader implementation, including a fundraising proposal, will be developed as part of the LESC Initiative. UNESCO has also supported such training initiatives in conjunction with the University of Melbourne. An additional aim has been to experiment with new skills and methods for solving language challenges in education and more broadly in society so participants gain the ability to themselves independently direct language planning processes in an informed way. These have been expressly built into the Facilitated Dialogues through the use of ‘confederate’ facilitators, in which Prof. Lo Bianco has worked with selected participants before and after Dialogue sessions to impart to them the aims, structure, assumptions, methods and operating principles of his methodology.

5.4 Public education on contentious issues

Methods of dealing with controversial topics were included in all Dialogues, talks and meetings. These include practical focus on delivery methods or how to solve the challenge of multiple languages in a single school or in a district or state. The role of English in education can often be controversial. There is widespread demand for English, occasionally there is also nationalist or culturally protective rejection of the incursions English is seen to be having in education and other social domains. Acquisition of English and demand for English is also influenced by rural/urban divides and by social class positions and its early introduction can occasionally be favoured over support for learning in minority mother tongues of children.
The timing and sequence of new languages in education, scripts and orthographies, the general question of multilingualism, the best age and method to introduce new literacy in a new language are also questions on which there is dispute. Other contentious questions involve how to designate different languages, for example, what is an ‘official’, ‘national’ or ‘regional’ language, what are ‘language rights’, what is the best education for disadvantaged children, for isolated, itinerant, undocumented, or marginalized children. All of these questions were encountered within the LESC Initiative and have formed the basis of efforts to promote better public education about the questions, introducing and applying existing research findings from the academic literature, and also promoting local research, experimentation and innovation.

5.5 Mitigating conflict

This has been a major focus of the work. Reducing conflict is advanced through replacing emotional talk with evidence-based policy processes. It frequently transpires in Dialogues that in the absence of information, data and research some questions which appear controversial, intractably difficult to resolve or incomprehensible, can be allayed, mitigated or redressed through information gathering activity. Conflict can be around symbolic questions as well as pragmatic/practical questions. In the latter category we find a clear connection between language and slow acting social disparities such as literacy and academic achievement dictated by differential language abilities among learners and social groups. Access to national languages, prestige forms of academic communication and articulate expressive ability are all questions of language which are typically underestimated in public policy, in conflict resolution practices and in activities aiming to foster national unity.

5.6 Writing guidelines and developing theory and understanding

A vital aim of LESC has been to develop new and better understanding of the links between language in use, language education, language in society and language policy and the links of these manifestations of language with questions of social tension, conflict, mobility, resilience and cohesion. A key outcome of the project will be to systematically map language and conflict according to a matrix along the above lines. This is taking the form of practical guides as well as academic writing. A deeper understanding of the complex interaction between language and conflict in multi-ethnic societies is urgently required under contemporary conditions of rapid and deep globalization of economies, vast mobility of populations and the diffusion of information and networking technologies.

To facilitate meeting this need, the UNICEF EAPRO and The University of Melbourne are developing methodological guidelines for problem-solving local dialogues to be released in mid-2016. The guide will be a technical compendium to support UNICEF staff, government and Ministry of Education officials, language policymakers, communities and other relevant actors involved in language policy development to engage in more inclusive, participatory and effective language policy planning processes and to use relevant participatory methodology such as a Facilitated Dialogues and to understand better methods and practices of negotiated democracy, shared policymaking procedures and similar evidence-based decision-making.
5.7 Official document analysis

It is critical that a credible research and evidence basis for informing the LESC Initiative and any public policy outcomes be established. This has taken the form of an extensive literature review of documents including legal texts, educational jurisdiction documents, academic sources, supra-national sources (e.g., documents produced by UNICEF, ASEAN, NGOs), documents from CSOs, and public media, among other materials. These will be included in the final publications arising from the LESC Initiative.
Facilitated Dialogues

Alongside consultations with a wide range of individuals and organizations, a key component of the LESC Initiative in Myanmar has been the use of Facilitated Dialogues. Also referred to as ‘Deliberation Conferences’, Facilitated Dialogues have been developed by Prof. Lo Bianco over many years of practical work in language problem solving. The method builds on assumptions and theory of deliberative democracy but also on the body of literature in the academic field of language planning. Facilitated Dialogues and consultative deliberation have become important features of research into problem solving and democratic practice in administration and government in different parts of the world. These approaches to practical problem solving using facilitate discussion are part of a surge in reflection on the limits of conventional policymaking as it has been practiced for many years.

The essential aim of Dialogues is to canvas policy alternatives for issues being debated and which are the cause of conflict, tension or policy paralysis. The use of Facilitated Dialogues in the LESC Initiatives to date have shown that such a technique can foster the convergence of ideas, as well as agreement on desirable courses of action that are needed for social cohesion. Under the initial LESC contract, the following Facilitated Dialogues and activities were conducted in Myanmar.

6.1 Language Policy Forum, Eastern Burma Community Schools
Mae Sot, Thailand, 12–14 February 2014

The aims of the Mae Sot Facilitated Dialogue were focused around developing a consensus position on the content and aims of language policy for a large number of ethnic/indigenous settings, including several with autonomous education systems, either as a pan-ethnic position or as a series of localized documents. This included deepening understandings of the forms and possibilities of language planning for fostering peace and justice in order to enhance the educational lives of children across the eastern Burma/Myanmar zone; supporting the rights of ethnic peoples, the learning of ethnic languages, the Union language and English, and identifying and addressing impediments to effective language planning. It moved to encouraging consensus on action, research and teaching required for socially just, educationally effective language planning, and to developing participants’ working knowledge of mother tongue-based MLE with an eye to developing the preferred position of a pan-ethnic policy document on ‘ethnic education’ (see Appendix 3 for the Dialogue agenda and a full list of the aims).

The Mae Sot Facilitated Dialogue was attended by 68 representatives from 22 organizations and 12 different ethnic groups and was conducted in 6 languages. Participants explored a range of fundamental challenges, including what communities envisioned for the educational and economic future for their
children, their languages and their culture, and their participation to and attitudes towards Myanmar society. Through detailed informational and participatory processes, the participants worked collaboratively to develop a research and action plan, focusing on both individual community needs and the potential of collective, pan-ethnic language planning and action. Through the processes of the Facilitated Dialogues, in developing a deeper understanding of language planning and policy processes, and MLE, participants gained a sense of ownership and agency over their linguistic and cultural heritage and rights. This sense of empowerment and commitment transferred into immediate and longer-term actions, as a pan-ethnic advocacy group, in service of demanding progression towards substantial improvements in educational access and outcomes for children across their communities.

6.1.1 Achievements

Many significant achievements emerged from the Mae Sot Facilitated Dialogue (Michaels 2014). A Declaration of Ethnic Language and Education was drafted during the gathering and a press release issued shortly after the meeting, declared the launch of MINE. The press release introduces MINE as
an advocacy and action group for the indigenous communities, provides information as to the mission of MINE and outlines its petitions on behalf of their communities. The main text of the press release follows.

“The Myanmar/Burma Indigenous Network for Education (MINE) was launched on Friday 21st February, International Mother Language day. An ethnic education seminar hosted by the Karen Teacher Working Group (KTWG) in Mae Sot from 12–14 February led to the creation of MINE. The seminar was facilitated by Dr Joseph Lo Bianco, Professor of Language and Literacy Education at the University of Melbourne and a consultant and expert in Language and Peacebuilding. Ethnic education leaders from 22 organisations attended, with 12 different ethnic groups represented. After attending this seminar, I am very encouraged by the level of enthusiasm of the group and the cooperation and participation in exploring different ways to preserve and promote our mother tongue languages’ said a Pa-oh representative from the Naung Taung Parahita Monestary (Hopone). A Declaration of Ethnic Language and Education was drafted during the meeting […] MINE is promoting indigenous language rights in schools and beyond. Although the promotion of indigenous language rights is at the heart of MINE, the network also recognises the importance of education in Myanmar and English languages and is seeking a multilingual language policy for the Union. ‘MINE is an exciting development for us. We have struggled for our language and culture rights for so long and without success. Now with MINE we have the support of our other indigenous brothers and sister’ said MINE spokesperson, Saw Kapi. ‘The recognition of our language and cultural rights is important to us, and is also essential if there is going to be peace and stability in Burma,’ he added.” (see also Michaels 2014).

Individual ethnic groups have been struggling for their language and cultural rights for many years in Burma. Each has a different experience of education, unique to their area, but there are many common experiences amongst the groups. “With MINE we can share our experiences and work together across different indigenous groups. We will work together to advocate for culturally appropriate education for our children. Most importantly, schooling for our children in their own languages,” said Naw Ler Htu, Karen Teacher Working Group Chairperson.

This important document goes on to argue that:

“International research clearly shows that Mother Tongue Based, Multilingual Education (MTB-MLE) improves children’s learning in school. It promotes better learning across all school subjects, keeps children in school and improves the quality of second and third language acquisition,” said Saw Kapi. ‘Children learn best in all subjects and are more engaged when taught in their mother tongue. If children have a strong base in their own language, they can master other languages, such as Burmese and English, when these are introduced, initially as subjects and later as languages of instruction,’ he added. Although there are some small changes happening in certain parts of the country, the current official government policy does not allow learning in the mother tongue or use of mother tongue in the delivery of government services. MINE is advocating for the official government policy to allow indigenous children to access culturally appropriate education in their own mother tongue. MINE also advocates for access to government services in mother tongue language in ethnic areas. ‘Our aim is to ensure that indigenous school children have the right to mother tongue education and to establish a multilingual education system in our country, where diverse ethnic nationalities co-exist,’ Saw Kapi said.”
Released to coincide with International Mother Language Day the key aim of MINE is for:

- Comprehensive language planning to support preservation of indigenous languages and improve learning of Burmese and English by indigenous people.
- A MLE system, promoting the language of the Union and English along with the indigenous group’s mother tongue.
- Indigenous children to have the right to education in their mother tongue.
- The right for ethnic school children to be taught using an inclusive curriculum, which values their own culture.
- The right for indigenous people to produce their own culturally appropriate curricula and to produce texts in their own language for use in schools.

(See Appendix 4, for full versions of the press release in English and in Myanmar).

Building on the sense of agency and knowledge of language planning and policy mechanisms acquired through the Facilitated Dialogues, MINE then moved to prepare and release an *Ethnic Languages and Education Declaration*, on 15 June 2014, in English (Appendix 5) and in Myanmar (Appendix 5). The document “describes the current situation of schooling for Indigenous children and youth in remote, ethnic nationality areas of Myanmar/Burma and then sets out a framework of recommended actions to be taken” (Appendix 5, p. 2). The report situates the challenges faced by communities in relation to the Myanmar constitution and the review of the national education law and identifies a range of structural
impediments to educational and linguistic outcomes for children in MINE communities. The declaration calls for the following goals to be included in Myanmar’s national education policy:

- The right to mother tongue education in the earliest years of schooling and continued throughout education.
- The right to learn the Union language of Burmese equally well with the main community of the Union for equal rights to citizenship.
- The right to learn English as the international language and the main language of ASEAN.
- National language planning to promote preservation of ethnic languages and cultures and teach in Myanmar (Appendix 5, p. 7).

The MINE declaration then calls for a further range of actions to be considered and entrenched in the education system, including wider teaching and learning reforms; specific research projects to support ethnic minority success in education and multilingualism; assistance for individual languages; the establishment of advisory structures; support for existing independent ethnic education systems; creation of ethnic language departments at university level, devolution of curriculum planning and implementation, alongside development of a multicultural national curriculum. These aims are collected into a preamble and set of statements, follow:

**ACTION**

The Government of Myanmar and civil society are working towards wide reaching reforms to education throughout the country. MINE calls for the following actions to be considered and entrenched in national education policy reforms.

**Teaching and learning**

- Improve quality of education through access to mother tongue based, MLE
- Local level planning to ensure instruction is available in all students mother tongues
- Support for use of teacher assistants and teaching aides to help students learn Burmese and maintain their mother tongue as they study the national curriculum
- Link English teaching to mother tongue and Myanmar language
- Support training for teachers in ethnic nationality areas in at least three languages—mother tongue, Myanmar and English
- Culturally appropriate education inclusive of local epistemologies, histories and cultural traditions/practices
- Develop an inclusive national curriculum promoting Myanmar’s diverse ethnicities, histories, languages and cultures
- Improve teacher capacity through pre-service training and continual professional development for indigenous areas
- Increase support for and employment of local teachers who can speak and teach indigenous mother tongue
- Increase learning of indigenous languages by teachers and recruit native language speakers into teacher training programmes
- Develop child-centred learning practices and improve teaching methods in government schools
- Urgent requirement to increase teacher salaries to improve commitment to and quality of teaching while reducing the practice of bribery by students

**Research**

- Research to support best practices of mother tongue-based MLE and language planning
- Establish a national research committee including ethnic representatives and ensure that language policy is one of its priority research areas
- Include the perspectives, stories and achievements of ethnic nationalities in the history curriculum
- Promote research to support the special needs of smaller language groups and vulnerable language communities
- Research to facilitate language planning on indigenous language scripts and vocabulary development
- Research on common forms of language within existing indigenous groups and in local areas with diverse languages
- Research exploring strategies of creating opportunities to apply mother language widely in daily life

**Assistance to individual languages**

- Fund oral history research and the revitalization and preservation of indigenous languages in cooperation with older generations
- Assistance for language planning on script and terminology to permit mother tongue teaching across a variety of subject areas
- Support to maintain and promote local names (towns, territories, etc.) to strengthen local history and identity

**Advisory structures**

- Form a board of linguistic experts to advise indigenous education groups
- Advisory structures should include ethnic representatives
- Initiate and support literacy and culture committees to develop mother tongue languages

**Ethnic education systems**

- For the short to medium term at least, maintain existing community and ethnic nationality schools and do not replace them with government schools
- Encourage collaboration between community and ethnic nationality schools and school systems and the government school system to improve education delivery
- Recognize and support community, religious and non-state actor administered schools
- Allocate budget for teacher stipends and teaching and learning materials for community, religious and non-state actor administered schools
- Support for school management and data collection for community, religious and non-state actor administered schools
- Support for local mother tongue-based curriculum development
Higher education

- Indigenous study departments should be established at university level
- Create and support a Department of Indigenous Linguistics and Philosophy
- Create Bachelor and Master’s degree programmes in linguistics for speakers of indigenous languages
- Grant the right to and encourage publication of indigenous literature

National curriculum and local flexibility

- A multicultural national curriculum promoting harmony amongst all people of Myanmar/Burma and respect for different ethnicities, language and cultural traditions
- Central government to provide only guidance and standard setting with increased management and decision-making authority at the State and local level
- Decentralization of authority over education to the State and local levels so that curriculum and teaching practices are applicable to the local context
- Allowance for and inclusion of local curriculum within the national curriculum (for example, 60% national and 40% local) (Appendix 5, pp. 8–9).

An ongoing commitment to advance the aims of the MINE collaboration was demonstrated through the development of a long-term working plan, based on ongoing language planning and policy work and regular meetings. The plan focuses on advocacy for mother tongue education, MLE, decentralization of educational decisions, intercultural education, policy decision-making and participation, and all inclusive education (Appendix 6).

6.2 Language, Education and Social Cohesion Facilitated Dialogue, Mawlamyine, Mon State, Myanmar
27–28 May 2014 (36 participants)

Language Education and Social Cohesion Facilitated Dialogue, Mawlamyine, Mon State, Myanmar
6–7 November 2014 (32 participants)

a) Technical issues in writing a language policy Facilitated Dialogue: Mon State. Mawlamyine, Myanmar, 6 November 2014 (32 participants)
b) Policy issues in writing a language policy Facilitated Dialogue: Mon State. Mawlamyine, Myanmar, 7 November (22 participants)

Both of the May and November Mawlamyine Facilitated Dialogues focused on the language planning and policy activities for Mon State, with the intention of elaborating and extending the mandated use of Myanmar as exclusive medium of instruction in state schools. This practice has been a significant barrier for children from non-Myanmar speaking households enrolled in primary grades (UNICEF 2015). This exclusion has also been a barrier for students entering high school and results in school dropouts and poor results in national schools, especially for predominantly Mon-speaking areas in the southern and more rural parts of the State (UNICEF 2015).
After initial difficulties due to lingering conflicts and different positions about the ultimate aim of ethnic education, the participants of the Facilitated Dialogue decided to focus their energies on development of a comprehensive approach to language policy on a state-specific basis. The idea was to trial preparation of this by beginning with drafting a preamble, principles, and focus areas to see if agreement could be achieved on these elemental steps. After success in these tasks it was decided to work towards a state policy linked to Union-wide policy in the interests of fostering social cohesion and collaborative social relations in Myanmar.

As the Facilitated Dialogue proceeded participants agreed to explore a wider understanding of the forms and possibilities of language planning to promote human rights in general as well as improved education and to identify, define and examine specific issues that require attention, such as the needs of disabled groups, the challenge of providing for areas of high multilingual density, how to promote improvements in acquisition of Myanmar language and English for remote pupils. (see Appendix 7 for the Dialogue agenda and a full list of the aims).

The Facilitated Dialogue was attended by 36 participants from a wide range of interested organizations, including government officials, researchers and academics, CSOs, as well as representatives from NGOs. Through a combination of informational sessions and whole group and small group activities and discussions, the participants explored challenges in MLE, literacy, and languages development in
Myanmar, and agreed to write a consensus statement and model language policy for the Mon State. The policy preamble was completed during dialogue, which required regular checking of assumptions and meanings of key terms, the applicability or non-applicability of concepts in MLE in schools and classrooms that have arisen from developed country contexts to the Myanmar setting. A key point of discussion was how education provision could be sustained by multilingualism in the community, and therefore the role of community-based language providers and agencies. Within a specifically educational context a key point of discussion was whether to ‘quarantine’ mother tongues from dominant languages in pedagogy, and research understandings of how children think and develop in more than one language.

6.2.1 Achievements

The outstanding achievement resulting from the Facilitated Dialogue was the eventual full agreement, endorsed through a procedure of ‘voice and vote’, devised by Prof. Lo Bianco as a constant check of understanding and agreement with the line of discussion by all participants, and eventual and strategic votes on key points, but not the most critical ones, which were decided through persuasion (voice). Using this method full consensus and commitment towards the preparation by local agents of a comprehensive multilingual language policy for Mon State was decided. This was particularly significant due to the high level of doubt and uncertainty, and considerable initial hostility from some parties, to the aims of the Facilitated Dialogue and to the role of the Central government in the entire activity. Such misgivings were apparent in initial phases and continued on and off, but voice and vote procedures during the first Facilitated Dialogue and a subsequent series of meetings, built a shared view and consensus. As this formed among many participants including state parliamentarians, ethnic leaders and external public officials including central government representatives the policy dialogue process succeeded in creating a sense of trust and a belief that the topic of language afforded the chance to construct positive gains for Mon State and to contribute to a general climate of peacebuilding. Via this process many stakeholders, including State government representatives from different political parties and factions, moved from observer roles to ownership and commitment, leading the emergence of a singular group constructed of government officials and civil society partners, supported by the facilitator to taking responsibility for direct drafting of a preamble and a declaration of policy aims, jointly with former antagonists.

The policy preamble and its conceptualization were not just limited to the Mon language, but included action on behalf of all the languages within the State, such as Pa’o, Karen and Mon, as well as Myanmar, the official national language. The beginnings of the wider development are shown through the measures detailed in the following preamble and press release prepared through the Facilitated Dialogue. Key components of the bilingual draft preamble for the policy (see Appendix 8, including press release) are as follows, retaining some of the original expression of the early drafts.

**Preamble:**

The Republic of Union of Myanmar is the country where all indigenous people are staying together unity. Therefore, it is very important all ethnic groups to get equal opportunity and to protect and maintain their literacy and cultural heritages. The development of each state and region in the country is same as the improvement of all indigenous people. All ethnic groups should endeavour together to develop their states and regions. Therefore, it is essential to support the development of all indigenous mother tongues by all indigenous people. Mon, Kayin, Pao, Myanmar and other indigenous people are staying together in Mon state. We believe that if mother tongue is used
as Medium of Instruction in classroom or education sector, it will support children to get better learning achievement and to learn the things which are really relevant to their daily lives. Therefore, while developing national or state/regional policies, authority should consider developing mother tongue based policies which also encourage learning national and international languages. By doing so, it will reinforce unity which will encourage all indigenous people to get peace, well-being and happiness. Accordingly, we prepare and purpose mother tongue based education policy which will promote the improvement of education quality, unity and upgrading cultural and traditional heritage for indigenous people in Mon state.

Objectives

• All children to get opportunity to use Mother-tongue Based Multilingual Education in basic education
• To create an education system based on mother tongue which will encourage to be able to learn mother tongue, national and international languages competently
• To establish and strengthen organizations which can support the improvement of ethnic literacy and language and enhance to get better collaboration and coordination among stakeholders
• State and Regional Education Department should train and produce qualify, skillful teachers who can speak one of local languages and having familiarly with local content for their regions.

Activities

• Government to provide funding and other supports to implement the Mother Tongue Based Multi Lingual Education planning and policy
• To implement Mother-tongue Based Multilingual Education, we will coordinate and collaborate with United Nations organization and other international organizations to get advice and technical assistance
• According to needs of the people, we will develop culturally and locally appropriate curriculum for each ethnic group
• We will coordinate and collaborate to recognize school curriculum developed by ethnic groups and will provide necessary support
• To be able to establish state level organization which will support in developing ethnic literacy and language, we will appoint and assign individual and organizations which are relevant to the objectives of the language policy and planning. In accordance with the needs of the people, we will open ethnic language centers and will provide trainings to native teachers
• To get better coordination, we will bring together all local donors, well-wishers and organization to provide necessary supports for each region to improve their language and literacy.

The second Facilitated Dialogue, held in November 2014, was conducted over two days. It incorporated a decision makers level meeting (32 participants), followed by a technical meeting (22 participants) (See Appendix 9 for the meeting agenda). Both of these meetings were informed by activities that had by this stage been undertaken at the national level in the Union-wide Naypyidaw Facilitated Dialogue that focused on the development of a national approach to a “peace promoting language
policy for Myanmar”. The decision makers level meeting at Mawlamyine addressed administrative and operational questions related to language policy, critical questions including teacher availability, textbook design and availability, programme design, duration and course content, language attitudes, levels of continuation of Mon and Myanmar languages, English and other languages, a timetable for the subsequent year’s work (that is 2015), links between Mon State policy and Union-wide language policy, special education needs in relation to sign language and minority languages, and special initiative to support the policy including a central language school and bilingual methodologies. The policymakers meeting focused on the aims, principles and political/legal framework within which to base the Mon State policy with the facilitator charged with fusing the outcomes of the two processes.

The subsequent technical meeting addressed the tasks and responsibilities for achieving the writing of language policy, the delegation of responsibilities, the research requirements to support policy development and the special initiatives.

The constructive and positive relationship that formed between all stakeholders though these processes and associated meetings has not only created a sense of ownership and agency around language and education, but resulted in the transfer of collaboration more broadly. Due to the positive relationship among stakeholders, it has been easier to work on other project activities such as school grant disbursements for non-state schools through the state education office and coordination among stakeholders across the education sector.
6.2.2 Evaluations

The Myanmar Country Office report to the regional workshop, the Knowledge Sharing Workshop of UNICEF EAPRO 15–17 September 2014 stated that the Facilitated Dialogues “held in Mon State has laid a very strong basis for the development of detailed language policy in that state as a model for extension to other parts of Myanmar”.

The feedback from participants was overwhelmingly positive. The vast majority reported that the process met or exceeded their expectations, commenting especially on the optimism it generated, with the quality of input and the presenters the notable standouts of the Dialogue. Teacher or education based participants identified the emphasis on practical delivery of mother tongue learning and MLE, as well as how to teach languages through action oriented learning, as the most beneficial aspects of the discussions. Policy and government based participants commented most strongly on the dynamic success of collaboration-based policy writing, and the information provided about possible models of provision, policy settings, evaluation methods and other ‘high order’ outcomes. Combining all responses participants identified: “explanations of how to teach ethnic languages in schools by applying mother tongue based multilingual education” as the most positive single item of learning for them. This reflects participants’ interest in the theoretical foundations of mother tongue-based MLE, and how the principles of this approach could best serve children in Mon State. Particular emphasis on the practical ways of teaching in both native and national languages was also recognized as of crucial importance by the participants. This was demonstrated by the participants’ enjoyment of the focus on
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“explanations of action oriented language teaching methods.” Other highlights included the Dialogue’s focus on the ways in which policy can be conceived through consultative discussion to alleviate tension in multilingual environments, which included specific exercises into “problem solving, discussion about issues and [how to] lay down education policy.”

Participants were asked to identify areas of information or problem areas in which they needed more information and support. A clear theme emerged in answers to this question. Most pointed out that the critical need in further Dialogues should be for more detail on practical ways in which mother tongue learning can be implemented and promoted while maintaining adequate proficiency in the national language to promote better lifelong education. Participants here were concerned both with practical delivery and design of such programmes but also with material to persuade hostile or unconvinced officials or community members. Participants also desired further information on “how to apply mother tongue based multilingual education in the classroom where many ethnic children are schooling in a particular place.” For the participants, future Dialogues could also incorporate more international case studies where MLE is a practical success; how mother tongue learning applies in classrooms where children have many different native tongues; as well as bringing more government officials into discussions about how to implement mother tongue learning methodologies in early childhood education comprehensively across the Union.

All responses from participants in the Mon State Facilitated Dialogues, and the many associated meetings, including the technical and policy based writing teams, recognized the critical importance of step-wise progression in language and education related challenges. This means that participants could identify that replacing past policies that had produced conflict, tension and acrimony would require sustained and repeated efforts to tackle individual problems and build solutions.

The overwhelming response was of an optimistic perspective. The dialogue process when led by expert facilitation and academic research based knowledge was seen as very positive, but that more events of this kind should be organized and undertaken in Mon State, other ethnic states, as well as Union-wide (See Appendix 10 for the feedback evaluations).

The writing of the Mon State language policy is now continuing under the extension of the LESC Initiative in Myanmar (See Section 8).

6.3 Language, Education and Social Cohesion Facilitated Dialogue. Naypyidaw, Myanmar
29–30 July 2014 (26 participants)

A meeting on language policy as part of social cohesion was convened in the capital Naypyidaw. This Facilitated Dialogue was attended by 26 representatives from a wide range of organizations and was designed in conjunction with the Government of Myanmar to ensure that it achieved its key goal of supporting local work, such as the Mon State processes discussed above, with a senior public official based approach. Direct meetings with the Ministry, directors general of education, and the Deputy Minister of Education, secured widespread support for the Dialogue. Participants included senior
government officials from Planning and Training, Education, and Social Welfare departments; culture and language committees from five ethnic states, and parliamentary representatives from different political parties; researchers and academics; CSOs, including language and literacy groups, ethnic organizations and educational committees; as well as representatives from a range of national and international NGOs.

The preceding meetings had achieved agreement on the objectives of the Naypyidaw Facilitated Dialogue: to discuss perspectives, and seek inputs and recommendations to advance the social cohesion, education improvements, and to promote ethnic reconciliation (See Appendix 11 for the Dialogue agenda).

### 6.3.1 Achievements

The NPT Facilitated Dialogue achieved a major breakthrough in persuasion of public officials that a comprehensive multilingual language policy could be prepared in a collaborative way, with significant national benefits in the education of minority children, improved social cohesion and greater impact on peacebuilding through relationships between all sectors of society.

Significant work was undertaken to achieve the drafting of a set of policy principles and a preamble for a Union-wide language policy. The policy principles, known as the Naypyitaw Principles, which emerged from the initial Facilitated Dialogue are as follows and were prepared by the facilitator in response to, and distilling, discussion during the Dialogue and from previous meetings. Using ‘voice’ approaches to discussion these were debated, refined, extended and modified, and then voted on in succession. All were adopted unanimously and later endorsed by the Ministry of Education directly as the basis for conducting nation-wide Facilitated Dialogues to prepare language policy for the Union to promote peace and social cohesion. The NPT principles for development of Myanmar language policy are:
Unity: by supporting all to learn Myanmar language and literacy, for common and equal citizenship

Diversity: by supporting ethnic and indigenous communities to maintain, enjoy and transmit their languages to their children

Cohesion: by promoting inclusion and participation for ethnic and indigenous minorities

Education: by improving equitable access and participation, literacy, vocational and life skills, and academic standards

Employment: by raising standards in Myanmar, English and mother tongues, where relevant, to help young people enter the competitive labour market including trades and professions

Service delivery: by supporting communication planning to make sure that public administration are communicating effectively with all citizens especially interpreting and translation in health, legal contexts and social services

International relations: in order to support trade, diplomacy and travel through widespread knowledge of English, and labour migration in the context of ASEAN mobility, and learning of strategic foreign languages

Inclusive communication: by integrating support for visually and hearing impaired persons, and other communication disabled citizens

Ethnic rights: by recognizing the unique cultures and traditions of Myanmar’s indigenous people

A broad policy preamble was also prepared, and both are being elaborated as part of the new LESC Initiative in Myanmar (see below) for the development of a Peace Building and Social Cohesion Promoting National Language Policy in Myanmar.

6.3.2 Evaluations

The evaluation sheets filled in by participants are characterized by optimism and enthusiasm for the entire process. Participants were extremely positive with regards to the quality, knowledge and effectiveness
of the presenters and facilitator. Overall, it was noted by participants that the atmosphere was friendly and conducive to effective and positive learning and that difficult initial positions were negotiated expertly and resolved effectively.

While participants had a broad spread of activities they commended, some sessions and topics had the deepest effect and impression. These tended to be policy oriented topics on apparently problematical or intractably difficult question related to multilingualism. In particular participants evaluated highest those sessions that focused on practical problem solving methods. The key ones were: how to reconcile the national official language with the claim for mother tongue-based rights, how to measure learning achievements and standards while acknowledging multilingualism. Also much commented on positively was the answers provided in the Dialogue on how to do collective policy writing in which ‘many hands’ are invited to participate.

Participant expressed, in both presentations and group activities, that the above were the high points of the dialogue. Participants also found examples provided from other countries’ responses to multilingual challenges to be helpful in providing important alternatives and options for language and educational responses in Myanmar. With some specific exceptions, the overall feedback from the participants was that the role of ethnic languages in education needed more attention. It was also noted that in order to deal with such complicated issues, the length of the dialogue was insufficient. It was noted that three to four days for such a workshop with its important policy writing aims would be more appropriate than two days. It was also expressed by some participants that they would benefit from a follow up workshop that looked more specifically at exclusive participation of policymakers and government officials, particularly with regards to ethnic children and the use of mother tongue learning in schools (See Appendix 12).
Processes for alleviating language challenges

Language is a factor in conflict in several key ways. Some of these are overt and evident, while others camouflaged. This is because language is both an expression of identity, as well as a tool to access cultural, symbolic, political and material resources. Academic language is the source of children’s advances in literacy and education (Tochon 2014), while specialized language enables adults to enter trade, occupational or professional fields. Language is also the means through which narratives of nation building are produced, so it plays a critical role in providing people with access to citizenship and political engagement and participation. Another key role for language is in the dissemination and perpetuation of culture and religion. As language and language-related decisions can be used to include or exclude people, they are key determinants in marginalization, but, also in social cohesion and breaking down societal barriers. Existing language-related tensions can then be exacerbated further by failing to discuss problems openly and respectfully, leading to further feelings of marginalization and cultural minimization.

Language and ethnicity differences are often present in conflicts and their failed resolution has exacerbated these conflicts by eroding trust in national institutions and between groups in society. The evidence for this is clear in the overt grievances of various armed groups in the three countries of the LESC Initiative (Lo Bianco 2015). Asia-wide documentation of ethnic conflicts shows that they rarely have a single causal explanation and that language itself is a phenomenon with multiple functions, simultaneously a symbol of ethnic and national identity and a practical tool for delivery of education and a tool for economic, social and political development. In an Asia-wide study of relations between language, identity and social conflict, Brown and Ganguly (2003) shows that different kinds of language planning can be critically important in language conflict. In this study, teams of researchers collected data across 15 Asia-Pacific countries to understand ethnic violence and concluded that in all but two of the 15 cases, governments dealt with ethnic language issues either ‘poorly’ or ‘disastrously’.

The LESC Initiative demonstrates that language plays a crucial role in conflict resolution. Although language status and language education can be a cause of conflict, or associated with and often compounding other conflicts, addressing difficult questions of language also proves to be an opportunity to resolve tensions and difficulties in related areas such as religion, ethnicity and socio-economic disparities as well as specifically language-focused problems.

However, the track record of language policymaking in Myanmar, as elsewhere, suggests that significant modification of the process of language planning is required to convert it into an instrument of conflict mitigation. Despite Myanmar’s focus on its national language and its development through the Myanmar
Language Commission, significant challenges remain for minority languages and new methods and practices of language planning are urgently required to foster national unity – methods which go far beyond ‘consultation’ as a modality of seeking endorsement or compliance of populations. There has been serious disparity between the perceptions of minority groups and officials as to the aims and experience of language education.

The LESC Initiative in Myanmar, and the significant progress that has been made across state-level, as well as Union-wide contexts, confirms that language problems and hostilities based on language questions can be relieved through focused and well-prepared interventions, particularly when framed in the general interest of enhancing social cohesion, resilience and fostering national unity.

The Facilitated Dialogues and other activities undertaken in Myanmar have shown an extremely high level of success in addressing these by a method of examining realistically achievable objectives against policy declarations and education documents and by exploring areas through which language issues and tensions can be accommodated and facilitated. It is an odd feature of language policy formulation that some specific questions of dispute are about symbolic representations of language, and others are about the presence of language as an almost silent or invisible aspect of social inequalities. We might contrast these as the ‘standing’ or representative nature of languages (what they are called and perceived to be, national, official, ethnic, regional, global, indigenous, identity etc., and other appellations) on the one hand, and the abilities produced by schooling and higher education that make possible high levels of educational attainment, employment and professional material success. Language questions span this vast range and therefore only a subtle and comprehensive approach to the content of language policy as well as its effects can aspire to realistically address language-related challenges.
Outcomes

The LESC Initiative has shown that language policy processes can play a vital role in generating consensus, trust, and collaborative approaches to decision-making and enactment, which can lead to greater educational outcomes for children and improve social cohesion. The Initiative has shown that the content and process of language problem alleviation can be achieved through focused and well-prepared interventions and research-based guidance in collaborative processes of decision-making (Figure 1), as enacted through the Facilitated Dialogues, policy forums, workshops, bilateral meetings and consultations.

The expert, organized structure of the Facilitated Dialogues allowed for constructive and positive relationships to be formed between many stakeholders, creating a sense of ownership and agency around language and education. They helped establish a dialogue space, which was previously absent, where MLE issues can be discussed. Through the Dialogues, the participants developed an understanding

Figure 1: Processes and outcomes of Facilitated Dialogues

- Language planning and policy development
- Collaborative decision-making
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilitated Dialogues</th>
<th>Information sessions on language planning and policy and multilingual education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy Forums</td>
<td>Knowledge sharing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilateral meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Understanding of differing stakeholder values</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Constructive engagement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Engagement with academic research and evidence in language and literacy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Increased sense of ability to effect change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Increased trust</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Convergence of ideas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Consensus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Collaborative action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Fostering a culture of dialogue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Scrutiny of existing models of good practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of the mechanisms of language planning processes, including status, corpus and acquisition planning in
the context of multilingual societies, and were able to move towards more collaborative processes.
These processes stimulated the demand side for policy development on the part of government, at both
the technical and decision-making level; built trust among government, expert and civil groups; moved
debate beyond notions of impossible and unmanageable; as well as raising expectations that common
ground can be achieved.

The process, where some entrenched and negative views among government officials and ethnic groups
have been overcome, developed over a number of discussions and interactions. Initially an understanding
began to emerge of the possibility of constructing a shared vision and understanding among themselves,
and then moved towards collaborative discussions around the issues previously a point of disagreement.
Public officials admitted on several occasions that they had never before had the opportunity to hear a
reasoned case for mother tongue education; in many cases, such individuals reported to being ‘won over’
to the needs and challenges for minority groups. The experience of jointly authoring policy preambles and
declarations was universally considered a powerful practice of learning alternative ways of thinking, of
coming to appreciate the validity of different views and even the forging collaborations and friendships.

A particular outcome has been the persuasion of public officials that comprehensive multilingual language
policy can be prepared collaboratively at the national and state levels, with significant national benefits
in the education of minority children, improved social cohesion and greater impact on peacebuilding
through relationships between all sectors of society.
Recommendations

The most important recommendation emerging from the LESC Initiative is for the preparation of a peacebuilding and social cohesion promoting national language policy for Myanmar, allied to an international conference on language policy in multilingual and multicultural settings. Significant work has been undertaken through the initial LESC Initiative in establishing and developing relationships, trust and consensus; in identifying and negotiating aims and expectations; and in moving towards a common and harmonious representation of the language and education needs in Myanmar. The use of Facilitated Dialogues, policy environment scans, observations and interviews, field trips and community consultation have been key components of the original Initiative and would again form the cornerstone of a participatory process of language policy development by and for the people of Myanmar.

Crucial theoretical components to be supported in the language planning and policy activities are status planning, corpus planning and acquisition planning.

Status Planning involves a detailed examination of the legal constitutional position of languages within the Union of the Republic of Myanmar and discussions with relevant bodies in Government and at university level. It also needs to include a commentary on the scope and adequacy of current arrangements, as well as addressing questions of decentralization of administration and state-based activity on behalf of languages. Community and district patterns should also be reflected in the examination, as well as civil society and community needs, effectively combining bottom-up and top-down language planning;

Corpus Planning addresses the linguistic developmental needs of languages in Myanmar, from high order standardization to script, dissemination, and terminology in relation to very small and endangered languages, seeking, through consultation, to provide a detailed map of culture and language cultivation activities across the country, identifying areas which require improvement;

Acquisition Planning addresses issues of multilingual language acquisition including the national language – Myanmar, mother tongues other than Myanmar, the bilingualism involved for many students, literacy and academic requirements, the role of English and other international languages, and a particular focus on the special needs areas of deafness and visual impairment and their impact on communication.

Building on the initial inputs of the LESC Initiative the main outcomes of this new initiative should include:

- The development of Union level language policy
- The development of several state level language policies coordinated with the Union level policy through the NPT principles (see 6.3.1)
• The development of model policies for other states and districts of the country based on the above
• Integrated implementation plans at state and Union levels, responding to a series of identified language and communication challenges
• A suite of integrated policy documents, envisaged to consist of two volumes
• Documented outcomes from the conference, and
• Other publications and information provision, including research reports, language maps, and other material as required.

Most importantly, language policies and language education should take account of the need for all students to:

i) gain full access to the knowledge and skills imparted through the curriculum;
ii) gain full literacy and speaking competence in the mother tongue, the national language and English;
iii) gain the awareness to conduct conversations in an inclusive and harmonious way that recognizes the rights and opportunities of all people.
Mon case study

The Mon State case study was designed to explore the prospects of modelling a positive approach to language education policy development in a location that is relatively compact and stable. Mon State was also chosen because of its willingness to participate in and host the activity of localized policy development. The LESC activities were designed to explore alternatives to the mandated use of Myanmar as the exclusive medium of instruction in Mon State schools. Recent legislative changes in Mon State have allowed teaching of the Mon language to recommence in state schools, along with other ethnic languages, including Pa-O and Karen languages.

The Mon State LESC case study was undertaken in order to establish the feasibility of locally driven, collaborative language policy development at the state level in Myanmar, with the intention of producing an accessible model of language policy development for ethnic groups and states to adopt across Myanmar. Mon State provided an ideal location for this activity as community groups and non-state authorities had already undertaken considerable work in establishing “extensive ethno-nationalist-oriented school systems running parallel to those of the official state system” (Lall and South 2014, pp. 298–299). The Mon National Education Committee has also established informal partnerships with local government schools in areas with Mon-speaking populations. These ‘mixed’ schools cater to Mon speakers by teaching the national curriculum, but also by offering extra modules on the Mon languages and history.

As a result, many of the parties involved were amenable to exploring the possibilities of progressing language-related issues in the Mon State education system, but were also interested in broader social issues in the region and Union-wide. The involvement of interested parties in the Mon State in this LESC activity has proved extremely effective. From its origins as a small case study within the larger LESC Initiative, the Mon State language policy activity has achieved significant outcomes, and now forms a key component of a much broader extension of the LESC Initiative, the development of a *Peace Building and Social Cohesion Promoting National Language Policy in Myanmar, 2015-2016*. The Mon State language policy and preamble now serves as a template for other State-based language policies, working in conjunction with the incipient National language policy.

The achievements of the Mon State case study are reported above, this section provides a more detailed picture of the specific setting, challenges and processes undertaken by the LESC Initiative in Mon State.

10.1 Mon language and identity

The Mon language holds a special significance for Myanmar. The Mon language has a long history in the broader Asia-Pacific region, with its writing system forming the basis of the current national language.
Old Mon is a script dated as far back as the sixth century, with inscriptions located on the current territory of Thailand at Nakhon Pathom and Saraburi (Bauer 1991). The language was widely used in late antiquity. Up to the twelfth century, Mon was the lingua franca of some south central areas of modern Myanmar. These areas included the crucial Ayeyarwaddy River valleys, modern Bago and Bagan Kingdoms. Even after the fall of Mon Kingdoms the language was supported by Bagan rulers, especially Kyansittha during whose reign, 1084 to 1113, the Mon orthography was adopted as the basis for elaborating a written form of the Myanmar language (Jenny 2013).

Demographic changes across the region, particularly along the Ayeyarwaddy Delta, and the influx of accompanying languages, resulted in the Mon language acting as a ‘donor’ to other languages. This occurred through the use of the Mon writing system, as well as through language contact at the level of the grammar and lexicon (words). The Mon language was also a recipient of these types of exchanges as well (Jenny 2013). It should be noted that there is sociolinguistic variation for Mon. As well as a Thai version of Mon, there are also three dialect forms of Mon within Myanmar all of which are mutually intelligible. These are usually called Central, Bago and Ye forms of Mon.

Over time, the influence of Mon began to lessen, which was exacerbated by the political control of the British Empire. While other ethnic nationality communities “were the objects of patronage from missionaries, and later state administrators, resulting in the promotion of indigenous language use and related processes of identity consolidation” (Lall and South 2014, p. 308), Mon was not a beneficiary of these processes. Language use became confined to traditional family and community life within more homogenous Mon speaking areas. Monks played a critical role in recording the Mon language and history, including religious history and remain to this day a key source of Mon language maintenance and education (Lall and South 2014; South 2003).

National independence after 1948 precipitated a much steeper decline in the language. The sociolinguistic effect of rapid changes caused by independence is such that today there is a great discrepancy between the numbers who claim Mon ethnicity and those who use the Mon language. South (2003) reported that the actual number of Mon speakers was “between 60-80,000”, which would not necessarily constitute serious language endangerment (Lo Bianco 2014). However, it is impossible to contrast this with the percentage of the wider Myanmar population who identify themselves as ethnic Mons, the numbers of actual Mon speakers of a young age and other figures related to linguistic vitality as the data is not reliably available (Lo Bianco 2014). South’s calculation contrasts with the Ethnologue report which summarizes the number of people using the Mon language as, “743,000 in Myanmar (2004)” although this number is decreasing. The Ethnologue report also states that the total Mon population in all countries is approximately 851,000, with an ethnic population of 1,000,000 (Lewis, Simons, and Fennig 2015). Bradley (2015) calculates the numbers at 400,000 plus. In all these calculations it is clear that Mon language knowledge and usage is vastly reduced when speakers are contrasted to the number of people who identify as ethnically Mon. The Ethnologue listing classifies Mon at level 5 or ‘Developing’, which is defined as:

“The language is in vigorous use, with literature in a standardized form being used by some though this is not yet widespread or sustainable” and in its Mon summary specifically says of Mon: “Vigorous in some rural areas and in Three Pagodas border area. Low or no usage in urban centers. Many domains in some communities; only among the elderly, in the monastery, or not at all in other communities. All ages. Positive attitudes. Widespread bilingualism; some language shift. Also use Burmese,” (Lewis, Simons, and Fennig 2015).
The geographic distribution between rural and urban is a telling and important danger signal, but Mon is spoken by young people and enjoys positive attitudes, both of which could be promising for future revitalization. The classification ‘Developing’ is point 5 on the 10 point (13 when we include subsidiary classifications) Expanded Graded Intergenerational Disruption Scale in which 0 is the highest point, marking the highest level of vitality, in effect the lowest point of endangerment, and 10 as ‘extinct’ (see Lo Bianco 2014 for an extended discussion of classifications and documentation of language endangerment).

These developments around the Mon language are not mirrored in relation to ethnicity and culture, since a vibrant Mon identity or a Mon people are and have been considered a distinct ethnic presence within the wider Myanmar/Burmese-Indochinese setting since the fall the Peguan (Bagan) Empire in the 1800s (Hla 1992).

Overall, the period since national independence has proved deleterious to the language, due mainly to the promotion of exclusive use of the Myanmar language, causing extensive attrition in the spoken domains of Mon. While not all scholars agree, there is a widespread view that Mon should be considered an endangered language due to its declining number of daily users, restricted domains for its use, and its association with rebellion against the policies of the military governments that have tried to impose linguistic uniformity. Prior to recent political ceasefires, Mon was only strong in areas where rebel forces had gained control and established separatist education, especially those close to the Thai border. Since establishment of a state parliament there have been many new moves to revitalize Mon, to encourage and expand its use. In 2013, for the first time in 50 years, the Than Lwin Times, a newspaper based in Mawlamyine, began publishing a small number of its pages in Mon, alongside the national language (Mizzima 2013).

One of the most positive outcomes for the Mon language since the 1995 ceasefire in the Mon State has been the development of models of mother tongue-based education. The New Mon State Party (NMSP) administers more than 150 Mon National Schools, which provide mother tongue education at the early primary levels, with students learning in the national language from the middle primary years. The advantage of this model is that it enables students to continue their education and to take the national matriculation examinations, allowing access to higher education. Additionally, as detailed above, the Mon National Education Committee has established informal relationships with over 100 government schools, whereby Mon speaking students study the national curriculum, but are provided with additional instruction on Mon language and history (Lall and South 2014). In the estimation of Lall and South (2014), the Mon education experience is a ‘useful model’ for wider education reform in the transitional state of national education across Myanmar, and especially in its efforts to negotiate a form of decentralized delivery of services.

10.2 The Mon State

After years of armed conflict and campaigning, a distinct Mon State was eventually established in 1974, becoming the “second smallest ethnic state in Burma, but also the most densely populated” (South 2003, p. 7). The Mon nationalist political movement was built on demands to preserve the unique heritage of culture and languages. As South (2003, p. 23) states, “To be Mon is to identify with a certain territory, with a distinct civilization and culture nearly two thousand years old, and with the Theravada Buddhist religion.”
Partly as a consequence of the prestige attached to Mon culture, the new Mon State is relatively wealthy and unified, often ranked above national averages on social development indicators. Students from the state often achieve top results in the national school examinations (UNICEF 2015). This is in part due to the establishment of local committees who have assumed responsibility for education during the violent conflicts that have beset the region since national independence. Since its establishment as a distinct state, ethnic, cultural and literacy committees and organizations have become instrumental in leveraging government to gain the right to teach, learn and participate in mother tongue language learning and cultural activities. These groups not only lobby for the political power to self-determination and for economic equality, but are also crucial in expressing the desire to revive and celebrate Mon cultural and linguistic heritages (Pedersen 2008, p. 52). While international attention often frames Myanmar’s conflicts as struggles between democracy and autocracy, many of Myanmar’s ethnic minorities, including the Mon people, are focused more on establishing their rights to “practice their own cultures, including language, literature, and religion, all of which are crucial to ethnic identities” (Pedersen 2008, p. 56).

10.3 Language policy challenges in Mon State

The underlying aims of the LESC Initiative in Mon State were to build an understanding of language and its role as a gatekeeper of greater social, educational and economic benefits. This included developing an understanding and consensus around the importance of mother tongue education. It also aimed to bridge the gap between the practices and desires of Mon speakers and educators, and reconcile the use of Mon with the national language as the medium of instruction.

The Mon State recently passed legislation promoting teaching of Mon language in state-run schools for the first time in more than 50 years. Mon is only taught for one hour each day in primary school up to Grade 4, but this start is crucially important to providing more educational opportunities for children whose first language is Mon. The bill also provides ethnic Pa-O and Karen people living in Mon State the opportunity to study their ethnic languages at school, which presents an opportunity to expand provision of mother tongue-based MLE across Myanmar (UNICEF 2015). Exploring alternatives to the mandated use of Myanmar as exclusive medium of instruction in state schools is critical because it has been a significant barrier for children from non-Myanmar speaking households enrolled in primary grades (UNICEF 2015). This exclusion has also been a barrier for students entering high school and results in school dropouts and poor results in national schools, especially for predominantly Mon-speaking areas in the southern and more rural parts of the State (UNICEF 2015).

While the introduction of one hour of instruction in Mon each day is a positive move, there is still somewhat limited, but slowly increasing, cooperation between Mon National Education Committee schools and the state sector (UNICEF 2015). Increases have been seen in the training and financial support for teachers, as well as the provision of increased funding for schools. However, a far more comprehensive approach to language planning and policy is required in order to systematically and sustainably advance language-related tensions at the educational and broader societal level, and was the focus of the LESC Initiative in Mon State.
Additional developments

An extension of the original LESC Initiative is underway in 2015–16. The objectives of the LESC extension are the development of peacebuilding and social cohesion promoting language policies in Myanmar at the national level, as well as at the state level in some instances. The Initiative is detailed below, along with a graphic overview of the process (Figure 2) and overview of language policy development process:

As outlined in Figure 2 following, the language policy process will consist of three key components:

1. Development of the language policy principles through consultation with the relevant working groups and the incorporation of feedback and questionnaire feedback.

2. Dialogues and consultations – this component of the project will involve carrying out
   a. Facilitated Dialogues in a number of states
   b. Union-wide Facilitated Dialogues; the first Dialogue to seek feedback and discussion of draft principles for language policy and their endorsement and a second Dialogue to discuss, modify and endorse the final policy draft
   c. Field trips at the state level for policy input negotiations
   d. Consultations in relation to a special needs component to the language policy

3. The commissioning of four specialist inputs to inform the above steps through detailed papers written by experts on a sociolinguistic map of the languages of Myanmar, English and its role in Myanmar society, special needs and inclusive education provision, as well as a case study and photo essay of MLE practices in Myanmar.

The final policy document, as detailed in Figure 3 below, will consist of a range of integrated but separate publications. It is envisaged that these would appear in separate volumes. The first will be compromised of the policy goals – the nationally agreed and endorsed principles for a Union-wide language policy. Related and integrated state level policies for a number of states will be included.

Following from field visits and other consultation processes and the above, state models will be templates for language policy development processes in general and for states/districts and other parts of Myanmar to devise locally relevant applications. This compendium, either in the same volume or separately, will also include an action-implementation plan and donor promises to support the overall plan or individual components.
Figure 2: Overview of policy development process

**Facilitated Dialogue**
- Union-wide (x3)
- Mon state (x3)
- Kayin state (x3)
- Special needs consultations (x2)
- Shan and Kachin state field trips
- Action in other states

**Specialist inputs**
- The languages of Myanmar
- English in Myanmar and ASEAN
- Special needs (deafness and visual impairment)
- Case studies of multilingualism, at community and local school level
- Policy Environment Scan

**Consultation**
- Circulation of principles with working groups
- Incorporation of feedback and questionnaire responses
- Observations, Field Visits, Interviews, Policy

**Draft language policy**
(fusing and incorporating all of these processes and inputs, preparing and consulting on implementation plans, for endorsement at the 2nd Union Wide FD)

---

Figure 3: Myanmar language policy and documentation process

**Policy & Principles**
Union, State (Mon and Kaying) + Templates approx 30 pages

**Action Plan**
50 pages: including overall action plan, elaborations of key points in the policy, donor promises to support components of, e.g. UNESCO, UNICEF, DFID, British Council, JICA & CIDA

**Commissioned papers, documents, essays**
~150 pages: To include all commissioned inputs (sociolinguistics of Myanmar; English in Myanmar and ASEAN, special needs, case studies, photo essays, profiles of key initiatives and agencies, reflections and observations, and details of the entire process and participants involved.)
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Appendix 1: Concept note: Language, Education and Social Cohesion: Myanmar (English and Myanmar versions)

Concept Note

Dr Joseph Lo Bianco, AM
Professor of Language and Literacy Education
Graduate School of Education
University of Melbourne

Introduction

This ‘concept note’ reports the initial orientation to research and related activities of the Language, Education and Social Cohesion (LESC) initiative, a component of the UNICEF East Asia and Pacific Regional Office (EAPRO) Education and Social Cohesion multi-country project. This initiative is part of the international Peacebuilding, Education and Advocacy Programme, supported by UNICEF in 14 counties globally and aims to address underlying issues that lead to education systems building peace and social cohesion — or exacerbating existing tensions which can lead to conflict. In the case of this multi-country initiative, this includes a review of language policy and planning, citizenship and ethnicity concerns in educational contexts.

Four UNICEF Country Offices replied positively to the invitation to participate in the ‘language and ethnicity’ component of the EAPRO project: Malaysia, Myanmar, Solomon Islands and Thailand. Each country can describe and title the initiative differently — selecting terms such as social cohesion, citizenship, integration of minorities, or ‘peacebuilding’ according to local preferences and priorities, given that different terms can have quite different meanings in different contexts and cultures and that some terms are politically and culturally ‘loaded’. Language, Education and Social Cohesion (LESC) is a temporary title of convenience to allow the project to get underway.

Preparatory research, document collection, expert consultations and other preliminaries has commenced for all four country sites involved in LESC. In-country familiarization visits and consultations with public officials, school level personnel and research agencies were undertaken in December 2012 in Thailand and Malaysia. This concept note represents the initial phase for the Myanmar component of LESC.
Project Context

The overall programme has been funded by the Government of the Netherlands in response to a UNICEF Headquarters proposal, which defines Education for Peacebuilding to include both Social Cohesion and Resilience with direct links to the broader issues of Disaster Risk Reduction and emergency preparedness and response, of language policies and social exclusion (including gender) in education, of educational and socio-economic disparities, and of building on the dividends of peace.

Common to all four countries involved in LESC is research and ‘intervention’ activities exploring policy and planning, current practices and prevailing attitudes and values related to language throughout education systems, with a view to their context in civil society, public policy and the labour market so far as these condition and shape language and ethnicity issues.

Myanmar Context

LESC research and intervention activities will take place in the context of the Government of Myanmar initiative, supported by diverse Development Partners, to undertake a Comprehensive Education Sector Review (CESR), as part of a general national reform agenda whose principal aim is to raise economic and social development. An overarching goal of this process and related reform agendas currently underway is to foster the development of a “modern developed nation through education” (Myanmar Ministry of Education, vision statement, 2004) and the wider 30 Year Long Term Basic Education Development Plan, 2001–2031. Critically relevant are the overarching constitutional provisions for the national language, for multilingualism and for the distribution and outcomes of education provision and employment/economic opportunity.

The Myanmar sociolinguistic profile is very complex, comprising more than 110 spoken languages (accompanied by an unknown number of sign languages), with seven main ‘ethnic’ language clusters Chin, Kachin, Kayah (Karenni), Kayin (Karen), Mon, Rakhine and Shan, spoken by more than 23 million people and distributed within correspondingly named State administrations (Lewis 2009). Another group of about 11 languages can be identified with speaker populations exceeding 100,000 each. Within this great diversity there are a large number of nested dialects and many highly variable multi-literate realities, including many languages lacking orthographic standardization (Burling 2003). The national language, Myanmar, is represented across the national territory, claiming 32 million speakers but highly variable rates of knowledge of its standard forms, and of its literacy.

The nature of cross-language bilingualism/multilingualism, and knowledge of foreign languages, knowledge of and use of ‘proximal’ languages (Chinese and Indian languages), are distributed in a highly variable pattern of urban/rural and shaped by education levels, occupation and mobility (Bradley 1997; Lewis 2009). A true sociolinguistic profile would also need to be sensitive to levels and distribution of sign languages, communication systems for the language disabled and other communication questions that impact on access to education or training, and prospects of access to remunerated employment.
LESC and the CESR

The on-going Rapid Assessment phase of the CESR, which will be completed in early 2013, will inform LESC activity, which could conceivably be seen as a key element of CESR Phases II and/or III, intended to last through to December 2013 and mid-2014 respectively.

LESC will take a comprehensive language planning approach, involving early childhood education, primary schooling and post-primary education. It will aim to offer concrete methods of language planning to support multi-lingual education in ethnic minority languages, in Myanmar (national language) and in strategic foreign languages (i.e., English as primary grade subjects, and as medium of instruction in grades 10 and 11) - guided by the principles elaborated below. A comprehensive approach will be prepared in consultation with all relevant policy, community and research interests in the Myanmar context looking at:

- Integrated language and literacy education (medium of instruction, relation of first, second and additional languages, links between literacy and curriculum content, pedagogy, notions of bilingualism and conceptual development, identity and inter-culturalism, transition points and sequencing in curriculum, etc);
- The Myanmar reform priority, as I understand it presently, is to shift from English to bilingual (Myanmar/English) medium in mathematical and science subjects in upper secondary grades; this too and related questions of assessment, training and materials development should comprise part of the comprehensive approach;
- The beginning point will be to explore outcome proficiency skills desired by the community of interests (speaker groups, policy makers, researchers, etc) in relation to the likely communicative outcomes from current provision with proposals for overcoming gaps and deficiencies identified;
- The work will be sensitive to questions of literacy, concept development and school participation; equity and access; drop out and discontinuation and re-entry possibilities; identity and citizenship; and economy and labour market questions;
- The approach will be guided by principles of effective language outcomes, language rights and opportunities, social cohesion and national unity in the context of the recognition of diversity and pluralism and the opportunity for all, mainstream and minority populations alike, to gain the spoken proficiency, literate and cultural knowledge and skills to support equal opportunity and full participation in national life;

The overarching objective should be to foster and integrated, coordinated and comprehensive evidence-based policy on language education; with facilitated deliberations to gain stakeholder commitment to the aims and requirements of full and effective implementation.

Proposed Method and Approach

In keeping with the LESC approach in Thailand and Malaysia the research phases of the LESC will address the following three spheres:
Questions of context - essentially socio-linguistic, but also economic, and political issues. Scripts, literature, literacy, diglossia, who speaks what to whom, the local status of language and the wider status of languages nationally, national language issues and language ecology in proximal areas should all be considered.

Questions of feasibility - essentially to be pragmatic, what is realistic? Consider issues of education and training systems for pre-, primary, secondary, post; technical and university; as well as practical issues around teachers, curriculum and programme models. What are some technological and new media possibilities?

Questions of purpose - exactly why are we pursuing bilingual education? What are the i) socio-cultural, ii) economic-political and iii) educational aims, desires, expectations, experiences and each of these three spheres can be seen from insider and outsider perspectives. In facilitated deliberations, the aim will be to gain stakeholder commitment to an overarching and integrated national language education policy.

These three spheres will be used to develop categories of 'question', which in turn will be informed in each setting by sampling of documentation related to the following sources to produce a credible research and evidence basis for informing public policy.

- Legal Texts - constitution, education act, citizenship (to answer the question: what is the authorizing remit for the activity);
- Central Jurisdiction - Ministries of Education (curriculum, textbooks, indigenous minorities), Ministry of Culture (indigenous affairs, internal affairs), Language Apex body (NL as L2)—Academic Centres, Ethnic Centres, Local Schools, headmasters and teachers; to answer questions on the sphere of administration and cultural authority for the activity);
- Civil Society: Religious, Social, Business, Labour, etc (as above);
- Devolved Jurisdiction: District literacy and education support and delivery agencies, Ethnic organizations (to answer the question, what can be reliably delivered);
- Supra-National: RELC, ASEAN, UN agencies, NGOs
- Public Media: Press and other reporting
- Academic Sources: PhD theses, published academic works

The processes to be followed will include the following:

- Desk review – collecting and reviewing a wide range of documentation to include critical literature and document review pertaining to education and language policies and practices, to education and peace building, social cohesions and resilience and to education for ethnic groups and linguistic minorities in different contexts;
- Initial visits to NPT and Yangon, as well as to 1-2 States/Regions for stakeholder and key informant interviews, additional document compilation, identification of additional key informants and issues, and planning for follow up visits
- Follow up visits for more in depth interviews and data collection, including with local leaders, Headmasters, etc.
- Sharing of initial findings, analysis and recommendations and preparation of Report
- Preparation for and eventual implementation of facilitated deliberations around comprehensive language education planning and policy.
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စီးပွားရေးနှင့် စိုက်ပျိုးရေးအတွက် လူ့စုစုပေါင်းသပ်ခင်းတို့အတွက် အမ်ိဳးသားအဖြစ် LESC ဦးဆောင်လွှာရေးသောစပ်လွာသည့် တစိုးတိုက်အဖြစ်တည်ဆောက်အား။

သက်ဆိုင်သည် ဘာသာစကား၊ စီးပွားရေးအပါအဝင် ဘာသာစကားကို ပေါ်စပ်ဖြဲ႕စည်ထားပြီး စိုက်ပျိုးရေးစိုက်ပျိုးရေး၏

ကျယ်၊

မြန် ဗိ缅甸 Country Report

စိုက်ပျိုးရေးစိုက်ပျိုးရေးကိုဆိုင်ရာ သုံးသန်းများ၏စကားျပာ ဗိုလ်မီးခန္႔ရွိသည့် စာျပမ်းစံု ဗိုလ်မီးအေျခခံဥပေဒကို ဆိုက်ကိုင့်သံုးျပဳမႈ ပိုမိုမ်ိဳးခန္႔ရွိသည့် စာျပမ်းစံု ကြဲျပားျခားနားမႈစနစ္တိက်စြာကြဲျပားမႈက်င့္သံုးျပားျဖင့္တိုးတက္ေစရန္ သတ္မွတ္ထားျခင္းမရွိသည့္ ၁၀၀ ႏွင့္ ဦးေရသာ ျပည္သူမ်ားက အဓိကမ်ားစြာကိုလည္း သေကၤတတိုးတက္ေသာ ၁၀၀၄ လုပ္ငန္းစဥ္မ်ားသည္ ရွိေသာ အလြန္ရွမ္းႏွင့္ ပံုစံမွာ ဘာသာစကားမ်ားကို ရခိုင္ (က်မ္းကိုး Lewis, 2009) အလုပ္အကိုင္ သတ္မွတ္ေထြးသည့္ တိုင္းရင္းသားမတူညီသည့္ အမ်ိဳးသားကို သတ္မွတ္ထားျခင္းမရွိသည့္ ၁၀၀ ကို ျမန္မာႏိုင္ငံ ရည္မွန္ခ်က္ထားသည့္ မြန္ အေျခခံပညာေရးစနစ္အဓိက ၀၀၀ ေက်ာ္စီ လုပ္ငန္းစဥ္မ်ားအစိတ္အပိုင္းတစိုးကို ရခိုင္ (က်မ္းကိုး Burling, 2003) စီးပြားေရးစိုက်ပျိုးရေး၏ စိုက်ပျိုးရေးစိုက်ပျိုးရေးကို ဆိုင်ရာ သုံးသန်းများသည္ေျဖစ္ပါသည္။
ဗဟုသုတ်သည် တစ်နာရီ ဦးတည်ခ်က္မွာ ေအာက္ပါတို႔ ပံုစံအမွန္တြင္ ေအာက္ပါတို႔ကို ရွိပါသည္။

LESC နှင့် CESR

LESC အတွက် အားလုံးသည် သဘာ၀မ္းျခံဳႏိုင္ေသာ (Grade 10) နှင့် အားလုံးသည် သဘာ၀မ္းျခံဳႏိုင္ေသာ (Grade 11) ကိုယ္စားျပီး ရွိပါသည္။
ကိုးကွယ်ပံ့ပိုးႏိုင္ရန္ထံုးတမ္းစဥ္လား

- အယ်ဒါမေးခြန္းမ်ား၊ ယဥ္ေက်းမႈခ်င္းအကူးအေျပာင္း ျပဳလုပ္ရမည့္ ေနရာမ်ားႏွင့္ ၄င္းသည္လည္း ေလ့လာဆန္းစစ္ခ်က္ ေမးခြန္းမ်ားကၽြမ္းက်င္တတ္ေျမာက္မႈအစိတ္အပိုင္းတစ္ခုခ်ိဳ႕ယြင္းခ်က္မ်ားအဂၤလိပ္ဘာသာမွ သခ်ၤာဘာသာႏွင့္ နားလည္ထားသည္တို႕ ဤဘက္စံုလႊမ္းျခံဳႏိုင္ေသာလုပ္ေဆာင္ရာတြင္ ေအာက္ပါတို႔ကို အစရွိသည့္စမွတ္တစ္ခု ျမန္မာႏိုငံ၏ ျပန္လည္တည္ေဆာက္ေရးတိုးတက္ဖြံ႔ျဖိဳးမႈႏွင့္ ေက်ာင္း၏ရပိုင္ခြင့္တာ၀န္မ်ား၊ ဘာသာစကားဆိုင္ရာထိန္းကြပ္ရမည္ျဖစ္သည္။ ေမးခြန္းမ်ားေမးရန္၊ ရည္ရြယ္ပါသည္။

- အေျခအေနတို႔ ဘာသာစကားအေနျဖင့္ အပ္ႏိုင္သည့္စိတ္ၾကိဳက္ေရြးခ်ယ္ထားသည့္ ဘာသာစကားဆိုင္ရာစာေပ ေပါင္းစပ္ထားသည့္ ထုတ္ေဖၚေပးထားသည့္ သင္ၾကားမႈနည္းပညာ၊ သာတူညီမွ်အျဖစ္ ေပါင္းစပ္ပါးကြပါသည္။ နွစ္ဘာသာ (ျမန္မာဆက္ႏြယ္မႈႏွင့္ ဘက္စံုလႊမ္းျခံဳႏိုင္ေသာနည္းလမ္းတစ္ခုကို ေအာက္ပါမူ၀ါဒ၊ အရ ဘာသာစကားေျပာဆိုသူမ်ား၊ ဆက္ဆံေရး အခြင့္အေရးမ်ားႏွင့္ ထိေရာက္ေသာအရ ျပဳလုပ္ထားသည့္ဖြံၿဖိဳးတိုးတက္မႈသည္ အထက္တန္းလက္ရွိရလဒ္မ်ားႏွင့္ စီမံကိန္းေရးဆြဲျခင္းကိုယ္ပိုင္ထံုးတမ္းမ်ား၊ အတြက္/အဂၤလိ္ပ္အစီအစဥ္မ်ား ပံ့ပိုးမႈမ်ားအား ေျဖရွင္းရမည့္အေပၚပညာေရး၏ ဘာသာစကား အဆိုုျပဳခ်က္မ်ား ျဖင့္တြဲ၍ ဦးစားေပးအခ်က္မွာ သင္ရိုး၀င္အခ်က္မ်ားႏွင့္ လူမႈအဖြဲ႔အစည္းတစ္ခုခုတြင္လုပ္ပိုင္ခြင့္မ်ား၊ ထံုးတမ္းစဥ္လာမ်ားႏွင့္ ျမန္မာႏိုငံ၏ သင္ၾကားမႈ ဘက္စံုလႊမ္းျခံဳႏိုင္ေသာနည္းလမ္းဒုတိယဦးစားေပး ဆက္စပ္ေနပါသည္။ သိန ေျပာင္းလဲမူ၀ါဒခ်မွတ္သူမ်ား၊ (သင္ၾကားပို႔ခ်ရာတြင္ သုေတသန ဟာကြက္မ်ား ဥပေဒသမ်ားျဖင့္ ရပ္နား ျခင္းတိက်ခိုင္မာစြာ သင္ၾကားမႈႏွင့္ သုေတသီမ်ား သေဘာထား ရွိရမည့္ကၽြႏ္ုပ္ ႏွစ္မ်ိဳး တို႔ျဖင့္)
အများအားလုံးများ လေ့လာခြင်း မှုတ်ထားသည်။ အမှတ်အသားများလည်း ပိုမိုက်င့်ကြည့်ရှုလိုသည်။
ျပည္မ်ားလည္းပါဝင္ရမည္ျဖစ္သည္။

မည့္အရာမ်ားသည္နည္းပညာအရ ျဖစ္ႏိုင္ေရွိပါသည်။

ရည္ရြယ္ခ်က္မွာေပါင္းစပ္ဖြဲ႔စည္ေသာအမ်ိဳးသားဘာသာစကားဆိုင္ရာပညာေရးမူ၀ါဒ ျဖစ္ေပၚလာေစရန္အတြက္ပါဝင္လုပ္ေဆာင္သူမ်ားထံမွကတိက၀တ္ရရွိရန္ျဖစ္သည္။

အထက္ပါလုပ္ငန္းနယ္ပယ္သံုးခုသည္ေမးခြန္းဟူေသာအမ်ိဳးအစားကိုတည္ေဆာက္ရန္အတြက္အသံုးျပဳရွိပါသည္။

၄င္းတို႕မွတဖန္ ေအာက္ပါအရင္းအျမစ္မ်ားႏွင့္သက္ဆိုင္ေသာစာရြက္စာတမ္းနမူနာထုတ္ေပးျခင္းျဖင့္အခင္းအက်င္းတစ္ခုစီအတြက္သတင္းအခ်က္အလက္မ်ားျပန္လည္ေပးပါသည္။

၄င္းတို႕ႏွင့္ယံုၾကည္စိတ္ခ်ရေသာသုေတသနႏွင့္အမ်ားျပည္သူႏွင့္ဆိုင္ေသာမူ၀ါဒမ်ားကိုအသိေပးအေၾကာင္းၾကားရန္တို႔အတြက္အေထာက္အထားကိုအေျခခံထားေသာသတင္းအခ်က္အလက္မ်ားျဖစ္သည္။

ဥပေဒစာသားမ်ား- ပညာေရးအက္ဥပေဒ၊ ႏိုင္ငံသားခံယူခြင့္(လုပ္ေဆာင္မႈမ်ားအတြက္မည့္အလုပ္မ်ားကိုခြင့္ျပဳထားသနည္းဟူေသာေမးခြန္းကိုျဖရန္ျဖစ္သည္။

ဗဟုအုပ္ခ်ဳပ္ေရးႏွင့္ယဥ္ေက်းမႈဆိုင္ရာအာဏာပိုင္မ်ားနွင့္ပက္သက္သည့္လုပ္ငန္းနယ္ပယ္မ်ားအတြက္မုဒ္မၾကာငံုပ္(NL as L2) အက္ဥပေဒ၊အလုပ္သမားေရးစသည္(အထက္တြင္ေဖၚျပျပီးသည့္အတိုင္းျဖစ္သည္။
• အင်္ဂါပါယ်အပါအဝင် စီး (သို့မဟုတ်ပါဝင်သည်ဖြစ်သော အက်ကီးရှားသော စီး) - အသီးသီးစီးမှုများနှင့် သိုလှောင်ခြင်းရှိသော အချက် (သို့မဟုတ် သို့မဟုတ်များ ဖြစ်နေသော အချက်) တွင်
• ရာဇဝင်အောင် အစိုးရအဖွဲ့ - အမွေအောက် အကြီးချင်း (REL) အဖွဲ့ (ASEAN) ကို လိုအပ်သော အခြေခံအဖွဲ့ NGO များ
• အစိုးရ - ရာဇဝင်အောင် အစိုးရာစီ
• သီးခြားသော အစိုးရအဖွဲ့ - အစိုးရ အစိုးရကို သီးခြားသော အစိုးရ အဖွဲ့


Appendix 2: Organizations and offices consulted for the LESC Myanmar Initiative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position/Office</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian Development Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AusAid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Embassy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be Lin Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDTC, Mudon Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Education Advisor to the President/Special Advisor to Myanmar Peace Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chin Association for Christian Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Education Sector Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting in International Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBE 1, 2 and 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Social Welfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Social Welfare, Mawlamyine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept of Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Basic Education No.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Basic Education No.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Basic Education No.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Education Planning and Training (DEPT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Law, Yangon University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Myanmar Education Research Bureau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Planning and Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Social Welfare, Naypyitaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Education Office, Mawlamyine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Foreign Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon Language and Literacy Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon National Education Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon State Education Office, Malwlamyine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon State Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mudon Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar Education Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar Literacy Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar Peace Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naing Lalar Middle Village, Thahton Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Edu Law Team Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nit Kaing Primary School, Thanphyuzayut Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Network for Educational Reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.1 Middle School, La Mai, Yay Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.1 Sein Taung, Mudon Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyein Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palaung Language and Literacy Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliament (three houses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Point B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyoepin Programme, British Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sagaing University of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Save the Children, Pyopin, Shalom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shan Language and Literacy Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shan, Kachin, Kayin, Mon, Chin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIL International &amp; Payap University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smile Education Training Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOAS University of London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Pao Language and Literacy Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swinburne University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thahton Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thanphyuzayut Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thar Yar Kone, Thahton Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thaw Ka Pa Ra Hi Ta, Belin Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The National Assembly Office of Vietnam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF - Vietnam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF-Yangon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF-Mawlamyine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universit of Vienna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University for the Development of the National Races of the Union (UDNR), Sagaing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Amsterdam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Victoria - Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Yangon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Yangon Department of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wai Yar Hai Basic Primary School, Yay Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Yangon University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yangon Institute of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yangon University of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yay Township</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3: Agenda Mae Sot Facilitated Dialogue

Language Rights. Language Planning. Language Policy. Language Education

Eastern Burma Community Schools

Facilitated Dialogue under the auspices of the UNICEF Peacebuilding, Education and Advocacy Program; Language Education and Social Cohesion Initiative

Dates: 12, 13, 14 February 2014
Location: Mae Sot, Thailand

Facilitator and Chair: Professor Joseph Lo Bianco

ยินดีต้อนรับ
Welcome
Aims and Objectives

To collectively debate, draft and adopt a consensus position on the aims and content of language policy, such as a position paper or declaration, and related media and public statements.

To deepen understanding of the forms and possibilities of language planning for fostering peace and justice.

To enhance and improve the educational lives of children, supporting their learning of ethnic languages, the Union language and English.

To identify, define and examine issues that must be tackled to foster effective language planning.

To encourage consensus on action, research and teaching required for socially just, educationally effective language planning.

Further develop our working knowledge of MLB-MLE with an eye at developing a pan-ethnic policy document on ‘ethnic education’.
### Agenda, Day One
**Wednesday, 12 February 2014**

**FOCUS: LANGUAGE PROBLEMS AND ISSUES**

We will be discussing our challenges in multilingual education, literacy, preserving endangered languages and influencing Myanmar/Burma policy development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SESSION</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>FORMAT</th>
<th>DETAIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AM 9:00-9:30</td>
<td>Official Opening</td>
<td>Speeches of Welcome</td>
<td>Ambassador of Canada Founder of School Scott O’Brien</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1 AM 9:40-10:30</td>
<td>Self-presentations Introduction to Workshop Icebreaker Visioning Exercise Expectations for Friday</td>
<td>Facilitator presentations to whole group with translation World Café Tables with hosts</td>
<td>Child: 2014 PowerPoint # 1: Facilitation &amp; Dialogues PowerPoint # 2: Methods PowerPoint # 3: Our Agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BREAK AM 10:30-10:45</td>
<td>Coffee/tea break</td>
<td>Coffee/tea break</td>
<td>Coffee/tea break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2 AM 10:45-12:00</td>
<td>Language Problems Language Issues</td>
<td>Facilitator presentation: whole group Brainstorming General Discussion, whole group and with hosts at tables</td>
<td>PowerPoint # 4: Language planning and policy Facilitator: EBCS LP model; components of a LP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUNCH</td>
<td>PM 12:00-1:00</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>Lunch Hosts and Facilitators to Organise PM activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 3 PM 1:00-2:45</td>
<td>Write Policy preamble</td>
<td>At tables with hosts</td>
<td>Child: 2026</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BREAK PM 2:45-3:00</td>
<td>Coffee/tea break</td>
<td>Coffee/tea break</td>
<td>Coffee/tea break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 4 PM 3:00-4:00</td>
<td>Language Planning and Language Policy What can the community do? What can officials do? What can schools do?</td>
<td>Storyboarding language problems/issues with hosts at tables</td>
<td>Converting language issues/problems into a narrative. Organise and classify language problems. Tables to work on sets of problems.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 5 PM 4:00-4:30</td>
<td>Wrap Up</td>
<td>Facilitator to Summarise Day and Plan Day 2</td>
<td>PowerPoint # 5: Community/Expert/Official</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DINNER</td>
<td>PM 5:00-6:30</td>
<td>Dinner</td>
<td>Dinner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Agenda, Day Two
**Thursday, 13 February 2014**

**FOCUS: LANGUAGE POLICY AND PLANNING**

We will be building on the problems and issues raised on day one to write a consensus statement and model language policy. We will focus on multilingual education in schools and classrooms; multilingualism in the community; how children think and develop in more than one language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SESSION</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>FORMAT</th>
<th>DETAIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#6</td>
<td>AM 9:00-10:30</td>
<td>• Input on bilingualism in education and society</td>
<td>Facilitator presentation Q/A</td>
<td>• Power Point # 6: Mother Tongue, Bilingual Education, Language Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BREAK</td>
<td>AM 10:30-10:45</td>
<td>Coffee/tea break</td>
<td>Coffee/tea break</td>
<td>Coffee/tea break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7</td>
<td>AM 10:45-12:00</td>
<td>• Merge Table LP drafts</td>
<td>General Discussion, whole group and with hosts at tables</td>
<td>Working with Day One records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUNCH</td>
<td>PM 12:00-1:00</td>
<td>LUNCH</td>
<td>LUNCH Hosts and Facilitator meet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#8</td>
<td>PM 1:00-2:45</td>
<td>• Begin Full merge of policy draft</td>
<td>General Discussion, whole group and with hosts at tables</td>
<td>Display developing policy position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BREAK</td>
<td>PM 2:45-3:15</td>
<td>Coffee/tea break</td>
<td>Coffee/tea break</td>
<td>Coffee/tea break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#9</td>
<td>PM 3:15-4:45</td>
<td>• Complete model policy draft</td>
<td>With hosts at tables in whole group session led by facilitator</td>
<td>Presentations from hosts or table reporters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DINNER</td>
<td>PM 5:00-6:30</td>
<td>Dinner</td>
<td>Dinner</td>
<td>Dinner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Agenda, Day Three
Friday, 14 February 2014

**FOCUS: LANGUAGE PROMOTION AND DISSEMINATION**

We will aim to adopt a model language policy statement, to prepare a public declaration on this statement to promote it with government, local and international community organisations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SESSION</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>FORMAT</th>
<th>DETAIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| #10      | AM 9:00-10:30 | Finalizing and agreeing policy | Reports, Debate and decision making | • Reviewing policy  
• Reflecting on effect on children                                      |
| BREAK    | AM 10:30-10:45 | Coffee/tea break | Coffee/tea break | Coffee/tea break                                                        |
| #11      | AM 10:45-12:00 | • Preparation of Media Announcement  
• Preparation of Declaration | Facilitator led whole group and at tables with hosts | • State level differences and variation: what more needs to be done?  
• Local level and site specific policy and training?                |
| LUNCH    | PM 12:00-1:00 | LUNCH     | LUNCH                      | LUNCH                                                                  |
| #12      | PM 1:00-2:45  | Anticipating government reaction | Open discussion about achievement and next steps: facilitator led | • Sharpening our arguments  
• What research is needed?  
• Alliances and collaboration                                       |
| BREAK    | PM 2:45-3:00  | Coffee/tea break | Coffee/tea break | Coffee/tea break                                                        |
| #13      | PM 3:00-4:00  | Rehearsing public presentation | Possible simulation |                                                                               |
| #14      | PM 4:00-4:30  | Wrap Up, Future Action | Facilitator to Summarise | • What are problems we haven’t dealt with?  
• What is missing?  
• Go public? How?                                                   |
| DINNER   | PM 5:00-6:30  | Dinner | Dinner                      | Dinner                                                                  |
Appendix 4:
MINE press release
(English and Myanmar versions)

“Its MINE”: Indigenous groups claim their rights through new network for education in Myanmar.

The Myanmar/Burma Indigenous Network for Education – MINE – was launched on Friday 21st February, International Mother language day. An ethnic education seminar hosted by the Karen Teacher Working Group (KTWG) in Mae Sot from 12–14 February led to the creation of MINE. The seminar was facilitated by Dr Joseph Lo Bianco, Professor of Language and Literacy Education University of Melbourne and a consultant and expert in Language and Peace building. Ethnic education leaders from 22 organisations attended, with 12 different ethnic groups represented. “I am very encouraged by the level of enthusiasm of the group and the cooperation and participation in exploring different ways to preserve and promote our mother tongue language,” said Lway Naw Chee, MINE Spokesperson.

A Declaration for Ethnic Language and Education was drafted during the meeting and will be released shortly. The Declaration and a key objective for MINE is promoting Indigenous language rights in schools and beyond. Although the promotion of Indigenous language rights is at the heart of MINE, the network also recognises the importance of education in Burmese and English language and is seeking a Tri-lingual language policy for the Union. “MINE is an exciting development for us. We have struggled for our language and culture rights for so long and without success. Now with MINE we have the support of our other Indigenous brothers and sisters,” a MINE member said. “Recognizing our language and culture rights is important to us, but is also essential if there is going to be peace and stability in Myanmar/Burma,” added Saw Kapi, a spokesperson for MINE.

Individual ethnic groups have been struggling for their language and cultural rights for many years inside Burma. Each group has a different experience about education, unique in their area, but there are also many common experiences amongst the groups. “With MINE we can share our experiences and work together across different Indigenous groups. We will work together to advocate for culturally appropriate education for our children. Most importantly, schooling for our children in their own languages.” said Naw Ler Htu, KTWG Chairperson and MINE member. “International research clearly shows that Mother tongue based education in the early years of school is essential for children to learn well. It promotes better learning across all school subjects, keeps children in school and improves quality of second and third language acquisition,” said Saw Kapi. “Children learn best in all subjects and are more engaged when taught in their mother tongue. If children have a strong base in their own languages, they can master other languages, such as Burmese and English, when these are introduced, initially as subjects and later as languages of instruction,” he added.

Although there are some small changes happening in certain parts of the country, the current official government policy does not allow learning in the mother tongue or use of mother tongue in the delivery
of government services more generally. “MINE would like to work with the government and the international community in Myanmar/Burma to see this change. We would like the official government policy to allow our children to access culturally appropriate and MTB-MLE (mother tongue based, multilingual education) and access to services in our mother language. Our aim is to ensure that ethnic school children have the right to mother tongue education and to establish a tri-lingual education system in our country, where diverse ethnic nationalities co-exist,” Saw Kapi said.

On International Mother Language Day, MINE is calling for:

- Comprehensive language planning to support preservation of Indigenous languages and improve learning of Burmese and English by indigenous people.
- A tri-lingual education system in our country, promoting the language of the Union and English along with the Indigenous group’s mother tongue.
- Indigenous children to have the right to education in their mother tongue.
- The right for ethnic school children to be taught using an inclusive curriculum, which values their own culture.
- Indigenous language studies and departments to be available at the University level.
- Research and resources to help develop mother languages so they can be used to teach a variety of subjects.
- The right for Indigenous people to produce their own culturally appropriate curriculums and to produce texts in their own language for use in schools.
- The inclusion of Indigenous language and culture rights in the Constitution.

Contact:

Saw Kapi  
Email: sawkapi@gmail.com

Lway Naw Chee  
Phone: Myanmar: +95821759214  
Thailand: +66821759214
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Appendix 5:
Ethnic Languages and Education Declaration (MINE) (English and Myanmar versions)

Myanmar/Burma Indigenous Network for Education

Released June 15 2014

1. Preamble

The Myanmar/Burma Indigenous Network for Education was established during an Ethnic Education Seminar convened by the Karen Teacher Working Group as part of the Eastern Burma Community Schooling Project, between 12–14 February 2014.

The seminar was attended by sixty four people from 22 organizations interested in education and language rights, with twelve ethnic national groups from across Myanmar/Burma represented. By the end of the seminar, participants reached a consensus on this Declaration that covers ethnic education and language rights and propose a language policy for implementation in Myanmar/Burma. The groups represented were:

(1) Mon National Education Committee, MNEC
(2) Karen Education Department, KED
(3) Karen Teacher Working Group, KTWG
(4) Karen Women’s Organization, KWO
(5) Karen Refugee Committee Education Entity, KRCEE
(6) Karenri Education Department, KnED
(7) Kayan New Generation Youth, KNGY
(8) Rural Development Foundation for Shan State, RDFSS
(9) Shan Women’s Action Network, SWAN (10) Shan State Development Foundation, SSDF
(11) Gawng Loe Mu: 3 Mountains, Wa
(12) Pa-Oh Literature and Culture Committee (Taungyi)
(13) Akha Literature and Culture Committee
(14) Pa-Oh Monastic Education (Hopone)
(15) Shannan Education Networking Group, SENG
(16) Lahu Women’s Organization, LWO
(17) Ta’ang Student & Youth Organization, TSYO
(18) Kachin Independence Organisation Education Department, KIO-ED
In this Declaration, MINE recognizes the importance of multilingual education in Myanmar so that the diverse ethnic nationalities can maintain their mother tongue, but also prosper in the wider society and in the regional and global community by learning the language of the Union and English. MINE agrees with UNESCO’s three guiding principles held in its Education in a Multilingual World (2003) paper, namely: “mother tongue instruction” to improve the quality and outcomes of education by building schooling on the knowledge and experience of learners; “bilingual and or multilingual education” to promote social and gender equality in public education; and “intercultural education” to encourage understanding between various population groups.

In this Declaration, MINE describes the current situation of schooling for Indigenous children and youth in remote, ethnic nationality areas of Myanmar/Burma and then sets out a framework of recommended actions to be taken.

2. Context

The over 60 million citizens of Myanmar live in one of the world’s most diverse countries. Ethnologue estimates there are 116 living languages in Myanmar representing five language families: Sino-Tibetan, Austro-Asiatic, Tai–Kadai, Indo-European, and Austronesian. Although there are a lack of current and reliable figures pending the coming census, it is estimated that over one third of the population speaks a mother tongue other than the language of the Union, Myanmar. Despite this, Myanmar language has the institutional support of the education system and national laws, and is used as medium of instruction in the national education system throughout the country, even in areas where primarily indigenous languages are spoken.

The schooling situation in Myanmar/Burma is complex and as diverse as its ethnic make-up. The government school system exists in some but not all ethnic areas, usually in or near to towns. Schooling in remote areas, where available, is mostly run by the community, religious institutions or non-state actors. Where there has been conflict with the Burma Army, there are less likely to be government schools, although this is changing during the current transitional/ceasefire period as more government schools are opened. In territories administered by ethnic non-state actors, the language of instruction and the texts used are usually in the local mother tongue language. Otherwise, the language of instruction and the texts are in Myanmar.

2.1 Global Situation

Over the past decades, there is growing international consensus towards indigenous rights in general and indigenous education rights in particular. The United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples states that Indigenous people should be able to practice their cultural traditions and use their languages in education and should not be forced into assimilation (Article 14, UNDRIP 2008). The
Barcelona Declaration on Universal Linguistic Rights under UNESCO supports all language communities to maintain their languages, educate their children and develop their culture.

2.2 Regional Situation

In the South East Asian Economic Outlook by the Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD 2012) Myanmar lags behind other ASEAN states in trade, health and education as one of the poorest countries in the region.

ASEAN has adopted a language policy making English the official working language of the Association. In 2014, Myanmar takes the rotating chair of ASEAN. For the people of Burma this means that English is becoming even more important. For ethnic minorities this means knowing at least three languages, the mother tongue, Burmese and English, and sometimes the dominant ethnic language in their areas also.

2.3 National Situation

The current Constitution of Myanmar in Chapter 1 at Clause number 28.C, “The Union shall implement free compulsory primary education.” This principle is a basis for future development of education language rights for Indigenous people in Burma. However, the current Constitution does not protect the right to a culturally sensitive education in the “mother tongue”.

Myanmar’s Ministry of Education has adopted Education for All Action Plan (2003-2015) aimed at implementing the Millennium Development Goal that every child in the world should “complete a full cycle of basic education of good quality.” As part of Myanmar’s overall “reform agenda” in the past years the Government adopted Comprehensive Education Sector Review (CESR) so that education can raise the “overall level of social and economic development in the country, with a focus on human development.” (Lo Bianco 2013b).

For these goals to be achieved these achievements to be made, education for indigenous groups also needs to be prioritized and urgent action needs to be taken.

The current government education policy and curricula are based on Myanmar language. Indigenous students in government schools who don’t speak Myanmar as a first language struggle to succeed at school. Children learn better when taught in their mother tongue. Furthermore, as the government curriculum reflects the social and cultural values of the Burman majority, Indigenous children are further estranged from curricular content, already made inaccessible because of language barriers.

The National Network for Education Reform (NNER) shares this view. On February 1st, 2014 after its “Ethnic Language Teaching” seminar, NNER stated “children’s mother tongue should be used as the medium of instruction in order for ethnic children to be effective in their studies and balance the teaching of national and international language skills. On March 28th, the NNER rejected a government-drafted education bill. While the bill contains some possibilities for local language, literature and culture inclusion in schools, control over basic education remains at the central level. Decentralization is essential to ensure that key decisions such as for language of instruction and local curriculum, can be made locally so that schooling is responsive to the needs of the children and communities it is meant to serve. The Bill also lists Myanmar as the language of instruction at every school level. If passed in its current form, the
Bill will deny indigenous children a quality education by removing their right to access education in their own mother tongue.

### 2.3.1 Language of instruction

Indigenous languages are often not permitted to be spoken in the classroom, taught as subjects at school or used as languages of instruction in government schools. While permission has been given to teach local languages out of school hours in a few limited areas, for most Indigenous students in government schools, learning a curriculum whose content is outside their lived experiences and delivered in a language in which they lack fluency is difficult. Children learn much better when taught, especially throughout the primary level, in their mother tongue.

### 2.3.2 School Texts

Government school textbooks are not produced in mother tongues and are not culturally relevant to Indigenous children. History and culture is taught from a Myanmar Burman perspective. Burman cultural traditions are taught in place of local ones. School children are not taught a range of historical perspectives and cultural traditions that are at play in their lives outside of schools. This devalues indigenous children's cultural identity and limits the potential to understand and appreciate Myanmar’s diversity.

### 2.3.3 Quality of education

Classrooms nationwide lack adequate teaching materials and school facilities. This is even more acute in remote areas. Nationwide, there is also a lack of teaching skills and knowledge that encourages teaching by rote and rigid adherence to curricular texts. Again, this situation is more pronounced in Indigenous areas where inexperienced government teachers lacking local knowledge, language and relationships rely on linear applications of the curriculum without the capacity to adapt it to meet the learning needs of students.

### 2.3.4 Lack of skilled teachers

The number of qualified and even unqualified teachers is insufficient for large numbers of students resulting in very large classrooms sizes. This problem is worse in remote ethnic areas. There is also a shortage of government teachers who can speak ethnic languages in ethnic areas and schools. There is a government internship program, where many teachers come to rural areas for practice and to gain a promotion. When Government teachers are sent to local and ethnic areas they don’t understand the languages and culture of the communities, and this results in difficulties for communities, the teachers and a poor quality of education for the children. Teachers must understand the language and the culture in the areas they are working.

### 2.3.5 Indigenous languages and scripts

Throughout the country there is a plurality of competing and co-existing languages being used in everyday life. This reality, in itself, puts greater stress on smaller language groups needing to cope with larger, more widely used local languages in their areas as well as Myanmar, the language of the Union. Government institutions and services that only accept the use of Myanmar reinforce the preference and prominence
of Myanmar language over other languages. This makes government services inaccessible to many people at the same time diminishing the value of local languages. In this way, Indigenous languages are left to be spoken only at home or in the village with parents and elders. This puts ethnic languages in further danger as they are designated to family and village but not for society at large.

Where Indigenous scripts exist, it is the older generation, and to a much lesser extent the youth, who is usually literate in them. The shift from traditional institutions to formal education means that schooling has taken prominence in terms knowledge transmission to the younger generation. This shift means a change in the content and process of knowledge transmission away from local knowledge and language. Many teachers do not know local languages and scripts and this makes it difficult to be able to teach the children. People need support in language planning to achieve multilingualism in school so children can be educated and languages properly supported.

3. Principles

In the UNESCO position paper, Education in a Multilingual World (UNESCO 2003), there are three guiding principles:

- “mother tongue instruction” to improve the quality and outcomes of education by building schooling on the knowledge and experience of learners;
- “bilingual and or multilingual education” to promote social and gender equality in public education; and
- “intercultural education” to encourage understanding between various population groups.

MINE supports these principles and recognizes that for indigenous language and culture to survive and for indigenous peoples to prosper, education must be mother tongue based, particularly in the early years of schooling. It is very important, because students require a multilingual education studying at least three languages, the mother tongue, Myanmar and English beginning with mother tongue facilitating second and third language learning. Mother tongue instruction fosters better learning outcomes for students, as well as better social and cultural outcomes. Research shows the best language to use for minority children is the mother tongue (Kosonen 2005; UNESCO 2003; World Bank 2005), and the evidence from Sri Lanka shows that teaching in the mother tongue improves the literacy of girls, rural students, minorities and the poor (Lo Bianco 2011).

MINE recognizes the importance of multilingual education in Myanmar so that the diverse ethnic nationalities can maintain their mother tongue, but also prosper in the wider society and in the regional and global community by learning the language of the Union and English. Given the recent history of conflict between the Government of Myanmar and ethnic nationality groups, promotion of indigenous languages, identities and cultures through the education system is one of the best ways to ensure peace in Myanmar’s future. MINE is calling for national language policy of multilingualism in which children learn their mother tongue, English and Myanmar as a minimum in schools. MINE is calling for a language policy that ensures that the mother tongue is the language of instruction in early childhood and early grades of school with Myanmar language taught as a subject. Gradually Myanmar language can be included as a language of instruction, but mother tongue should be maintained as language of instruction in some subjects. Then when the child is literate in the mother tongue, Myanmar and English can also be added.
MINE also supports intercultural education as a way of fostering understanding and peace between Myanmar’s diverse ethnic groups. This Declaration supports the effort to promote culture and language diversity, with equal treatment of every ethnic language, and education success for all children.

4. Goals and Objectives

MINE calls for the following goals to be included within Myanmar/Burma’s national education policy:

• The right to mother tongue education in the earliest years of schooling and continued throughout education.
• The right to learn the Union language of Burmese equally well with the main community of the Union for equal rights to citizenship.
• The right to learn English as the international language and the main language of ASEAN.
• National language planning to promote preservation of ethnic languages and cultures and peace in Myanmar.

The diversity of Myanmar’s indigenous groups and their unique situations, means that there should be language and education planning at the top and local levels, with principles that are shared across the country adopted nationally, but then adapted to take account of local differences and needs. The principles of national language planning should engage the entire national community to promote ethnic rights, economic development and peaceful co-existence. The use of mother tongue should be allowed not just in education, but also at all levels of society. This will encourage inclusion and common citizenship, ensuring space for the rights of indigenous people.

Planning needs to capture the diversity of mother tongues in some areas where schools will require instruction in multiple languages. While challenging, the Indian model demonstrates that is possible to have a functioning classroom where two or more languages of instruction are used. This requires multi-lingual teachers, most likely from the local area, who, where necessary, are supported by local language assistants ensuring that all children can learn in their mother tongues.

If the current education policy persists, Indigenous youth will become increasingly marginalized, if not excluded, from accessing a quality education that is the right of every child of Myanmar. A mother tongue based, multilingual education policy is an inclusive one promoting the “Education for All” policy adopted by the Government of Myanmar/Burma.

5. Action

The Government of Myanmar and civil society are working towards wide reaching reforms to education throughout the country. MINE calls for the following actions to be considered and entrenched in national education policy reforms.
5.1 Teaching and Learning

- Improve quality of education through access to mother tongue based, multilingual education
- Local level planning to ensure instruction is available in all students mother tongues
- Support for use of teacher assistants and teaching aides to help students learn Burmese and maintain their mother tongue as they study the national curriculum
- Link English teaching to mother tongue and Myanmar language
- Support training for teachers in ethnic nationality areas in at least three languages – mother tongue, Myanmar and English
- Culturally appropriate education inclusive of local epistemologies, histories and cultural traditions/practices
- Develop an inclusive national curriculum promoting Myanmar’s diverse ethnicities, histories, languages and cultures
- Improve teacher capacity through pre-service training and continual professional development for Indigenous areas
- Increase support for and employment of local teachers who can speak and teach Indigenous mother tongue
- Increase learning of Indigenous languages by teachers and recruit native language speakers into teacher training programs
- Develop child-centred learning practices and improve teaching methods in government schools
- Urgent requirement to increase teacher salaries to improve commitment to and quality of teaching while reducing the practice of bribery of students

5.2 Research

- Research to support best practices of mother tongue based multilingual education and language planning
- Establish a national research committee including ethnic representatives and ensure that language policy is one of its priority research areas
- Include the perspectives, stories and achievements of ethnic nationalities in the history curriculum
- Promote research to support the special needs of smaller language groups and vulnerable language communities
- Research to facilitate language planning on Indigenous language scripts and vocabulary development
- Research on common forms of language within existing Indigenous groups and in local areas with diverse languages
- Research exploring strategies of creating opportunities to apply mother language widely in daily life

5.3 Assistance to individual languages

- Fund oral history research and the revitalization and preservation of Indigenous languages in cooperation with older generations
- Assistance for language planning on script and terminology to permit mother tongue teaching across a variety of subject areas
• Support to maintain and promote local names (towns, territories, etc) to strengthen local history and identity

5.4 Advisory Structures

• Form a board of linguistic experts to advise Indigenous education groups
• Advisory structures should include ethnic representatives
• Initiate and support Literacy and Culture committees to develop mother tongue languages

5.5 Ethnic Education Systems

• For the short to medium term at least, maintain existing community and ethnic nationality schools and do not replace them with government schools
• Encourage collaboration between community and ethnic nationality schools and school systems and the government school system to improve education delivery Recognize and support community, religious and non-state actor administered schools
• Allocate budget for teacher stipends and teaching & learning materials for community, religious and non-state actor administered schools
• Support for school management and data collection for community, religious and non-state actor administered schools
• Support for local mother-tongue based curriculum development

5.6 Higher Education

• Indigenous study departments should be established at university level
• Create and support a Department of Indigenous Linguistics and Philosophy
• Create Bachelor and Master’s degree programs in linguistics for speakers of indigenous languages
• Grant the right to and encourage publication of indigenous literature

5.7 National Curriculum and Local Flexibility

• A multi-cultural national curriculum promoting harmony amongst all people of Myanmar/Burma and respect for different ethnicities, language and cultural traditions
• Central government to provide only guidance and standard setting with increased management and decision making authority at the State and local level Decentralization of authority over education to the State and local levels so that curriculum and teaching practices are applicable to the local context
• Allowance for and inclusion of local curriculum within the national curriculum (for example, 60% national and 40% local)
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- လူမှုများ၏ စိတ်ဝေါ်မှုကို မတိုက်နိုင်သော ဘာသာရပ်များကို အသုံးပြု၍ ပြုလုပ်ရန် လိုအပ်သည်။

Language Education and Social Cohesion (LESC) Initiative
• ႏိုငးငဵသာ့မ္ာ့ႏြငးံသကးဆိုငးေသာ (Social and gender equality) အစို့ရပညာေရ့စနစးတျငးလူမႈေရ့ႏြငးံက္ာ့မတနး့တူညီမြ္ေရ့
• ႏိုငးငဵတျငး့ရိြအမ္ိဳ့မ္ိဳ့ေသာလူမ္ိဳ့စုမ္ာ့အၾကာ့နာ့လညးမႈ်မြငံးတငးရနးအတျကးရို့ရာယဥးေက့္မႈအမ္ိဳ့မ္ိဳ့အေၾကာငး့အသိပညာေပ့်ခငး့ (Intercultural Education)

ဤေၾက်ငာစာတမး့တျငး MINE အဖျဲ႕မြ်မနးမာႏိုငဵေဝ့လဵေခါငး်ဖာ့ေဒသမ္ာ့တျငးေနထိုငးၾကေသာကေလ့သူငယးမ္ာ့ႏြငးံလူငယးလူရျယးမ္ာ့၌လကးရိြပညာသငးၾကာ့ေရ့အေ်ခအေနမ္ာ့ကိုဖား်ပထာ့ကာအႀကဵ်ပဳထာ့သာလုပးငနး့လုပးေဆာငးမႈမ္ာ့ေဘာငး (Framework of recommended actions) တစးရပးကိုုပါတငး်ပထာ့ပါသညး၈
လူသိမ်းစိုက်ပျိုးနိုင်ခြင်း (Context)

ဒေသတွင်းရာသိမ်းစိုက်ပျိုးမှုများကို တိုးတက်ပေးသော သူများသည် အနေဖြင့် အားလုံးခေါင်းဆောင်ရာတွင် အသုံးပြုသော ဘာသာစကားများကို အသုံးပြုကြသည်။ ထိုသို့နေ၍ Ethnologue စာရင်းအရ အနေဖြင့် အားလုံးခေါင်းဆောင်ရာတွင် အသုံးပြုသော ဘာသာစကားများကို (Language families) လေးဖြင့် အခေါ်မပြုကြသည်။ လူမျိုးစိုက်မှုအားဖြင့် အချက်များကို အသုံးပြုသော ဘာသာစကားများကို အားလုံးကို ဖော်ပြသည်။

- ဆိုး-သာဒေ (Sino-Tibetan)
- အာစို-သရာမီး (Austro-Asiatic)
- ဗြိတိန်-ကျော (Tai-Kadai)
- အင်း-ချောင်း (Indo-European)
- အလူးတိုင်း (Austronesian)

ကြီးစေရာနှင့် ပြုစုရာသို့မဟုတ် ဘာသာစကားများကို အားလုံးမှာ အထိမုန်းပါသည်။ လူသိမ်းစိုက်ပျိုးမှုကို မြန်မာ ဗားရှည်လမ်းများဖြင့်လည်း ပေါ်ထွန်းစေသည်။ လူသိမ်းစိုက်ပျိုးမှုကို အားလုံးကို အပေါ်ပြုသော ဘာသာစကား (Medium of instruction) ကို ဖော်ပြသည်။ အခြား လူသိမ်းစိုက်ပျိုးမှုများကို အသုံးပြုကြသည်။ လူသိမ်းစိုက်ပျိုးမှုများကို အားလုံးကို ဖော်ပြသည်။

Language Education and Social Cohesion (LESC) Initiative
Language Education and Social Cohesion (LESC) Initiative

Global Situation

Language Education and Social Cohesion (Global Situation)

The United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People (UNDRIP) (Article 14 UNDRIP, 2008) states that indigenous peoples have the right to determine their own programs, policies and administrative structures, and to have their own educational institutions, which are adequately resourced, and to develop their own curricula. UNESCO (Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD, 2012) reports that the Southeast Asian Economic Outlook shows that Myanmar’s education sector has made significant progress in recent years.

Regional Situation

Myanmar has made significant progress in recent years in the education sector. The Southeast Asian Economic Outlook reports that Myanmar’s education sector has made significant progress in recent years. UNESCO (Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD, 2012) reports that the Southeast Asian Economic Outlook shows that Myanmar’s education sector has made significant progress in recent years.
အတွက် ထိုအခါသည် အဂၤလိပ်ဘာသာစကာ့သည် ပိုမိုအေရ့ပါလာမညး ဆိုသည်ကို ပသလိုက်ပသလိုက်ဖစ်ပါသည်။

သည်၈ တိုင်ရင်းသာ့မိဳ့ႏျယးစုမိ့အတျက်အနညး့ဆဵု့ဘာသာစကာ့သံ မိခင်ဘာသာစကာ့ ၇ မနာ မိခင်စကာ့ႏြငးး အဂၤလိပ်ဘာသာစကာ့ ရဵဖနးရဵခါတျငး ၁ငး့တို႕ေဒသမိ့ရာစာမာ လျမး့မို့မႈအာ့ေကာငး့ေသာ တိုင်ရင်းသာ့ ဘာသာစကာ့တစ်မိ့မိ့ကို သိရိြနာ့လညး ထာ့ရန်ဖစ်ပါသည်၈.

ဇပ စာရင်းဒေသ (National Situation)

ယူ အစို့ရက်စက်မြွန်ချင်ခွင်းသံ၀ကရာစီး (၂၀၁၆) ကို အပိုင်းဖွဲ့နောက် စို့ချင်ကံ့၊ မြန်မာအောက်နေ အနာဂါတးကာလ၌ ပညာေပိ့က တျငး ပညာသင် လက်မောက့်ပါအတိုင်း ပိုမိုအေရ့ပါလာမညးကိုေတျ႔ရပါသည်၈.

ယူ အစို့ရက်စက်မြွန်ချင်ခွင်းသံ၀ကရာစီး၀ကရာစီး (၂၀၀၃-၂၀၁၅) အာ့အေလ့ထာ့ပီ့်ဖစ်သည်၇ မိ့ခြင်းအာ့ေအာကးပါအတိုင်း ခြင်းထာ့သည်ကိုေတျ႔ရပါသည်၈.

Lo Bianco, 2013b).
လူမှုညီမျှဝေးမှု (Language Education and Social Cohesion, LESC) အဖြစ် တိုက်ရိုက်ဆောင်ရွက်မှုကို အဖြစ်လိုအပ်သည်။

(Chapter 12, NNER report, #4) ဖြင့် စာသင်္ချာ စာချိန်များသည် အထောက်အထားများကို ဖြေရှင်းစေရန် အတူတပ်ဆင်ထားသည်။ LESC ကို ပြုလုပ်ခြင်းသည် မြန်မာ့အစို့အဆင့်များနှင့် အထောက်အထားများကို ဖန်တီးရန် အခြေအနေဖြင့် အထောက်အထားများကို ဖြေရှင်းစေရန် အတူတပ်ဆင်ထားသည်။

Language Education and Social Cohesion (LESC) Initiative
ဗမာဘာသာစကားကိုပထမဘာသာစကာ့ (First language) အားပေးပါရှိသော အမျိုးသားသောအထိအကြောင်းအရာများဖော်ပြသည်။ စိန့်ဝင်းနိုင်စေရန်မို့၊ မို့စို့သောအခါများကိုသာ အရှေ့ပြောင်းလဲထားသည်။

ဗမာဘာသာစကားကိုပထမဘာသာစကာ့ဖော်ပြသည် (The National Network for Education Reform (NNER)) ရှိကြသောလူမှုနေရာများမှ မြန်မာပြည်တွင် အခြေခံအဖြစ်အဖြစ် ပြောင်းလဲသည်။

ဗမာဘာသာစကားကိုပထမဘာသာစကာ့ဖော်ပြသည် (The National Network for Education Reform (NNER)) ရှိကြသော အခြေခံအဖြစ် ပြောင်းလဲသည်။

ဗမာဘာသာစကားကိုပထမဘာသာစကာ့ဖော်ပြသည် (The National Network for Education Reform (NNER)) ရှိကြသော အခြေခံအဖြစ် ပြောင်းလဲသည်။
လူမှုပညာရိုးထိန်း(Language of instruction)

သင်တင်ကားပေးသူကို အခက်အခဲမြောက်သော ဘာသာစကားကို သင်ယူပေးသည်။ ထိုစိုးမိုးယူချက်အပေါ် သင့်ကောင်းသူများကို အလေးများစွာ သင်ယူချက်၊ သင်ယူကြည့်ရှင်နှင့် သင်ယူချက်မှုများ အပေါ် သင်ယူချက်များကို ဖယ်ရှင်းပေးသည်။ သို့ပေါ် မိခင်ဘာသာစကားများကို သင်ယူပေးသည်။ သို့ပေါ် မိခင်ဘာသာစကားများကို သင်ယူချက်များကို ဖယ်ရှင်းပေးသည်။ သို့ပေါ် မိခင်ဘာသာစကားများကို သင်ယူချက်များကို ဖယ်ရှင်းပေးသည်။ သို့ပေါ် မိခင်ဘာသာစကားများကို သင်ယူချက်များကို ဖယ်ရှင်းပေးသည်။ သို့ပေါ် မိခင်ဘာသာစကားများကို သင်ယူချက်များကို ဖယ်ရှင်းပေးသည်။ သို့ပေါ် မိခင်ဘာသာစကားများကို သင်ယူချက်များကို ဖယ်ရှင်းပေးသည်။ သို့ပေါ် မိခင်ဘာသာစကားများကို သင်ယူချက်များကို ဖယ်ရှင်းပေးသည်။ သို့ပေါ် မိခင်ဘာသာစကားများကို သင်ယူချက်များကို ဖယ်ရှင်းပေးသည်။
ပေါ် အတွက် ကာကွယ်ရေး/စိုးစံရေးပြုလုပ်မှုများ ပြောင်းလဲသော စီးပွားရေး ဖော်ရောက်ရေးအရာများ

ပေါ် အတွက် ကာကွယ်ရေး/စိုးစံရေးပြုလုပ်မှုများ ပြောင်းလဲသော စီးပွားရေး ဖော်ရောက်ရေးအရာများ

ပေါ် အတွက် ကာကွယ်ရေး/စိုးစံရေးပြုလုပ်မှုများ ပြောင်းလဲသော စီးပွားရေး ဖော်ရောက်ရေးအရာများ

(1) စိုးစံရေးစုံစံများ(School Texts)

ကဗျာ့ အစို့ရေကြောင်းပြုလုပ်မှုအများတွင် ကြောင့်သော စိုးစံရေးစုံစံများ ပါဝင်လာပါသည်။ အင်းဆိုသော စိုးစံရေးစုံစံများ ပြောင်းလဲသော စီးပွားရေး ဖော်ရောက်ရေးအရာများ

(2) ကာကွယ်ရေး(Cultural identity)

ကဗျာ့ အစို့ရေကြောင်းပြုလုပ်မှုအများတွင် ကြောင့်သော စိုးစံရေးစုံစံများ ပါဝင်လာပါသည်။ အင်းဆိုသော စိုးစံရေးစုံစံများ ပြောင်းလဲသော စီးပွားရေး ဖော်ရောက်ရေးအရာများ

(3) စိုးစံရေးစုံစံများ(Teaching materials)

ကဗျာ့ အစို့ရေကြောင်းပြုလုပ်မှုအများတွင် ကြောင့်သော စိုးစံရေးစုံစံများ ပါဝင်လာပါသည်။ အင်းဆိုသော စိုးစံရေးစုံစံများ ပြောင်းလဲသော စီးပွားရေး ဖော်ရောက်ရေးအရာများ
လူ့အားလုံးမှ သိုလှောင်မှုများနှင့် လူ့အားလုံးကို ကူညီပေးရန် နေရာများ၏ အားလုံးကို အလိုအား ဆောင်ရွက်ရန်အတွက် မြန်မာ့စိုက်ပျိုးမှုများလာရောက်သည်။

(Child Centered Approach) အရည်အသွေးများကို ကူညီပေးရန်အတွက် သူငယ်သူများ၏ မှတ်ချက်များကို အောက်ပါသည်။

၁၆. မြန်မာ့စိုက်ပျိုးမှုများနှင့် လူ့အားလုံးကို ကူညီပေးရန်အတွက် (Lack of skilled teachers)

၁၇. မြန်မာ့စိုက်ပျိုးမှုများနှင့် လူ့အားလုံးကို ကူညီပေးရန်အတွက် (Lack of skilled teachers)
မြန်မာနိုင်ငံအသံ့ရာသီအားဖြင့် အရေးပေါ်သောအခက်အချင်းတွေကို လုပ်ဆောင်ပေးရန် အချင်းချင်းဆိုင်ရာ လေး လူချင်းစု၌ လျှောက်လာသော ဘာသာစကာ့အဖြစ် အုပ်ချုပ်ထားပေးထားသော (Dominant language) အချင်းအလားကို မြန်မာဘာသာစကာ့ဖြင့် အရေးပေါ်သော အချင်းချင်းနိုင်ငံ့ရာများအားဖြင့် ရေးသားထားသောစာပို့မႈများ သိရိြူးထားသော ရာမှော်စုံဖြင့် အစိုးရ အရေးပေါ်သော ဝန်ဆောင်မှု လုပ်ငန်းများ အာ့နည်းပါသည်။

ဗိုလ်ချုပ်ရေးဝန်းကျင် အရေးပေါ်သော အခက်အချင်းတွေကို မြန်မာနိုင်ငံတွင် အခြေခံပေးသော အခက်အချင်းများကို အသေးစိတ်ပေးသော သိပ္ပံရေးဆောင်ရာများဖြင့် အစိုးရ အရေးပေါ်သော အချင်းချင်းဆိုင်ရာ လေး လူချင်းစု၌ လျှောက်လာသော ဘာသာစကာ့ကို မြန်မာဘာသာစကာ့အဖြစ် ဗိုလ်ချုပ်ရေးဝန်းကျင်အစိုးရများ မီးအိုးမြင့်တည်ရေး ပေးကြည့်ပေးသည်။
မြန်မာဘာသာစကာ့တစ်ခုစီးပါသည် ဗမာစကာ့ကိုသည် တိုင်းရင်းသာ့မ္းပါလား ဆိုရန်သာနိုင်ပါသည်။

 Language Education and Social Cohesion (LESC) Initiative
• “ဘာသာစကာ့် (Bilingual and or multilingual education)”

• “ကျောင်းကျောင်းကြီး” (Intercultural education)

ရေးမှုအဖြစ်သည် အထက်ပါလမ်းညျန်းမူဝါဒမြာ့ကိုသေဘာတူေထာက်ချင်သည်

ရေးမှုအဖြစ်သည် အေနဖင့်မြင့်မာ့လာေရ့အတျကး အာ့ေပ့်ခငး့၈

မိခငးဘာသာစကာ့ကို အေ်ခ်ပဳရမညးဆိုသည်ကို အသိအမြတးပါပါသည်၈

မိခငးဘာသာစကာ့အေ်ခ်ပဳသင်ၾကာ့်ခငး့သည် ေက္ာငး့သာ့မ္ာ့၌သင်ၾကာ့သင်ယူမႈရလဒ်ေကာငး့မျနးေသာရလဒ််ဖစးထျနး့ေစပါသည်၈

ကြား တိုငး့ရငး့သာ့လူမႈအသိုငး့အွိုငး့တျငးပါသည်၈

ရို့ရာယဥးေက့္မႈအမ္ိဳ့မႈအေၾကာငး့အသိပညာေပ့်ခငး့

(UNESCO, 2003; World Bank, 2005) အေဝါင်းကျောင်းကျောင်းကြီး ကျောင်းကြီးကို သင်ယူထိနး့သိမး့ဒိုငးၾကၿပီ့ တစးခ္ိနးတညး့တျငးပငး

(Lo Bianco, 2011).
က္ယးေသာေဒသတျငး့နြငးံကမၻာံလူမႈအသိုငး့အွိုငး့တျငးပါ
တျငးက္ယးစျာဝငးဆဵဵလာႏိုငးၾကလိမးံမညးဟု
ဘာသာစကာ့မ္ိဳ့စဵုအသဵု့်ပဳေသာပညာေရ့စနစး၌အေရ့ပါမႈကို
MINEမြလကးခဵအသိအမြတး်ပဳထာ့ပါသညး၇
၂၀၈မနာ့စစးအစို့ရႏြငး့သာ့လူမႈမႈကိုတညးေဆာကးရနးေထာကးပဵ႕အာ့ေပ့သညးံ
နညး့လမး့တစးခု်ဖစးသညးဟုMINEမြေထာကးခဵမႈ်ပဳပါသညး၇
မတူကျဲ်ပာ့သညးံဘာသာစကာ့ႏြငးံယဥးေက့္မႈပါဝငးေသာပညာေရ့စနစး
(Intercultural education ) ဥၾက့ႀကိဳ့ပမး့မႈမ္ာ့ကိုမေထာကးခဵ၏ပါသည်၇
မြန်မာ့စိုက်ကျင်းများကို အာ့ခေ့ခြင်းများသာလွင်မာနာ့ကိုတွဲပေးကာ၊ သာလွင်မာနာ့အာ့လွဲကာ ၁၈ရန်မြန်မာ့စိုက်ကျင်းများကို အတွင်းဘာသာစီမဵကိနး့တစးရပးအရ ဗိသုကာအဆင့် (Local levels) တွင်းဝင်ပေးကာ၊ (Top level) ပေးအာ့ အာ့တွေ့ရိုက်ခိုင်းသူများကို ပြောင်းလဲနူး့ကာ၊ အဆင့်ကားသောနာ့ကို လူ့အဖျဲ႕အစည်းတစ်ရပးလွှတ်ပေးကာ၊ အဆင့်လေးကို တိုးတက်အာ့ကြောင့် စီ့ပျားလာတော့ကာ၊ မိခင်ဘာသာစကာ့ပေးအာ့ပေးသာမကဘဲ လူ့အဖျဲ႕အစည်း၌ အဆင့်လေးကို တိုးတက်ခံလာရိုက်ပြီး ၁င်းကြီးချင်းက တိုးတက်လျင်မာနာ့အာ့လွဲကာ တွေ့ရိုက်ခိုင်းသူများကို တွင်းဝင်ပေးကာ၊ (Inclusion) ဖြစ်ရိုက်အကားဖျင် (Common Citizenship) အာ့ကြောင့် အဆင့်လေးကို တိုးတက်ခံလာရိုက်ပြီး စီ့ပျားလာတော့ကာ၊ မိခင်ဘာသာစကာ့ပေးအာ့ပေးသာမကဘဲ လူ့အဖျဲ႕အစည်း၌ အဆင့်လေးကို တိုးတက်ခံလာရိုက်ပြီး ၁င်းကြီးချင်းက တိုးတက်လျင်မာနာ့အာ့ကြောင့် စီ့ပျားလာတော့ကာ,
သို့မဟုတ်ပညာရေး၊ (အင်္ဂလိပ်-သာရီ) ဗိုလ်ချုပ်ကြီးအနေဖြင့် သို့မဟုတ် ပညာရေး ဥပဒေ (Inclusion) ကို လိုအပ်နေသော (Common citizenship) အစိတ်အပိုင်းများအားလုံး စီမံခန့်ခွဲပေးသည်။ သရုပ်ဆောင်ပေးနေသောအား သင်္ကေတများဖြင့် ပညာရေး အားလုံးကို စာရင်းပေးသည်။

ပညာရေးအသီးသီးအပေါ် သင်္ကေတများ အတွက် အကြီးအကျယ်ကိုပေးထားပါသည်။ ဥပဒေ(Education for All Policy) ကို လိုအပ်နေသော (Language assistant)အလေးနက် သင်္ကေတများဖြင့် ပညာရေး အားလုံးကို စာရင်းပေးသည်။

Language Education and Social Cohesion (LESC) Initiative
Actions

1. Support educational curriculum reform and ensure the adequacy of educational materials and equipment in accordance with MINE standards.

2. Ensure the implementation of the national curriculum and monitor the progress of the educational system in line with the MINE requirements.

3. Provide linguistic assistance (Linguistic assistance) to students who require additional support in their language studies.

4. Support the training and development of assistant teachers (Assistant teachers) to enhance the quality of education.

5. Implement culturally appropriate education (Culturally appropriate education) to ensure that the educational programs are relevant to the local context.

Teaching and Learning

- Ensure the education system is in line with the MINE standards.

- Support the implementation of the national curriculum and monitor the progress of the educational system.

- Provide linguistic assistance (Linguistic assistance) to students who require additional support in their language studies.

- Support the training and development of assistant teachers (Assistant teachers) to enhance the quality of education.

- Implement culturally appropriate education (Culturally appropriate education) to ensure that the educational programs are relevant to the local context.
ဗဟုသုတပိုငး့ဆိုငးရာအေတျ့အေခ၍မ္ာ့ပညာေရ့အရညးအေသျ့တုိ့လစာကိုဆရာမမြဆရာမအတျကး

(Research)

MINE ဗိုလ်ချုပ်ကိုယ်စားလှယ်များ၏ ကျောင်းသားကိုယ်စားလှယ်များ၏ မိမိနိုင်ငံရေးရိုးရိုးမှုများကို ကျောင်းသားကိုယ်စားလှယ်များ၏ မိမိနိုင်ငံရေးရိုးရိုးမှုများကို ကျောင်းသားကိုယ်စားလှယ်များ၏
တိုင်ရင်သာ့မ္ိဳ့ႏျယးစုကိးစာ့လြယ်မ္ာ့ပါဝငးေသာ အမ္ိဳ့သာ့သုေတသနအဖျဲ႕ (National Research Committee) တစးရပးတညးေထာငးၿပီ့ ၁ငး့အဖျဲ႕မြသုေတသန်ပဳလုပးမညးံ ေလံလာမႈမႈတျငးဘာသာစကာ့ေပ၍လစီမူဝါဒကို ဦ့စာ့ေပ့ထညးံသျငး့ထာ့ရိြရန၈း ၏အေတျ့အ်မငးမ္ာ့၇ ပဵု်ပငးမ္ာ့ႏြငးံ ေအာငး်မငးမႈမ္ာ့ကိုပါထညးံသျငး့သငးၾကာ့ေစရနး၈ ၏၃၄၈ ေက္ာငး့သမိုငး့သငးရို့ႏြငးံသငးခနး့စာမ္ာ့တျငးတိုငး့ရငး့သာ့မ္ိဳ့ႏျယးစုမ္ာ့၌အေတျ့အ်မငးမ္ာ့၇ ပဵု်ပငးမ္ာ့ႏြငးံ ေအာငး်မငးမႈမ္ာ့ကိုပါထညးံသျငး့သငးၾကာ့ေစရနး၈ ၏၃၅၈ တိမးေကာမညးံအႏၱရာယးကိုရငးဆိုငးေနရေသာဘာသာစကာ့ ႏြငးံအငးမတနးအငးအာ့နညး့သညးံ ဘာသာစကာ့မ္ာ့အတျကး၁ငး့တို႕၌သီ့သနး႕လိုအပးခ္ကးမ္ာ့ႏြငးံပတးသကးေသာ သုေတသန ေလံလာမႈမႈကိုတို့်မြငးံလုပးေဆာငးသျာ့ရနး၈ ၏၃၆၈ တိုငး့ရငး့သာ့မ္ိဳ့ႏျယးစုမ္ာ့၌စာေရ့သာ့သညံးအက၏ရာစနစး (Language Scripts) မ္ာ့ႏြငံးစာေပမ္ာ့အေပ၍မ္ိဳ့ႏျယးစုဝငးသကးႀကီ့ရျယးအုိမ္ာ့၌ႏႈတးေ်ပာသမုိငး့(Oral history)မ္ာ့ကို ဆကးလကးထိနး့သိမး့ႏုိငးေရ့၇ ်ပနးလညးရြငးသနးလာေစေရ့အတျကး သုေတသနေလံလာမႈ်ပဳႏိုငးရနး ရဵပဵုေငျရာထာ့်ခငး့၈ ဘာသာစကာ့တစးခုစီအာ့ႏိုငးငဵေတားအစို့ရမြပဵံပို့်ခငး့ႏြငးံပတးသကး၊ ဤေၾကညာစာတမး့မြ အဆို်ပဳတငး်ပပါသညး၈ တိမးေကာမညးံအႏၱရာယးႏြငးံရငးဆုိငးေနရေသာ ဘာသာစကာ့ႏြငံးစာေပမ္ာ့အေပ၍မ္ိဳ့ႏျယးစုဝငးသကးႀကီ့ရျယးအုိမ္ာ့၌ႏႈတးေ်ပာသမုိငး့(Oral history)မ္ာ့ကို ဆကးလကးထိနး့သိမး့ႏုိငးေရ့၇ ်ပနးလညးရြငးသနးလာေစေရ့အတျကး သုေတသနေလံလာမႈ်ပဳႏိုငးရနး ရဵပဵုေငျရာထာ့်ခငး့၈ သုေတသနေလံလာမႈ်ပဳလုပးသျာ့ရနး၈ လကးရိြတိုငး့ရငး့သာ့မ္ိဳ့ႏျယးစုမ္ာ့အၾကာ့ ဘုဵတူညီေသာ ဘာသာစကာ့ပဵုစဵမ္ာ့က ို သုေတသန ်ပဳလုပးသျာ့ရနး၈ လကးရိြတိုငး့ရငး့သာ့မ္ိဳ့ႏျယးစုမ္ာ့အၾကာ့ ဘုဵတူညီေသာ ဘာသာစကာ့ပဵုစဵမ္ာ့က
လူမှုနှင့်စျေးကစား (LESC) အစိုးရအဖွဲ့ဝစ်

- မိခင်ဘာသာစကာ့ကို ေကာင့်သင်ဘာသာရပ်မြို့တိုင်းသင်နေရာသို့သင်ရာစနစ်အဖြစ် စာရ့သာသည်အက်ရာစနစ်၇ စကာ့လာ့အသဵးအသံမှ မြို့တော်ပါဝင်မည်

- လောကကျွန်ုပ်ရိုး ပါဝင်သော ဘာသာစကာ့တွင် ကျွန်ုပ်ရိုးအဖွဲ့/အစိုးရအဖွဲ့မှာ ဖျင်ရေးစနစ်

- အစိုးရအဖွဲ့/အစိုးရအဖွဲ့အဖျင် ဆက်လက်ထားရေးမှာ ဖျင်ရေးစနစ်မှာ အဖျင်ရေးစနစ်

- အထက်ပါအစိုးရအဖွဲ့/အစိုးရအဖွဲ့အဖျင် လောကကျွန်ုပ်အထိစွာ ဖျင်ရေးစနစ်မှာ ဖျင်ရေးစနစ်

- အထက်ပါအစိုးရအဖွဲ့/အစိုးရအဖွဲ့အဖျင် လောကကျွန်ုပ်အား ဖျင်ရေးစနစ်မှာ ဖျင်ရေးစနစ်

- စိုက်ရောက်ကျွန်ုပ်အား ဖျင်ရေးစနစ်မှာ ဖျင်ရေးစနစ်
၅၄ အထီးကာန်းစာမျက်နှာတစ်ခုအတွက် အားလုံးကွဲပြားကွဲမှုကို ရှာဖွေနိုင်သည်။

၅၄.၁ အထားအမှန်အခြေခံ (Higher Education)

၅၄.၁.၁ အထီးကာန်းစာမျက်နှာတစ်ခုအတွက် အားလုံးကွဲပြားကွဲမှုကို ရှာဖွေနိုင်သည်။

၅၄.၁.၂ အထားအမှန်အခြေခံ (Higher Education) အားလုံးကွဲပြားကွဲမှုကို ရှာဖွေနိုင်သည်။

၅၄.၂ အထားအမှန်အခြေခံ (National Curriculum and Local Flexibility)

၅၄.၂.၁ အထားအမှန်အခြေခံ (National Curriculum and Local Flexibility) အားလုံးကွဲပြားကွဲမှုကို ရှာဖွေနိုင်သည်။

၅၄.၂.၂ အထားအမှန်အခြေခံ (National Curriculum and Local Flexibility) အားလုံးကွဲပြားကွဲမှုကို ရှာဖွေနိုင်သည်။
Language Education and Social Cohesion (LESC) Initiative

1. IP&EM, (2012), Statement of Indigenous Peoples & Ethnic Minorities of ASEAN, Promote and protect rights to land, territory, resources and development of indigenous peoples and ethnic minorities in ASEAN.


9. UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP, 2008)


Appendix 6: MINE working action plan

MINE အဖွဲ့၏ ဗိုလ်မှု့စာတမ်း ထုတ်ပေးချင်းနှင့် ပတ်သက်ခြင်းမှာ အခြေချိ တိုင်းရင်းသားကိုယ်စားလွယ်များမှာ မိခို့အဖွဲ့အစည်းနှင့် အေသးစိတ်တိုင်းခံရန် ရွိပါသျဖင့် အေနာက်ဆုံးထားသည်။

- Lobby စရာရှင်၊ သင်္ကေတာကို ရိုးရိုးတင်အသီးသီးမှာ ပုဂ္ဂိုလ်များကို မိမိတို့ခ်ဥာကပ်နိုင်ရာနည်းလမ်းများဖြင့် MINE အဖွဲ့ကို ဖိတ်ဥပရန်ကြေညာချေလျှင် ရွိသည်။

- Individual (July 2014) 3 weeks

- Informal meeting (မြန်မာစာ ၃ လိုဏ်ဂူ)

- Formal meeting (Before the end of 2014 (Nov-Dec)

- အောက်ပါလောက်အသီးသီးရှိရန် အေပ်အလှဆုံးထားမှုများကို ပြောင်းလဲရန် တိုက်ရိုက်ထားသည်။

- Formal အဖွဲ့အစည်း ဖွဲ့စည်းရာ အားလုံးတွေ့ရှိခြင်း။

အိန္ဒိယိုးယာဉ်ကျသော စာပိုဒ်အရ အားလုံးများတွေ့ရှိခြင်းကို အကြောင်းကျော်မှုပြုသည်။

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>စာပိုဒ်အရ</th>
<th>စာပိုဒ်အရ</th>
<th>စာပိုဒ်အရ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. အခန်းက</td>
<td>၃ တန်ချင်း</td>
<td>အကြောင်းကျော်မှု</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. အနီးအနာ</td>
<td>၃ တန်ချင်း</td>
<td>အကြောင်းကျော်မှု</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Karen Educational Department
4. Karen Teacher Working Group
5. Karen Women’s Organization
6. Karenni Education Department
7. Kayan New Generation Youth
8. Rural Development Foundation for Shan State
9. Shan Women’s Action Network
10. Gawng Loe Mu: 3 Mountains, Wa
11. (Pa-Oh Monastatic Education (Hopone)
12. Lahu Women’s Organization
13. Ta’ang Student & Youth Organization
12. Kachin National Education Committee
13. Eastern Naga Development Organization

MINE coordinator

**Name List of MINE Focal Persons**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mi Krak Non</td>
<td>(MNEC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naw Law Eh Moo</td>
<td>(KED)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klo Loh Htoo</td>
<td>(KTWG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knyaw Paw</td>
<td>(KWO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorcus Moo</td>
<td>(KRCEE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone Myint</td>
<td>(KNGY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sai Naw Kham</td>
<td>(RDFSS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nan Mwe Kham</td>
<td>(SWAN)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. Nan E (GUM)
10. Nan Hnin New (PLCC)
11. Paul (Akha LC)
12. Maung Han (PaO Monastic)
13. David Zet Nan (SENG)
14. Daw Mary (LWO)
15. Lway Naw Chee (TSYO)
16. Saya La Raw (KIOED)
17. Naw Zet (KNEC)
18. Peter Kyaw Myint (ENDO)
19. WSA

**MINE Coordinator Job Description**

- Coordinate Advocacy efforts for MTE
- Communicate with all FBs for MINE orgs.
- Resources / partnership
- Coordinate with 60 MTTs
- Summer MTT
- TPC/s

**Coordination Team**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Based</th>
<th>backup</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Naw Zet</td>
<td>Myintkyina</td>
<td>Sayar La Raw</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Naw Kham Lasho Lay naw Chee
3. Kholo Htoo Maseriang Naw Ler Htoo
4. Lwee Naw Chee Lasho/ Mae sot Naw Kham
5. Nan E. Yangon -
6. Nan Hnin Nwe Taungkyi -
7. Sayar La Raw Maijaya Naw Zet

or can be up to 9

**MINE Structure**

- (1) coordinator
- (7) coordination team
- (19) focal persons

**Term Limit for Coordination Team**

- 2 years

**Advocacy Talking Points**

1. Advocate for Mother Tongue Education (MTE)
2. Multilingual Education
3. Decentralization
4. Intercultural Education
5. Policy decision making participation
6. All inclusive education
-Coordination Team

Declaration Release  • July 15, 2014
- Talking Point

Focal Points (19)

Advocacy Plans

- Individual
- Informal -MP
- Formal –MP
- Formal MoE
- INGO –

Plan A
Plan B

Note: Next MINE meeting will be in October
Appendix 7: Agenda Mawlamyine Facilitated Dialogue (May)

Language, Education and Social Cohesion
Myanmar

Facilitated Dialogue under the auspices of the UNICEF Peacebuilding, Education and Advocacy Program; Language Education and Social Cohesion Initiative

Dates: 27-28th May, 2014
Location: Mawlamyine, Myanmar

Facilitator and Chair: Professor Joseph Lo Bianco

ยินดีต้อนรับ
Welcome
Aims and Objectives

The workshop will function along the lines of a World Café, meaning an open-ended exploratory solutions-seeking facilitated dialogue. Key objectives are to discuss perspectives, and seek inputs and recommendations:

To develop a comprehensive language planning and policy framework for Myanmar, including preamble, principles, and focus areas;

To foster national unity, social cohesion and collaborative social relations in Myanmar;

To promote understanding of the forms and possibilities of language planning for fostering human rights, improved education and social cohesion;

To identify, define and examine problems that require special attention, and to identify areas of capacity development in language and social cohesion planning;

To foster improvements in language learning in Myanmar;

To make a contribution to enhance and improve the educational lives of children in Myanmar.
Agenda, Day One  
Tuesday, 27 May 2014

FOCUS: LANGUAGE PROBLEMS AND ISSUES

We will be discussing our challenges in multilingual education, literacy, and languages development in Myanmar.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SESSION</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>FORMAT</th>
<th>DETAIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AM 9:00-9:20</td>
<td>Official Opening</td>
<td>Speeches of Welcome</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| #1      | AM 9:30-10:15 | • Self-presentations  
• Introduction to Workshop  
• Icebreaker  
• Visioning Exercise  
• Expectations for Friday | Facilitator presentations to whole group with translation  
World Café Tables with hosts | • Child: 2014 (5 years old)  
• PowerPoint # 1: Facilitation & Dialogues  
• PowerPoint # 2: Methods  
• PowerPoint # 3: Our Agreement |
|         | AM 10:30-10:45 | Coffee/tea break | Coffee/tea break | Coffee/tea break |
| #2      | AM 10:45-12:00 | • Language Problems  
• Language Issues | Facilitator presentation: whole group  
Brainstorming  
General Discussion, whole group and with hosts at tables | • PowerPoint # 4: Language planning and policy  
• Facilitator: LP model;  
• components of a LP |
|         | PM 12:00-1:00 | Lunch | Lunch | Lunch |
| #3      | PM 1:00-2:45 | Write Policy preamble | At tables with hosts | Child: 2023 (14 years old) |
| BREAK   | PM 2:45-3:15 | Coffee/tea break | Coffee/tea break | Coffee/tea break |
| #4      | PM 3:15-4:15 | Language Planning and Language Policy  
What can the community do?  
What can officials do?  
What can schools do?  
Storyboarding language problems/ issues with hosts at tables | Converting language issues/ problems into a narrative. Organise and classify language problems. Tables to work on sets of problems. |
| #5      | PM 4:15-4:45 | Wrap Up | Facilitator to Summarise Day and Plan Day 2 | PowerPoint # 5: Community/Expert/Official |
Agenda, Day Two
Wednesday, 28 May 2014

FOCUS: LANGUAGE POLICY AND PLANNING

We will be building on the problems and issues raised on day one to write a consensus statement and model language policy. We will focus on multilingual education in schools and classrooms; multilingualism in the community; how children think and develop in more than one language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SESSION</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>FORMAT</th>
<th>DETAIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#6</td>
<td>AM 9:00-10:15</td>
<td>• Input on bilingualism in education and society</td>
<td>Facilitator presentation Q/A</td>
<td>• Power Point # 6: Mother Tongue, Bilingual Education, Language Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BREAK</td>
<td>AM 10:15-10:45</td>
<td>Coffee/tea break</td>
<td>Coffee/tea break</td>
<td>Coffee/tea break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7</td>
<td>AM 10:45-12:00</td>
<td>• Merge Table LP drafts</td>
<td>General Discussion, whole group and with hosts at tables</td>
<td>• Working with Day One records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUNCH</td>
<td>PM 12:00-1:00</td>
<td>LUNCH</td>
<td>LUNCH</td>
<td>LUNCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#8</td>
<td>PM 1:00-2:45</td>
<td>• Begin Full merge of policy draft</td>
<td>General Discussion, whole group and with hosts at tables</td>
<td>• Display developing policy position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BREAK</td>
<td>PM 2:45-3:15</td>
<td>Coffee/tea break</td>
<td>Coffee/tea break</td>
<td>Coffee/tea break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#9</td>
<td>PM 3:15-4:45</td>
<td>• Complete model policy draft</td>
<td>With hosts at tables In whole group session led by facilitator</td>
<td>• Presentations from hosts or table reporters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 8:
Mon State policy and planning preamble and press release

The Language, Education and Social Cohesion workshop (27-28 May), Mon State:

Preamble:

The Republic of Union of Myanmar is the country where all indigenous people are staying together unity. Therefore, it is very important all ethnic groups to get equal opportunity and to protect and maintain their literacy and cultural hesitates. The development of each state and region in the country is same as the improvement of all indigenous people. All ethnic groups should endeavor together to develop their states and regions. Therefore, it is essential to support the development of all indigenous mother tongues by all indigenous
people. Mon, Kayin, Pao, Myanmar and other indigenous people are staying together in Mon state. We believe that if mother tongue is used as Medium of Instruction in classroom or education sector, it will support children to get better learning achievement and to learn the things which are really relevant to their daily lives. Therefore, while developing national or state/regional policies, authority should consider developing mother tongue based policies which also encourage learning national and international languages. By doing so, it will reinforce unity which will encourage all indigenous people to get peace, wellbeing and happiness. Accordingly, we prepare and purpose mother tongue based education policy which will promote the improvement of education quality, unity and upgrading cultural and traditional heritage for indigenous people in Mon state.

**Objectives**

- All children to get opportunity to use Mother-tongue Based Multilingual Education in basic education
- To create an education system based on mother tongue which will encourage to be able to learn mother tongue, national and international languages competently
To establish and strengthen organizations which can support the improvement of ethnic literacy and language and enhance to get better collaboration and coordination among stakeholders.

State and Regional Education Department should train and produce qualified, skilled teachers who can speak one of local languages and having familiarity with local content for their regions.
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Activities

- Government to provide funding and other supports to implement the Mother Tongue Based Multi Lingual Education planning and policy
- To implement Mother-tongue Based Multilingual Education, we will coordinate and collaborate with United Nations organization and other international organizations to get advice and technical assistance.
- According to needs of the people, we will develop culturally & locally appropriate curriculum for each ethnic group
- We will coordinate and collaborate to recognize school curriculum developed by ethnic groups and will provide necessary support
- To be able to establish state level organization which will support in developing ethnic literacy and language, we will appoint and assign individual and organizations which are relevant to the objectives of the language policy and planning.
- In accordance with the needs of the people, we will open ethnic language centers and will provide trainings to native teachers
- To get better coordination, we will bring together all local donors, well wishers and organization to provide necessary supports for each region to improve their language and literacy.

PRESS RELEASE (THIS IS A DRAFT STATEMENT CURRENTLY BEING REVISED BY WRITING TEAMS IN MON STATE)

This meeting of UNICEF language and social cohesion held at Mawlamyine, 27-28 May 2014 announces that it has adopted a policy for multilingualism for the needs of Mon state, and which has relevance across the republic of the union of Myanmar. Our policy would promote the rights of all citizens living in Mon state to maintain, enjoy and develop their ethnic languages, while also learning the official language of the union, and English for international communication.

We call on the government of the republic of the union of Myanmar to collaborate with Mon state officials, parents, and community organisations, to implement an ambitious plan to support, improve and defend our unique languages which are a precious resource for all citizens.
Appendix 9:
Agenda Mawlamyine Facilitated Dialogue (November)

Dates: 6 November, 2014
Location: Mawlamyine, Myanmar

Facilitator and Chair: Professor Joseph Lo Bianco

DECISION MAKERS LEVEL MEETING

Discussion of aims and objectives of language policy 2014-2015 Mon state as part of Myanmar wide language policy

1. Preamble and key aims: what do we want a Mon state language policy to achieve? For Mon language, for Mon speaking children, for non-Mon speaking children in Mon state, for other languages
2. Critical problems and issues to be addressed in Mon state language policy: open discussion (for example, teacher availability, level of continuation of Mon and Myanmar languages, English, other languages)
3. Timetable for 2015 (outline decision November 2014, review date, agreement date
4. Link between Mon state policy and Union wide language policy
5. Special education: sign language, minority languages
6. Special initiatives (central language school, bilingual methods, etc)

Dates: 7 November, 2014
Location: Mawlamyine, Myanmar

Facilitator and Chair: Professor Joseph Lo Bianco

TECHNICAL MEETING

Discussion of tasks and responsibilities for achieving the writing of language policy 2014-2015 Mon state as part of Myanmar wide language policy

1. Report of decisions from DECISION MAKERS MEETING
2. How to achieve the aims of the DECISION MAKERS MEETING
3. Personnel involved and agencies/organisations involved?
4. Timetable for 2015
5. Research issues needed: what data do we have: teacher numbers, existing programs, materials,
6. Roles and duties 2015
7. Special initiatives (central language school, bilingual methods, etc)
## Appendix 10:
Feedback summary Mawlamyine Facilitated Dialogue (November)

UNICEF/Professor Joseph Lo Bianco

### Total Participants – 36  Mawlamyine, May (27-28) 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>Rating Scale</th>
<th>Rating Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor -1</td>
<td>Average -2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Please rate the overall Seminar</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Did the workshop meet your expectations</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Quality and relevance of input</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Quality &amp; presentation of the presenter</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Other comment/ what did you like best</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- how to use three languages (mother tongue, national and international languages) for teaching and learning process
- The explanations how to teach ethnic language in school by applying moth tongue based multi lingual education
- The presenter mentioned that we should teach languages by doing activities and it will get more effective outcome
- Mother tongue based multi lingual education
- The best way to teach language is action oriented teaching method
- Siva’s experience and action oriented language teaching
- If teacher use not only works but also interactions while teaching languages, children’s intelligent will be improve
- Explanation of three teaching method when applying mother tongue based multi lingual education
- Classify teaching mother language, preamble, problem and policy
- Believe that application of mother tongue based multi lingual education will be success
- to teach official language together with mother language
- The language policy and planning
- Thai education policy
- The policy, example and explanations which support mother languages to be used in education system
- To lay down policy and to express challenges and problems
- Action oriented language teaching in the classroom
- To add one more day for the workshop and have to have very open discussion to choose more options
- Language problems and issues
- Problem solving, discussion about issues and lay down policy
• To be effective teaching and learning process, it should teach lesson based on activities
• Action oriented teaching and learning process
• Interaction based teaching and learning process
• Discussion to lay down language policy
• Zomia Exercise
• Models of language teaching for different ethnic in a same school
• Mother tongue based MLE, Special Language centre for state, action oriented teaching learning process
• All children opportunity to get access to their mother languages
• Three kinds of actives to solve multilingual education
• Research findings
• Ways of MTB-MLE teaching, to develop ethnic language, objective of policy, short/long turn teaching, etc
• Development of education policy for Mon state by working groups

6 Other comment/what suggestions do you make improvement

• To negotiate with ethnic experts while developing curriculum to teach ethnic languages
• To teach ethnic language, it should be systematically discussed in detail about the contents of teaching should in accordance with ethnic groups and places
• How to apply mother tongue based multi lingual education in the classroom where many ethnic children are schooling in particular place
• All hand out should be translated by Myanmar
• It will improve if there is a link between mother tongue based multi lingual education and official language teaching
• It is important to skill up both month tongue ethnic language as well as official language
• To be included ethnic language teaching methods
• How to teach official language(Myanmar) by using mother tongue/language
• To take more time how to conduct mother language teaching in Mon State
• senior government officials to participate in the work shop
• To increase numbers of participants from government, civil society and experts sides
• To invite more participants from other organizations and it will be better if this policy could be implemented practically
• To discuss in detail about ethnic language teaching and learning which can reflect actual situation of ethnic regions requirement.
• To apply mother tongue based multi lingual education in basic education sector
• Workshop should be organized frequently with International organizations and experts
• To open special school by government to learn ethnic languages
• After discussion, each group should present their discussion points to all participants and other groups should provide comments and suggestions for each presentation. Need enough time to do so.
• To teach mother language, official language and international languages
• Hand out should be translated into Myanmar
• To learn Mon language to be able to learn other languages such as official and international languages
• Workshop should be organized in each and every state and regions where indigenous people staying over there
• Need more model from other countries where mother tongue based multi lingual education is practicing
• To discuss more detail how to practice Mother tongue based teaching and learning methodology in regions with very diverse ethnicity
• To discuss policy and planning in detail
• Power point slides, handouts should be translated in Myanmar to understand clearly and save time for translation
- Need to get solution and methodology to get learning achievement in school where more than two ethnic children are schooling
- Ethnic language development must be carried out
- Requested professor to mobilize government to lay down MTB-MLE policy

7. Do you want a follow-up workshop and what focus should it have?

- Have to make higher level work shop again in Mon State
- To develop and implement policy effectively, it is needed to organize follow up workshop
- To organize a work shop with decision makers (Mon, Myanmar and Pao)
- This workshop is sufficient to succeed policy
- To organize district level workshop
- Want a follow up workshop focus on managing or how to operate teaching mother language in multi language ethnic schools
- It is essential to organize more workshop like that
- it is required to organize follow up work shop
- it should organize MTB-MLE workshop again
- to reinforce government to lay down policy and apply mother tongue based multi lingual education at the national level and to invite senior decision makers while organizing next follow up workshop
- A workshop should be organized and invite all ethnic organizations to discuss and work together
- To organize follow up workshop
- Follow up workshop should be organized frequently
- Should organize language planning and policy workshop at every state and region
- To do three more workshops to discuss how to teach mother tongue based multi lingual education (at least three times)
- To organize follow up workshop
- Technical level work shop should be organized
- Follow up workshop should be organized in Mon state
- To organize follow up workshop and participants should be MoE, Mom Literature and language group, ethnic political leaders and MNEC
- Suggested to organize such kind of policy workshop with very high level seniors officials from MoE (Naypyitaw)
- How to make advocacy to upstream level by evidence based
- To collect and combine all outcomes of workshop and should prepare term paper/report/article in accordance with findings. To be able to do so, should organize follow up workshop
- The roles & responsibilities at various level(Union, District, Township) to implement multi lingual education
- To make decision how to teach MTB – MLE, when to teach, how to prepare curriculum etc.
- Township level MTB-MLE workshop should be organized
- Should be National wide workshop
- Follow up workshop required
- Want to know how to fit MTB-MLE policy to national education policy
- Wants to know process and procedure how to prepare and implement language policy and planning
Appendix 11: Agenda Naypyidaw Facilitated Dialogue (July)

Language, Education and Social Cohesion
Myanmar

Facilitated Dialogue under the auspices of the UNICEF Peacebuilding, Education and Advocacy Program; Language Education and Social Cohesion Initiative

Location: Naypyidaw, Myanmar

Facilitator and Chair: Professor Joseph Lo Bianco

ยินดีต้อนรับ
Welcome
Aims and Objectives

The workshop will function along the lines of a World Café, meaning an open-ended exploratory solutions-seeking facilitated dialogue. Key objectives are to discuss perspectives, and seek inputs and recommendations to advance the following fields:

Social Cohesion: by promoting an attitude of inclusion and participation for ethnic and indigenous minorities;

Education skills: by improving school attendance, academic standards and literacy;

Employment skills: by raising standards in Myanmar, English and mother tongues, where relevant, to help young people enter the competitive labour market including in trades and professions;

Service delivery: by implementing literacy, Myanmar language and communication planning to make sure that public administration are communicating effectively with all citizens;

International connections: in order to support trade, diplomacy and travel through widespread knowledge of English, and learning of strategic languages;

Inclusive communication planning: by integrating support for blind, deaf and other communication disabled citizens.
We will be discussing our challenges in multilingual education, literacy, and languages development in Myanmar, in order to support social cohesion and promote Myanmar economic and social prosperity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SESSION</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>FORMAT</th>
<th>DETAIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AM 9:00-9:20</td>
<td>Official Opening</td>
<td>Speeches of Welcome</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>AM 9:30-10:15</td>
<td>• Self-presentations • Introduction to Workshop • Icebreaker • Visioning Exercise • Expectations for Friday</td>
<td>Facilitator presentations to whole group with translation</td>
<td>• Child: 2014 (5 years old) • PowerPoint # 1: Facilitation &amp; Dialogues • PowerPoint # 2: Methods • PowerPoint # 3: Our Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break</td>
<td>AM 10:15-10:45</td>
<td>Coffee/tea break</td>
<td>Coffee/tea break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>AM 10:45-12:00</td>
<td>• Language Problems • Language Issues</td>
<td>Facilitator presentation: whole group</td>
<td>• PowerPoint # 4: Language planning and policy • Facilitator: LP model; components of a LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>PM 12:00-1:00</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>Lunch Hosts and Facilitators to Organise PM activities</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 3</td>
<td>PM 1:00-2:45</td>
<td>Write Policy preamble</td>
<td>At tables with hosts</td>
<td>Child: 2023 (14 years old)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break</td>
<td>PM 2:45-3:15</td>
<td>Coffee/tea break</td>
<td>Coffee/tea break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 4</td>
<td>PM 3:15-4:15</td>
<td>Language Planning and Language Policy</td>
<td>Storyboarding language problems/issues with hosts at tables</td>
<td>Converting language issues/problems into a narrative. Organise and classify language problems. Tables to work on sets of problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 5</td>
<td>PM 4:15-4:45</td>
<td>Wrap Up</td>
<td>Facilitator to Summarise Day and Plan Day 2</td>
<td>PowerPoint # 5: Community/Expert/Official</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Agenda, Day Two**  
**Wednesday 30th July, 2014**

**FOCUS: LANGUAGE POLICY AND PLANNING**

We will be building on the problems and issues raised on day one to write a consensus statement and model language policy. We will focus on the mechanisms for a co-ordinated national language planning process. This will address Myanmar language, English and multilingual education in schools and classrooms; multilingualism in the community; how children think and develop in more than one language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SESSION</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>FORMAT</th>
<th>DETAIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#6</td>
<td>AM 9:00-10:15</td>
<td>• Input on bilingualism in education and society</td>
<td>Facilitator presentation Q/A</td>
<td>• Power Point # 6: Mother Tongue, Bilingual Education, Language Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break</td>
<td>AM 10:15-10:45</td>
<td>Coffee/tea break</td>
<td>Coffee/tea break</td>
<td>Coffee/tea break</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| #7      | AM 10:45-12:00 | • Merge Table LP drafts  
• Extend from Preamble to Goals of Policy | General Discussion, whole group and with hosts at tables | • Working with Day One records                                                                   |
| Lunch   | PM 12:00-1:00  | Lunch                                                                    | Lunch Hosts and Facilitator meet | Lunch                                                                                            |
| #8      | PM 1:00-2:45    | • Begin Full merge of policy draft                                        | General Discussion, whole group and with hosts at tables | • Display developing policy position                                                            |
| Break   | PM 2:45-3:15    | Coffee/tea break                                                         | Coffee/tea break        | Coffee/tea break                                                                                 |
| #9      | PM 3:15-4:45    | • Complete model policy draft  
• Present to whole group                                                       | With hosts at tables In whole group session led by facilitator | • Presentations from hosts or table reporters                                                      |
Appendix 12: Feedback summary Naypyidaw Facilitated Dialogue

Q.1 Please rate the overall seminar

Q2. Did the workshop meet your expectations?
Q3. Please rate the quality and relevance of presentation

![Quality and Relevance of Presentation]

Q4. Please rate the quality and presentation of presenter

![Quality and Presentation of Presenter]
Q5. What did you like best?

- No emotional discussions during the workshop
- Conceptualization of setting language policy and its related exercise
- Principles
- The technique of drawing and making consensus
- Mr. Joe can change workshop content to be in line with mood of participants during workshop
- I liked the discussion of participants with presentation of language problems
- The conversation with college principles and professor, exchange and sharing of education knowledge and rich diverse language
- Approach using in the workshop
- Nest discussion on workshop
- Format to brainstorming – from different groups drawn the wishes upon experience of community combined with authorities
- Language problems in the community
- It should be 3 or 4 day workshop, instead of 2 day one
- Process of building up content of policy. Examples, especially how to rescue dying languages and the nest example.
- Exercises and discussions on day 2
- Why LP? Mother tongue or first language – how to use in education
- Useful inputs provided to participants particularly on conceptualisation of language policy
- Some real time example within presentation
- I do like the presentation concerning about the ethnic language role in education
- Technology goes to economy
- Examples and options for LP and mother-tongue based multilingual education from other countries, L1 and L2 learning processes
- I like the presentation
- Language problems
- Language problems
- Principles and goals of language planning
- I liked every ethnic language to learn in education
- Examples of other countries are good
- Very good
- Examples of other countries, presentation very good
- Very good presentation, very good examples

Q6. Other comments/ what suggestions for improvement?

- Video of audio recording; minutes
- To include expertise in the field of children in special needs next workshop
- Ethnic group didn’t change their attitudes, they think that Myanmar language is influence that is a wrong attitude
- Sometimes move very quickly
- Need more time to discuss
- To increase the duration of workshop, at least 3 days instead of 2
• Myanmar language improvement for ethnic children must/should be carried out by the elders of this ethnic group who can speak and write Myanmar
• The workshop like this should conduct more and the ethnic education issue and using language should concern as decentralization level
• Two day workshop is not sufficient. We need to learn more for developing language policy
• To need to start language policy plan
• More workshop like this to get understanding each other to strengthen language policy
• Future task oriented discussions should be incorporated
• It should be 3 or 4 day workshop instead of 2 day one
• We need longer duration as translation needs time and some concepts are new to majority of participants so it also takes time to get these
• Ethnic language is very useful in learning process
• Mother tongue (Myanmar)
• Extend workshop I do found some progress in understanding the problems of ethnic peoples and their feeling concerning with the education and their ethnic languages importance
• Should invite more ethnic education candidates for workshop
• Bilingual is relevant to Myanmar
• To better address deficiencies of some of the Burmese academics and their denial of the presence of power dynamics between Burmese government and ethnic groups
• I would like to get more information about language policy in all over the world and countries
• I got the ideas from other ethnic and so I can balance what I need. We have the experience and we can help each other
• Education skills
• Every ethnic language must learn in primary education
• It is difficult to understand on policy draft with a short period because it is a professional field
• Policy draft with a short time- it is a special field
• It’s hard to develop/provide feedback on policy draft with a short period because it is a special area/field
• It has to development policy with the short time it is the special field

Q7. Do you want a follow-up workshop and what focus should it have?

• We would need a follow up workshop focussing on the feedback from policy makers as well as the finalization of language policy and its implications
• I want to follow up next workshop and then many policy makers/ decision makers should attend this workshop
• It should focus on problems and actions to overcome ? problems
• Language policy
• Focus should be improving what we finished at this workshop and completing the unfinished parts (including car park)
• I want a follow up workshop and language planning and policy
• Decentralization education issue
• Focus should be based on language policy (draft)
• It need a follow up workshop and to decide to language policy
• Strengthening of practical implementation
• Policy implementation
• How to implement language policy
• A follow up to continue the effort. Advocacy workshop for high stake holders
• It should have focus to/on social cohesion
• Wider consultation to obtain wide range of inputs from wider stakeholders and detail follow up to elaborate the contents
• Keeping track on what has been discussed and agreed for follow up workshop
• A follow up workshop is still in need for policy making. It should focussed on more flexibility on ethnic language for the best education system and policy for all the peoples of Myanmar, not be for only one.
• Multilingual education
• Focus on language policy if possible to invite 2 participants
• Changing curriculum
• To discuss the complete language policy draft and language planning, with relevant stakeholders
• Focus on language planning policy making process
• I would like to get MLE experience work together in Myanmar
• I want a follow up workshop based on inclusive
• Want to another workshop based on all inclusive
• Yes, need of having a follow up workshop. It should be a four day workshop.
• We need follow up workshop. Any focus related to the workshop.
• Yes, need of having follow-up activities. Any focus related to the workshop theme. E.g. ethnic language policy (draft)
• We need follow up workshop. Any focus to this workshop.