Consultation Meeting on Education for Migrant, Ethnic Minority, and Stateless Children

Date: 17-18 November 2014
Venue: Mandarin Hotel, Bangkok Thailand

OPENING SESSION
Open and Introduction

A. Welcoming Remarks: Mr. KamonSiriban (Deputy Permanent Secretary and Secretary General of the Thai National Commission of UNESCO, Thailand)

1. Welcomed all to the meeting. The Thai National Commission to UNESCO, UNESCO Bangkok, UNICEF glad to participate, to share experiences and hear other’s experiences to assist each other in policy.
2. The Ministry of Education Thailand remains committed to migrant agenda; there is an obligation to meet basic learning needs. Emphasized Education for All (EFA)
3. Speaks of migrant workers who come to Thailand (from Myanmar, specifically) for better opportunity; their right to education has become a matter of public concern. Policy must be adopted to provide free and compulsory education for migrant children. UNESCO and other schools work to provide non-formal education to border areas, want recognition.
4. The next two days must be used to identify what needs to be done to bring education to all children, to equip them with knowledge, language, and skills, which are applicable in both Thailand and Myanmar.
5. Thanks UNESCO and UNICEF and others who have contributed to make this gathering a success.


1. Welcomes all on behalf of Myanmar Ministry of Education (MoE)
2. Three tier emphasis for future policies: Political reform, Economic reform, Socio/social Reform,
3. CESR: In order to systematically reform, Myanmar Comprehensive Education Sector Review (CESR) has been operating since 2012. Under recommendations of CESR, basic education law, higher education law, as well as other related education laws, will be under the process of review. Based on results of CESR, under national education law, basic education (education changed over to G+543 – in line with international level)
4. Kayah and Kachin under control of central government?
5. Would like to request all participants to participate in conversations
C. Welcoming Remarks: Dr. Cynthia Maung (Executive Director, MTC/Migrant Education Integration Initiative)

1. Welcomes all partners from governments, CBOs, NGOs, universities, and others
2. 3 million migrant workers in Thailand. Almost 10% are children who need to go to school.
   a. Must increase access to quality education for migrant children beyond what is already available in Migrant Learning Centers (MLCs).
3. Importance of Thai ID
   a. There have been increases in standards in MLCs and throughout other schools due to EFA and availability of Thai ID. All the children who have access to Thai ID can attend Thai schools, but there are many children born here or moved here at 10 or 12 years who cannot access correct ID and have few opportunities.
   b. There is an increase in number of students who can access Thai school – many children are getting ID and registration is improving. Many children born at Mae Tao Clinic could not get registration before; but more and more children do have access to this registration.
   c. We must recognize students with Thai ID and also without Thai ID.
4. More students born on the border, more students moving back and forth. Must be prepared, these children are the future resources for the development of our region. Must look to future policy with an emphasis on vocational training and ASEAN focus. We must be proactive to protect their futures, their opportunities to education, healthcare.

D. Objective of the Consultation Meeting: Mr. Kyaw Kyaw Min Htut (Director, BEAM Education Foundation)
   a. The Objective was outlined in a PowerPoint Presentation, where objectives were clearly outlined and expected outcomes presented.
1. Rational for the meeting: to create space to identify issues affecting migrant children, youth living in Thailand, to bring together collaborative effort of likeminded individuals and organizations focusing on needs of ethnic minority, migrant, and stateless children and youth. Today is a good time to develop a good education system by combining our resources.
2. First Objective: to report on current migrant education landscape and needs
3. Second Objective: Develop recommendations and strategies for future collaborations
4. Third Objective: Brainstorm on the policy framework, education equivalency system and accreditation between Thailand and Myanmar
5. **Expected Outcomes:** Government and development organizations will be informed; a formal collaboration will be created; develop strategies and policy to address existing education needs.

6. **Identification of needs:** Standardization of curriculum, education equivalency and accreditation system, inclusive student access, and resource allocation to ensure quality education provision for migrant, ethnic minorities and stateless children and youth.

**SESSION 1: Situations and Government Interventions**

**Moderator:** Education Council MoE

**Delegates:**

1. **Mrs Tipsuda Sumethsenee (Education Council, MoE Thailand)**
2. **Ms Nongnuck Owatchaiyapong (Office of Basic Education Commission – OBEC - Thailand)**
3. **Ms Thitaporn Jintaketkorn (Office of the Non-Formal and Informal Education - ONIE - Thailand)**
4. **Daw Aye Aye Tint (Department of Education Planning and Training – DEPT, MoE, Myanmar)**

Start with Thailand side; Tipsuda to talk about overall picture of Thai policy towards stateless. Has floor for 10 minutes.

**Tipsuda Sumethsenee:**

A. **PowerPoint Presentation entitled “Overview of Situations and Interventions towards Education for Migrant, Ethnic Minority, and Stateless Children in Thailand”**

1. **Regulation Framework and Policy**
   a. Goals and background: humanitarian responses to displaced children; provide with education and life skills; focus on current framework policy towards migrant and stateless children.
   Ministry of social development and ministry of interior, ministry of health, has worked with local NGOs to provide healthcare to families with small children.
   b. Convention of Right of the Child; the right to be educated by hosting state
   c. UNESCO’s EFA: GOAL 1, 2, 3 (EFA: Section 10)
      i. Section 10: “All individuals have equal rights and opportunities to receive basic education provided by the State for at least 12 years. This education, provided on a nationwide basis, shall be of quality and free of charge”
      ii. Mentions as well vocational training, etc.
   d. National Education Act of 1999

2. **Service Coverage**
a. Numbers of non-Thai Students in Academic Year 2013: Pre-
primary (27,351), basic education (98,887) basic education
vocational (7,744), tertiary education (19,405), unidentified by
level (19,910) – total 173,297
b. Splits numbers between levels, also splits based on where they are
receiving education (Office of Basic Education Commission, Office
of Vocational Education Commission, Office of Higher Education
Commission, etc.). This information was discussed very quickly;
comprehensive numbers can be found in the PowerPoint.

3. Type of Policy Intervention
   a. Financial Support: Cost-per-head analysis and direct subsidy to
      child development centers, schools, learning centers (ages 3-18)
   b. Special identity under 13 digital citizen number can track down
      non-Thai citizen students by birth certification and registration of
      migrant workers with children
   c. Adaptability of School Environment: cater to non-Thai students
      with adapted media and teaching materials, teacher capacity
      building, and assessments of learning outcomes

4. Key Success Factors of Intervention
   a. Family orientation towards Thailand citizenship and employment
      opportunities
   b. Family background and period of settlement in Thailand
   c. Accessibility to child development centers, learning centers, etc.
   d. Student awareness towards knowledge and skill development

The Moderator spoke at this time for a few moments, to estimate that nearly
300,000 individuals with non-Thai nationality are currently living in Thailand, with
only a small percentage registered in the system. To speak in more detail about
what is in place for non-Thai citizens (especially those above the age of 15 who need
access to non-formal education, the moderator introduced Thitaporn Jintaketkorn
with ONIE.

Thitaporn Jintaketkorn (Office of Non-Formal and Informal Education – ONIE)

A. ONIE - has realized the human rights, “ASEANness”, and the importance
   of education. Has also realized the importance of coordinating with
   private and government sectors
B. Objective: to provide education for people without Thai nationality in a
   concrete manner to provide learners a change to improve their quality of
   life and adjust themselves to society
C. Details: 200 hours of Thai literacy, assessment and certificate by
   evaluation, and the option to carry this certificate to apply into formal
   education system
D. Doubt group is those students who are older than 15 years old
E. Guidelines developed in 2012 for non-formal education for children under the age of 15 who remain in a compulsory group (focuses on physical, mental, social, and intelligence development)
   a. Speaker presented comprehensive list of what courses would be alternates for migrant learners in this NFE program – Thai 1,2,3, ASEAN study, Virtues, Laws, Culture, Rights of Children
   b. Piloted in 5 provinces in Muang District (Phangnga, Ranong, Samut Sakhon, Tak, Chiang Rai)
   c. FY2015: ONIE made policy for developing Thai learning, life skills among migrant groups (MoE: “People without civil registration evidence or people without Thai nationality.”)

MODERATOR: Anecdote about students without ID and the challenges that they face

NongnuckOwatchaiyapong (Office of Basic Education Commission – OBEC)

A. Introduction. Reminds the room that the goal of the education system is to receive all students regardless of nationality; children with non-Thai nationality can enroll into all education institutions. The generosity of the cabinets has allowed many migrant children to register in Thai schools, and the numbers are increasing. She at this time passed the microphone to another speaker who talked about migrant children and the Thai Education policy.

Speaker:

A. Thai Education Policy and Figures
   1. 1997 Constitution, 1999 National Education Act
   2. Primary school (expanded school), Secondary school, welfare schools, special needs schools (total number of schools is 30,922. Breakdown by category can be found on the PPT)
   3. Breakdown of students per level of education - over 7,000,000 students registered. Breakdown can be found on PPT.
   4. Stateless students – seen a significant increase in the past 3 years (from 45,733 in year 2554 to 57,597 in 2556)
      a. Works closely with ministry of interior to assist with budget and assessing these numbers
      b. For Non-Thai students, have to present before 10 June.
         Number of students is expected to continue increasing.

B. OBEC Policy:
   1. Emphasis on students: competencies, academic ability, ethics, moral values, pride
   2. Students with special needs (including migrant students) must be developed to their highest potential
      a. Systems in place for disadvantaged children to gain opportunities in accordance with learning standards.
b. Includes homeschoolers, those in private organizations, alternative education, those with special protection and assistance

   1. Provide EFA. (Finish compulsory to Grade 9)
   2. Develop educational qualities and standards (multilingual, bi-lingual – we must think about that to make it more effective and widespread. Focus on research, be innovative)
   3. Life skills, livelihood skills, career skills development (Vocational preparation, alternative opportunities and education. Reduce number of students who wish to drop out or who are forced to drop out due to financial need)
   4. Develop effective administrative personnel (promote, create incentives to people to work in this area.)
   5. Develop educational administrative system and mechanism
      a. Emphasis on teachers
      b. Emphasis on system/administrative

6. Challenges
   a. Number of unreached children – parents moving around (database needed? Specialist needed.)
   b. Capacity building in inclusive education to educators and teachers
   c. Adaptation of national curriculum
   d. Participation from all sectors
   e. Coordination and collaboration both government agency and private sectors
   f. Policy implementation and practice
   g. Budgeting: allocation, equity, more effectiveness
   h. Child Rights sensitization to all sectors

Daw Aye Aye Tint (Department of Education Planning and Training, MoE Myanmar)

A. Policies of Myanmar – Speaker presented on a number of chapters and articles within the 2008 Constitution of the Republic of the Union of Myanmar that related to education and migrant youth

B. Basic Principles of the Union (Chapter VIII Citizen, Fundamental Rights and Duties of the citizen)
   a. Article 22: Union shall assist
      i. Develop language literature, etc
      ii. Promote solidarity, mutual amity, respect of national races
      iii. Promote socio-economic development including education, health, economic, communication, of less dev. National races
   b. Article 28 – Union Shall:
      i. Strive to improve education for all citizens of Myanmar
ii. Enact necessary laws to enable all citizens to participate in education

iii. Implement free, compulsory primary education system for all citizens

iv. Implement modern education system to promote thinking and strong moral character to build up the Union

c. Article 348
   i. Shall not discriminate based on race, birth, religion, official position, status, culture, sex, wealth

d. Article 349: Citizens shall enjoy equal opportunity in carrying out:
   i. Technical know-how and vocation
   ii. Exploration of art, science, technology

e. Article 366: Every citizen has:
   i. The right to education
   ii. The right to conduct scientific research to explore science, work with creativity, and develop arts

C. National Education Law – Law No. 41 –
   a. Enacted by Pyidaungsu Hluttaw – 31 Sept 2014)
   b. The National Education Law is Mother Law and sectorial education laws are in the process of being developed. The focus for this power point was on national law only.
   c. Basic Principals for National Education Ch. 3 Article 4
      i. Access to education by all school going age children and youth, including disabled
      ii. Including implementation of inclusive education, special education, etc.
      iii. Create opportunity to have access to education
      iv. Free and compulsory, expand level by level
      v. To produce human resource such as intellectuals, technicians, skilled workers for development of nation

d. Chapter 6 – types of schools
   i. Government/public schools, government-supported, regional organization schools, private schools, monastic schools, Parahita (orphanage) schools, special education, mobile/emergency schools
   ii. Emphasize for purpose of this meeting: Ministry and Regional Authority carry out mobile schools for migrant students (free and compulsory); as well as emergency schools for remote areas developmentally delayed, etc.

e. Chapter 7: Identification of curriculum and curriculum standard
   i. In line with practical life of society
   ii. Must allow for ability to transfer between schools and types of schools
   iii. Must help/support open training for improvement of literature, languages, cultures, etc of national races
iv. Implementation of literature and language of national races can be implemented starting from primary level

f. Chapter 8: Right to Education and Responsibilities
i. Parents or guardians must have responsibility to send the school children for the free and compulsory education
ii. Parents or guardians must have right to cooperate and coordinate with the parent teacher association and school board of trustee to improve the quality of learning achievement of their children and continuous learning opportunity for the children. [Article 47]

iii. Community from ward and village must help and support the children to complete the free and compulsory education. [Article 48]

iv. The local authorities must support and implement:
v. For the completion of the identified free and compulsory education by all school going age children.

D. Current Program and Activities Implemented in Formal and Non-Formal Education Sector
a. Program related to NFE:
   i. Basic Literacy Program
   ii. Continuing Education Program (includes income generation program, better life program and post literacy program)
   iii. Primary, Middle, Extended and Continuous Education and Learning Project (EXCEL)

E. Various Programs Related to Formal Education
a. Various Activities for Implementation of National Education Law
b. Long Term Basic Education Development Plan
d. CCA Nationwide Teacher Training Plan
e. Quality Basic Education Program (in collaboration with UNICEF and MDEF)
f. Basic Education and Gender Equality Program (In collaboration with UNICEF)
g. Poverty alleviation and Rural Development Plan (in collaboration with Ministry of Information)
h. Primary Curriculum reform project (in collaboration with JICA)
i. Secondary curriculum reform project (negotiation process with ADB and EU)
j. Taungoo education college rehabilitation project (in collaboration with JICA)
k. English for Education College Teachers (In collaboration with British Council)
l. Decentralizing funding to schools project (in collaboration with world bank and AusAID) .. And so on

F. Current Practice and Procedure for Returning Migrant Children
   a. No limitation for children and youth from migrant families to enroll Basic Education Schools as well as NFE related programmes such as NFPE, EXCEL etc.
b. Special programme to have access to basic education for Migrant children and youth.
c. The local authorities and State/Regional Education Director Offices, District Education Offices, Township Education Offices, Respective Basic Education Schools must help to enroll students in accord with current education policies.
d. Procedure: migrants from MoE-recognized school can directly enroll by showing certificate
e. Procedure: migrants in non-MoE schools must sit for placement exam; this will be for the grade below their current school. Failure to pass the placement test means student will be placed one further grade down
f. Flexibility in timeline
g. Possibility for special changes to submit application for matriculation exam directly for Migrant children and youth
h. All Migrant children and Youth who are willing to learn in Myanmar are warmly welcomed and we will make to ensure to have access not only for basic education but also in all education sectors, such as higher education and TVET sector.

G. QUESTIONS
   a. TheanNaing - Secretary of Curriculum Committee - MEII
      i. Problems for students moving back into Burma. How can we make sure that when they move back to Burma, the headmasters and leaders can accommodate the displaced children?
      ii. Daw Aye Aye Mint passed the mic to answer: placement test will determine level
      iii. Question still stands that there are many unreached students and many hurdles for youth who may move back to Burma

SESSION 1: SITUATIONS AND GOVERNMENT INTERVENTIONS
Moderator: UNICEF Thailand Office
A. BMTA/ETWG (Maesot Case) : MsShweZin and Mr. NaingNaingTun (BMTA Chairperson) – BMTA – Burmese Migrant Teachers’ Association
   a. First: History: 1990 started migrant schools from 1995. First developed migrant schools, then got support form NGOs and other donors. Different types of donors: yearly basis donors, until now there are ones we have to support on our own.
   b. 69 migrant schools that are registered, 13,000 students
   c. 757 teachers in BMTA from 51 out of the 69 schools
   d. More than 200 schools in the area
   e. Challenges from 2014 Academic Year:
      i. In 6 migrant schools, 160 teachers working as volunteers without pay. Difficulty to keep human resources
      ii. 9 schools have been closed down for some reasons
      iii. Registration of schools
      iv. Relaying on Thai Education system for migrant education to develop curriculum
      v. There are language issues also – Thai, Burmese, and English, as well as local languages
      vi. We need NGOs to give support and technical info to develop education for migrant children
      vii. Capacity building for teachers: working closely with MoE Thailand as well.
B. NaingNaingTun to speak further on BMTA
   a. Recovery Begins with Teacher
   b. Will talk about role and responsibility of ETWG
   c. Who: Burmese migrant teachers in migrant schools in Tak (800 members from 51 schools out of 69 in the area)
   d. Vision:
      i. “Skillful teachers who can lead their students towards a safer, better, and harmonious society by accessing and effectively using resources to deliver quality education”
   e. Mission:
      i. “Develop the education standards for migrants in the area and representing the role of teachers in this”
   f. Goal:
      i. “Access to an accredited and recognized quality education for migrant communities along the Thai-Burma Border through emergence of an enabling environment.”
      ii. “We are here to collaborate together, to improve on the education of migrant children.”
   g. Objectives:
      i. Improve teaching capacity and professional skills through accredited recognition certificates
      ii. Increase transparency/accountability of BMTA and promote mission to stakeholders
iii. To standardize curriculum which is appropriate by integrating Thai/Myanmar curriculum, to utilize utilizing teaching and assessment in migrant schools
iv. Provide access to all school-aged children that is recognized regionally and internationally
v. Strengthen cooperation of parents and local communities
vi. Strengthen organizations operational management policies
vii. Provide necessary capacity building opportunities to increase staff capabilities
viii. Promote teachers’ security, dignity, and rights through advocacy
ix. Improve networking systems through collaboration with local and international education partners

h. WHAT WILL BMTA do:
i. Capacity building for Parent Teachers Association (own program, and joined with World Education)
ii. Staff and stakeholder capacity building
iii. Teachers Seminar, education seminar
iv. School trips
v. Teacher security and awareness
vi. Migrant Education Sector Research (Joined with World Education and Suwannmit Foundation)
vii. Curriculum Development and Standardization (Joined with MEII)
viii. Networking and advocacy (Joined with MEII, NNER, EWG, and EWGN)

C. EWG (Education Working Group)
a. Under Umbrella for “Consolidation Team for Displaced and Migrant Children.”
b. Members (all organizations providing education services in the Tak area)
   i. BMTA
   ii. Burmese Migrant Workers’ Education Committee (BMWEC)
   iii. Migrant Education (ME)
   iv. Social Action for Women (SAW)
   v. Community Council for Migrant Education (CCME)
c. What we do:
   i. Facilitate monthly networking to share activities, updates, plans
   ii. Discuss policy, standard, needs
   iii. Solve crises in areas (MEET – Migrant EducationEmergency Team is one example)
   iv. Raising money to allow over 2,500 students to continue their education in 2013-2014 (money going towards teacher stipend, rent, utilities, transportation costs at 19 MLCs)
d. Future Plan and Policy
i. Continue current programs
ii. More number of PTA capacity building and parent education program
iii. Set up standard assessment and exam for migrant children based on MEII CSF framework to promote migrant education quality assurance base – children may wish to return to the motherland
iv. Many changes in policy-, which is good. Good for migrant students – those who finish primary/secondary in Thailand can just university or secondary back in their home country

e. Challenges
  i. People who don’t know their future options

Burmese Migrant Situation in Thailand – MrHtoo Chit (Executive Director: Foundation for Education and Development)

A. History
   a. 1976 in Ranong – migrant learning Centers established
   b. Before we didn’t have a proper learning center – parents would try to teach their own children. They shared with other families.
   c. After tsunami in Thailand, many migrants in this area and he has gone into the fields, plantations, fish industries, to conduct research, provide education in learning centers.
   d. Registered as foundation, looked at issues, children will lose their identities and forget the Burmese language, trying to send coordinators from FED to facilitate these trainings, set up MLCs to provide two languages
   e. Burmese children with Thai ID can enroll in Thai school. But Myanmar is now open and students want to go back.
   f. Total of 4,000 students and some monastic schools with monks as instructors

B. Challenges:
   a. Budget - lack of quality teachers.
   b. Insufficient number of learning centers.
   c. Differences in curriculum. Cannot certify many students.

C. Overview of Reasons for migration to Thailand
   a. Includes information presented in previous presentations: Suppression of human rights in Myanmar; oppression of ethnic minorities through force, land confiscation, forced labor, rape; internal displacement; fewer job opportunities and low wages; economic mismanagement leading to poverty

D. History of FED
   a. Formerly Grassroots Human Rights Education and Development
   b. Founded in 3000 in Sankalaburi
   c. Relocated after 2004 tsunami to PhangNga, became registered Foundation in 2007 with an operational branch in Mae Sot
E. Core Programs:
   a. Migrant Development
   b. Education
   c. Health
   d. Women’s Empowerment
   e. Moken Project
   f. Peace Building
   g. Child Protection

F. Migrant workers:
   a. FED provides emergency assistance and healthcare to migrant laborers
   b. FED provides education and development opportunities for migrant children
   c. Some small programs of empowerment which often allow women to earn supplemental income

Mr. AungKyaw (Chairperson/Headmaster of MWRN supported school)
A. Just recently started in July
B. More than 300,000 migrant workers in Thailand
   a. Faced much discrimination
   b. Need to rely on NGOs due to limited government support
   c. Mahachaidistrit: highly populated with migrant workers in fishing industry
   d. Problems with ID cards – can only register as migrants but not for jobs like as a teacher
C. Work with Ranong personnel to learn how to provide for this population
   a. Advocates to Ministry of Labor and Ministry of Education in Myanmar for how to work for the rights of these people
   b. Would like to encourage all to support migrant education

Questions – 4 individuals from the audience asked questions to the panel.
A. Regarding students who do not speak Burmese as their mother tongues and the need for trilingual (Burmese, Thai, ethnic language) education
   a. Two main ethnic group: Mon and Taway/Burmese (similar language), alsoArakan.
   b. Try to use common language, Burmese (does not feel that this is discrimination).
   c. Teaches Myanmar language, try also to teach in Thai language (hire native Thai teachers).
   d. Respect minority language – try to teach Buddhist Mon Monks in Thailand to teach the language at the schools.
B. Change BMTA to MMTA (Myanmar instead of Burma). Clarification of local needs – welcoming programming clarification
C. On behalf of Thai NFE, wishes to have more information from NGO work especially in Mahachai district.
D. Too long of a story if we just repeat what we've already done. Better to plan for the future.

Moderator: Many challenges for parents and children based on variety of curriculum in each school. The challenge is to create a curriculum that fits everyone's needs. Kyaw Kyaw Min Htut will explain the future program during his session. Curriculum Issue will be discussed at this time. The idea of ID is brought up again; migrant workers need to have a work permit, but this work permit does not qualify everyone for every type of job. There is the necessity to certify teachers properly.

In order to work in Thailand, they need a work permit. Only 7 types of work that are accepted – the jobs that Thais don’t want to work. Necessity of certifying teachers.

Afternoon Sections
Ma Thu Zar Moe (from World Education Thailand)
Andrea Costa from Save the Children International/KRCEE

Ma Thu Zar Moe – PhopPhra District, Tak Province NFPE (Non Formal Education Program) – spoke in Burmese.

A. Started Primary in 2012 as literacy and numeracy community center
B. World Education pilot program in 2014, then with support through Myanmar Literacy Resource Center NFPE office to address gaps in access and opportunity.
   a. Provides recognized certificate and opportunity for children to demonstrate level of education to allow them to return to Myanmar
   b. Targeted to 14+ years old. Some have never attended school prior to this
   c. Map: 4 centers, 4 teachers, 43 students
C. NFPE role in pilot program
   i. To support facilitator training and observation
   ii. Monitoring of quality and implementation very carefully
   iii. Issued certificate for those who have completed teacher’s training (4 teachers).
D. Role of World Education in this pilot program
   a. Repair, build, and furnish centers
   b. Distribute teaching/learning materials
   c. Support management planning and admin
   d. Organize township monitor liaison
E. Short video clip of children and parent
F. Final Remarks: in order for students to go back to Burma to continue their secondary education, we will discuss next session how to improve education system.

Health Without Frontiers – name of this person (?)
A. Children in Mae Sot/PhopPhra  
   a. Pilot program in Rangong, Mae Sot, and Bangkok  
   b. May 5th – started pilot for migrant education/Thai NFE. Started class in two learning centers. Has some programs that are Thai NFE based and some that are Burmese NFED based  
   c. Example: Mae Sod/Myawaddy Program  
   d. Video slideshow to illustrate NFED (can choose between Burmese and Thai NFE)  
   e. Final remarks: Hopes for more openness and open communication. We try to make it small and easy.

ANDREA COSTA – “Education Systems in the 9 Temporary Shelters Along the Thailand/Myanmar Border”  
A. Apologizes on behalf of KnED and KRCEE who are unable to travel to Bangkok  
B. Overview of KRCEE  
   a. Karen Refugee Committee Education Entity  
   b. In 7 temporary shelters: Mae Liia, Umphium Mai, Nu Po, Mae Ra Ma Lang, Mae La Oon, Tham Hin, Dong Yang  
C. Overview of KnED  
   a. Karenni Education Department  
   b. 2 temporary shelters – Site 1 and Site 2  
D. KRCEE and KnED  
   a. 31,000 students, 80 basic education schools, over 1,500 refugee teachers  
   b. All use mother tongue for education  
   c. KRCEE and KnED do teacher trainings, basic structure, professional development, and provide administrative oversight of education services (including teacher stipends, teaching and learning materials, and teacher training programs)  
   d. Primary-higher education  
   e. Education systems compared to Myanmar:  
      i. Save the Children (Thailand) and partners undertook analysis  
      ii. KnED system is more closely aligned to the current Myanmar system of 11 years of basic education  
      iii. KRCEE system has 12 years of basic education and therefore is more closely aligned to that being currently proposed as part of Myanmar’s education reform.  
   f. Overview of KRCEE and KnED basic education curriculum  
      i. Break down and comparison of G1-G12 (Karen) and KG – S10 (Standard 10, Karen).  
      ii. Primary school: both systems offer English, mathematics, health and physical education and art. The KnED schools offer social studies; KRCEE schools offer history and geography. Karenni schools teach Burmese language from
the first year of primary school, while the KRCEE offer Burmese language from G3. KnED schools also offer music, and library (which teaches reading and study skills).

iii. In middle school: both teach English, Burmese, and mathematics and introduce science as a subject. KRCEE schools teach Karen, history and geography, plus a social science subject that adds studies of the environment, religion, social relations, and economics. KnED schools teach Karenni, and also social studies to S6 before narrowing the focus to geography and history from S7.

iv. In high school, KRCEE schools continue to teach Karen, English and Burmese, but KnED schools teach only English and Burmese. Both: students take mathematics, history, geography, and science. In the KRCEE schools students also study art and vocational subjects in high school.

g. Teacher education system in temporary shelters and border:
   i. Supported by Right to Play, KnED, JRS, World Education, and KTWG (Karen Teachers Working Group)
   ii. Shows comparison of teacher competency frameworks against ASEAN, Border TCF (teacher competency framework) standards (Responding to student needs, knowledge of curriculum. Frameworks, mastery of subject matter, planning, application, and teaching/learning materials). Also classroom management, assessment, collaboration, professional attitudes, reflective practices, initiatives for CPO.
   iii. Competency-based teaching standards could be a useful means of establishing equivalency between refugee teachers and host/home teachers, for refugee teacher graduates who may wish to return to Myanmar.

h. Competencies: Impact upon return
   i. Reduce and remove barriers to access to education and gaining meaningful employment
   ii. Reduce and remove barriers to contributing to growth and development of Myanmar
   iii. Reduce and remove child protection risks and social division, as well as potential for marginalization
   iv. It is vital that we recognize qualifications, skills, and experiences gained in temporary shelters
   v. These teaches will be necessary to supporting introduction of mother tongue education in Myanmar and meeting the demand for more teachers in rural ethnic areas

i. Indepth analysis of competencies frameworks in ASEAN, Myanmar, Border
   i. Available on powerpoint, as is more indepth breakdown of Current education programs, and impacts of student
learning and teacher qualifications upon return to Myanmar

j. Apologies once again on behalf of KRCEE and KnED for their inability to attend

k. Final remarks: There has been lots of speculation in the aftermath of the election. Lots of fear and anxiety for people in the camps about what they will return to. The idea of starting from ground zero is a big challenge and has implications for families’ choices to return. It’s a great opportunity with both MoEs in the room to come up with a way to support children’s education without discrimination and without disadvantage. Majority of support from INGOs, most of teachers’ work comes from internal commitment to the work rather than financial reward. When talking to refugees in the camp about their future, they are “partly filled with hope and partly filled with terror.” Would like their skills from the camps recognized so they may be a part of the rebuilding of their nation upon their return.

THIRD SESSION – REINTEGRATION

Dr. PremjaiVungsiriphisal (Chulalongkorn University, on behalf of VSO Thailand)

A. Reintegration into Myanmar Education System – Findings of Research
   a. Changes in Myanmar coming rapidly. Many migrants want to return to their villages. Increased development opportunities
   b. Review of Thailand policy and current situation – that non-Thai children may study at local schools, that only a few MLCs are legally registered, funding allocated to MLCs is decreasing while funding for Myanmar is increasing, MLC networks successfully negotiating with Karen state authority to send MLC students for matriculation exams, MLC center passing rate very low still
   c. This student was carried out between March-May 2014 in Chiang Mai, Mae Sot, Bangkok, Samutsakorn, and Ranong in collaboration with BEAM, CDC, BMWEC, World Vision, and others.
   d. Sample size of 412 between 10 and 20 years
   e. Majority from border areas (Kayin, Shan, Mon, Thaninthayi, Kayah, States while many are still from internal areas (Yangon, Bago, Kachin, Ayeyarwady, Mandalay, Magway, Rakhine, Sagaing)

B. Future Education plan – 14% plan not to study, 78% plan to stay in Thailand to study, 21% to return to Myanmar to study
   a. Reason to return broken down by ethnicity – need more study, need Myanmar accreditation, among others
   b. Also analyzed confidence in preparation to reintegration by current education institution – MLCs non-formal education show high rates of feeling unprepared, as do MLCs Grade 9-12. Thai Schools and MLC with Thai learning show higher rates of feeling
prepared (due to the fact that they feel their education is formally recognized)
c. Additional information: parents are willing to support kids education, but complain about high cost of study and high living costs in cities where schools exist (no school/poor schools in their home areas)

C. MLC Reintegration Plan
   a. A few plan to return when the economic system is improved
   b. Opportunity to reintegrate is only possible in some places (namely private institutions, not government schools. Very difficult to return)

D. Conclusion:
   a. Possibility to return
   b. Gaps – different curriculum environments, knowledge, standards, school availability
   c. Challenge – transfer accreditation, policy to encourage teachers to return, increase budge for free education, teachers want more income and clearer career path

E. Recommendation
   a. Clearer info about national test, study environment, etc
   b. Curriculum in MLCs revised to support integration
   c. Broaden collaboration between MLC and Myanmar schools
   d. Thai and M governments should set up transfer system, should provide incentives for teachers to return, training, scholarships for students

Mr. Patrick Kearns (and Mr. Tim Murray - Education specialist of Save the Children Thailand) - World Education and Save the Children

“MESR: A Joint Project Led by World Education and Save the Children International”

A. MESR – Migrant Education Sector Research
   a. A joint project between WE and Save the Children – Maesot and surrounding areas, Bangkok
   b. Local partners – BMTA, MECC, Help Without Frontiers, Suwannimit Foundation, Foundations for Rural Youth, and many others

B. Why
   a. Increasing number of students enrolled in MLCs as well as Royal Thai Government school, decreasing financial support, enrollment has increased, high drop out rate, lack of accreditation, lack of awareness of EFA, language and cultural barrier – emphasis that funding is moving across the border and this is expected to continue.
   b. This research aims to find out what is required for the current migrant education sector to be able to provide sustainable access
and opportunity to quality and accredited education for all school age children in Mae Sot and Bangkok.

c. Questions – what is required for Migrant Education sector in Thailand to be able to provide access and opportunity to accredited education
   i. Models of best practices
   ii. Visions and hopes for parents
   iii. Challenges and shortfalls in this sector
d. Interviews, surveys, focus groups, document review, quantitative assessment of literacy skills with students, stakeholders, teachers, directors, parents

C. Initial Findings of Language and Literacy (Average age 9.5 years of age in Grades 1-5. 341 students, mix of boys and girls, in MLCs and Thai schools)
   a. Preliminary breakdown and presentation of statistical findings is available on PowerPoint; presented went through the numbers quite quickly, explaining that a comprehensive report will be coming out soon
   b. What is level of reading in target schools
   c. What is the level of reading in students learning in Thai versus learning in Burmese
   d. Are certain groups struggling more than others to master reading skills
   e. Standards/Assessment Areas: letter recognition, fluency in reading, accuracy in reading, reading comprehension
   f. Key Findings: MLCs low fluency rate, high letters, accuracy). Slightly lower comprehension rates. In Thai schools, comparison between MST and BKK – higher rates I nearly everything in BKK. Significantly lower results in Fluency and Comprehension. BKK students have been through a 1-2 year long Thai language preparation before entering Thai language schools.
   g. Other key findings among migrant students in Thai schools: students in ECD programs in same language as where they studied at primary level tended to have stronger literacy skills. Students with stronger literate environment (books at home, being read to, etc) have better reading skills. Girls have higher scores than boys.

D. Recommendations
   a. Migrant children continue in Thai schools
   b. Burmese LCs need continued support and investment
   c. Programming to increase access to books and literacy activities out of school
   d. Role of ECCD in language development should be investigated further. Consider carefully what language this should happen in?

Mr. Ichiro Miyazawa – “Education System for Migrant Children”

A. Summary – 300,000 migrant children.
i. Three providers OBEC (formal education. 31,000 schools, 98,000 migrant learners, majority from Myanmar). ONIE (Non-formal Education, NFE – 9,000 schools, 5,000 migrant learners), BPP (Border Patrol Police – 178 schools – 22,000 migrant learners, certified with OBEC curriculum)

ii. And then NGO schools/ MLCs – 50,000 learners (or 15,000 fact check this), ONIE pilot (3 years), NFPE (2 years)

iii. And then in camps – 35,000 learners

B. Slide showing Education Systems of Thailand and Myanmar

i. Photos of Community Learning Centers under ONIE, schools under OBEC, Border Patrol Police Schools, NGO Learning Centers,

C. Venn Diagram overlapping Myanmar Formal, Myanmar NFE, MLCs, Thailand NFE, Thailand Formal

i. In depth breakdown available on PowerPoint: Each school broken down by years required in Primary, Middle Secondary, and High School

ii. MLCs: Currently 5 years in Primary, 4 years Middle Secondary, 2 Years High Secondary

iii. It is possible for student to move from MLC into Myanmar formal education – must take a test first for placement. Of course examination will be difficult for him to pass.

iv. Girl moving from Thai formal school (up through lower secondary, 9 years of study). Can she move into Myanmar high second where she is supposed to be? Is it easy for her to do this?

D. If it is not easy for students to transition from MLCs, Thai schools, etc, into Myanmar schools, we have to do something. System does not exist to keep people away from school. It exists to accommodate people and allow them to continually learn. This is necessary for our group discussion. Don’t just look for tomorrow, look for 1, 5, 10 years from now.

B. Questions to consider

A. “What agreements/policies do we need over countries/region” – consider ASEAN

B. “What kind of systems do we need to create?”

C. What kind of Action to create?

D. How could we ensure resources

Mr. TheinNaing (Curriculum Consultant MEII) – “Curriculum Integration for Burmese MLCs in Thailand”

A. Started with needs assessment and community consultations

i. Intensive study of existing Migrant curriculum guidelines, Myanmar/Thai curriculum standards, NFPE guidelines

ii. Development of inter-agency network for education

iii. Resource sharing
iv. Four Frameworks - ECD, Primary, Junior Secondary, Senior Secondary
v. CSF presented in 7-9 January 2014 MEII Seminars in Mae Sot

B. Will try to propose curriculum for 112 MLC (less than 20 high school level. Majority of MLCs are primary, Grade 1-6)

C. Summary continued – challenges
   i. Limited trainings for teachers
   ii. Curriculum development limited; small subject training courses are available through local organizations and INGOs
   iii. Unstable and high turnover rate due to constant movement and low stipends
   iv. Resources
   v. Among others

D. MLC’s stronger points for Curriculum Development and Integrations
   i. Free and open discussion (democratic practices)
   ii. Formal school system with free access
   iii. Regular school-based meetings
   iv. Multi-region networking
   v. CSF can be implemented with material support and financial contributions
   vi. Work with teacher associations, CBOs, iNGOs, Thai/Myanmar MoEs

E. Comparison of Myanmar NFE and Thailand NFPE – again broken down in more detail in other studies. Thai focuses heavily on vocational trainings, also life skill training. Both curriculum have advantages and disadvantages.
   i. Myanmar NFE:
      1. Myanmar 40%
      2. English 15%
      3. Maths 25%
      4. General 20%
      5. 6 days a week, 500 hours/year
   ii. Thai NFPE
      1. Life Skills
      2. Vocational Training
      3. Literacy and Numeracy
      4. Among others

F. Guiding principals MEII CSF
   i. EFA and equal access
   ii. Social reconstruction and critical pedagogy for MLCs
   iii. Thinking curriculum
   iv. Integration, inclusivity, child-centered approach, active learning, continuous assessment
G. Integration pathways discussed in depth based on research

H. Important role of curriculum development – example is history, and what languages subjects are taught in

I. Overall education objectives
   i. Provide knowledge and competency necessary for living in Thai communities
   ii. Provide knowledge and competency necessary for reintegrating into Myanmar communities
   iii. Provide basic knowledge and skill
   iv. Provide knowledge and competency necessary for ASEAN integration

J. Major strands
   i. Well-being
   ii. Citizenship/belonging
   iii. Effective communication
   iv. Intellectual Empowerment
   v. Aesthetic Expression
   vi. MEII Framework / Primary 1-6 – Each strand of learning broken down by Subject, time frame
      1. Basic knowledge
      2. Social Development
      3. Life Skills and Occupational Skills
      4. Foreign Language

K. Recommendations
   i. Teacher training for CSF and Subject methods
   ii. Social development curriculum
   iii. Civic, ASEAN, art, vocational, sports/physical education, priorities
   iv. Holistic approaches in education and curriculum development
   v. Multi-region participation and facilitations
   vi. Local empowerment
   vii. Teacher Resource Development
   viii. Curriculum negotiation, recognition, advocacy
   ix. This research aims to find out **what is required for the current migrant education sector to be able to provide sustainable access and opportunity to quality and accredited education for all school age children in Mae Sot and Bangkok.** Would like support from both Myanmar and Thailand

Director of Thai NFE spoke briefly at this point
   A. Shared own experience with providing education to migrant children in Thailand – many areas
   B. Focus on children age 15+, will try to provide an appropriate education with necessary skills covered. Special education for disabilities
C. Raise an advantage of EFA (specifically migrant)
a. Differences in Myanmar/Thai systems – very good idea to bridge the two education systems as a model, can further develop this with other ASEAN countries
b. Can be transferred to other countries with good skills and knowledge. Try to emphasize universal subjects (math, English, science) and essential life skills and vocational skills.
c. Each country has own assessment tools. Each country must use their tools to facilitate children’s ability to continue in higher education
d. Problems relating to the borders of Thailand – from Myanmar’s side, he does not see that they are well prepared for this. So many problems for children who wish to return to Myanmar – there is a lack of teachers. Somehow the education system in Myanmar is still rigid.
e. Equivalency program necessary
f. Why do we need to establish an education system for these people? Sometimes they only need a diploma. So we must cater our system to fit their needs. It’s complicated to create an appropriate program, but we need to ensure the appropriate rights for these people – issue of human dignity; people have the right to receive an education in Thailand, they will qualify as a human being and will have the choice to return to Myanmar.
   i. Mae Sot as example of huge hub of migrant learners

Session 4 (KK as moderator): Towards Policy Framework and Equivalency System for Continuous Education/Learning over the Countries

1. Summarize:
a. Opportunities:
   i. Thai Education laws offers opportunity to all to receive education, and as policy to locate resources
   ii. Myanmar laws that welcome migrant children, provides equal access to education.
   iii. MLCs – they have own values to promote cultural identity
   iv. Nonformal programs in Thailand
   v. EFA
   vi. Share excellent research from Save the Children, World Education, et cetera
b. Challenges
   i. Address lack of accreditation
   ii. Address lack of resources
c. NEEDS
   i. Standardization of curriculum (not creating our own curriculum. Adaptation of existing curriculum)
ii. Education equivalency and accreditation system
iii. Inclusive student access
iv. Resource allocation

4 Groups
A. OBEC
B. ONIE
C. Myanmar Education
D. Development Agencies

All groups to present on Tuesday

TUESDAY 18 NOVEMBER 2014
Mr. Ichiro Miyazawa (Programme Specialist, UNESCO Bangkok) announces:

UNESCO Website is updated with agenda, power points, and so on

21 organizations registered here, 82 schools

Presentations:
1. Development Programs
   a. Speaker James from UNHCR in Mae Sot introduced the three subgroups:
      i. What agreements and policies do we need?
      ii. What systems need to be created?
      iii. How do we ensure resources?
   b. Agreements and policies
      i. Focused on issues of equivalency and accreditation
      ii. Focused on inclusive access to students
      iii. Focus on students rather than teachers
      iv. Four sub areas (problems and solutions)
         1. National EFA policy: inconsistent application of the policy. School to school, district to district.
            Differentiation in documentation needed, procedures needed to leave the school and enter a new school. One suggestion: Awareness raising activities on the school level, to make administrators aware of what to ask for, what must be made available for students leaving.
         2. School and System Transfers: within a country and potentially cross borders. One suggestion: student tracking system (possibly automated, made online, networked?) In the short term, clearer policies on transitioning.
         3. Placement testing (students entering new schools) – language barriers. Suggestions: change placement
testing format to a skills based testing approach rather than a knowledge approach. How a child is able to perform rather than what they know. (Adjustments in pedagogy – move away from rote memorization). Bridging courses (intensive language courses) Intensive systems orientation course from moving to NFE to Formal, etc. Comprehensive/holistic testing. Long-term goal is standardized curriculum across the region.

4. Absorbing students from unsustainable systems into sustainable systems (unsustainable: MLC, Temporary Shelter schools.) Thai schools do not have capacity for all migrant students. Create new schools? Possibility of branch schools/branch classrooms. Accreditation through state systems.

5. Resources: cross ministry fund transfers. Ministry of interior towards ministry of labor. New industry levy towards industries more dependent on migrant labor, to support new schools, teacher accreditation

6. Long-term goal: Pool fund within ASEAN region, to move funds within the region based on migrant trends.

c. Speaker 2: Shirley Worland (Chiang Mai University/MEII) –
   i. Cross border education committee with Myanmar and Thai Education officials
      1. Core Competencies (Curriculum competencies that need to be there for each grade levels)
         a. NFE and NFPE – scaling up the pilots already in place to be more widespread along the border
         b. Placement tests (open information policies so all educators have an understanding)
         c. Cross border cooperation for preparation of students to take these tests

   2. MLCs – accreditation necessary
      a. For point 2 to happen, students need ID for this to happen. So many stateless children have no birth registration – need an agreed way by which these students can access education

3. Resources: mother tongue based multi cultural education – MTBMCE (mother-tongue based multi-cultural education) enshrined into education

4. Questions: How to receive accreditation? (Woman from World Education)
   a. Answer (Shirley): In this time of EFA/ASEAN/ethnic state education committees; we have the time now and the opportunity to pursue a cooperative approach. There is money available, and human agency, and trainings –
how can we channel these resources with educators in Myanmar and Thailand

b. Ursula: The Thai and Myanmar government officials here vouch for the optimism of this

2. Speaker 3 (Thai Education group – representative from Thai MoE)

Standardizations of Curriculum, educational equivalency and accreditation of system

a. Mentioned policy –

b. National Standardization test - formal, non-formal, and vocational educations (5 subjects: Thai English Math, Science, and Social Science. Core subjects, mandatory for all educators in Thailand.) For other subjects like mother languages, history, and geography – those are included in elective subjects. Based on Target learners.

c. Transfer of credits –

i. Thai education is similar to Myanmar Education system. Another breakdown of education systems by year and system.

ii. National Examination for two categories (National Test used for those who have graduated from Grade 3 in Thai, Math, Science. In 6th grade, tested again, and again in 9th grade. Test on 8 subjects – but some will be not included in general test. Only 5 mandatory subjects will be focused on for national examination

2. Speaker 4 – ONIE (Ranong Province)

a. Work related to all stakeholders.

b. Identification of needs:

i. Standardization of curriculum – National Curriculum in each country

ii. Education Equivalency and accreditation system
1. Development of transfer of credits system, as well as clear tracks for primary, secondary, and vocational tracks.

2. Must reside in same province for 3 years (this is an obstacle for many)

3. Inclusive student access – creates learning community and network. We can use homes, temples, and public areas, to be our classrooms. Our target groups include those with disabilities, minorities, etc.

iii. Emphasis on confidence of learners. Very important. Must bring up the confidence of our Burmese learners. Emphasis on government to raise awareness of their own citizens, to make them confident to make them receive an education regardless of location.

   1. ONIE tries to provide all kinds of learning

iv. Resource allocation to ensure quality education to all – mentions fundraising for all stakeholders, continued work with and appreciation towards partners

c. Question: Kyaw Kyaw towards OBEC and ONIE

   i. Registration of migrant students

      1. Certification is a major barrier, as is lack of documents

      2. What suggestions do OBEC and ONIE have towards allowing recognition of MLC certificates?

   d. Answer– Provincial Director to Tak NFE

      i. ONIE and OBEC are trying our best to provide education for all; trying to open up opportunity to all. Raised more than 200 million baht into migrant education.

      ii. Would like to extend authority to all schools in Thailand, all institutions to use their suitable tuitions based on the needs on the learners in community with core curriculum. Includes mandatory subjects. Education institutions are authorized by all learners – children at age of 10 receiving education at MLC for 4 years. Committee to be set up for each student to be sent to correct level.

      iii. Transfer of learners from MLC to NFE CLCs – very challenging. Not many CLCs have rules in place for transfer of students. No standard rules. Our homework is to develop this rule.

      iv. Relevant subjects to daily life of migrant learners – for example agriculture. Must be flexible, must take diversity into account.

      v. Ask all parties and all stakeholders to support education at ONIE; asks all NGO and development agencies that MLCs organized by CBOs have to report their situations to ONIE so we know the needs of MLCs and we can develop further collaboration.

      vi. I believe we have the same target groups and the same objectives – to help them.
e. Answer Part 2 - OBEC response
   i. Children need to have birth certificates, ID cards with 13 digit numbers, and need household registration. This will limit numbers.
   ii. There is cabinet resolution of 2005 to include other evidence to identify birthplace of the children. Evidence can be through interview. School managers and teachers can interview teachers and parents of birthday, birth place, etc, according to MoE format. If circumstances do not allow, the teacher who identified the need can interview by himself or herself. Now there is opportunity for public school.
   iii. Remember: Last circumstance: we can just ask the teacher to interview the parents. The teacher can accept the students then. Non-Thai citizens may receive certificates, but it will be mentioned that student is non-Thai citizen. (Prior to 2005)
   iv. After 2005, there is a change in certification. Prohibited to have remark that they are non-Thai citizen. Non-Thai children are entitled to equal rights. Students may carry and use certificates.
   v. BUT: what about schools not registered with MoE? Learning centers cannot give out official certificates. Learning centers need to be registered to nearby schools (“Schools Within Schools” Project. They can then issue certificate that is recognized by MoE. Initial placement test - school will then have authority to consider appropriate classes. This is recommendation of OBEC that all Thai schools have to conduct this placement test. Very important that schools communicate with education services to get support.

4. Ministry of Education Myanmar – Planning Officer speaks
   a. Curriculum reforms to start in 2016
      i. Plan in place for migrant placement tests (Math, English, Science) – emphasized!
      ii. Remedial teaching should be both in Myanmar and Thailand – may have language needs for Myanmar language
      iii. Access of continuous education for migrant children at any level
      iv. Warm welcomes to migrant children
      v. Increase enrollment rate and retention rate
      vi. Law of Education has included implementation for migrant education
      vii. Education for all
      viii. Technical need for teachers – teaching mechanisms to be put in place by both Thailand and Myanmar MoEs
      ix. Find weakness, build sustainable relationships in MLCs (long term plan)
x. Pilot field-testing needed, as well as discussion for specific needs by level and by region.
xi. Move forward to prepare for the future.
xii. Equivalency for language within ethnic groups and with national language
xiii. Confident in the continuing initiative of this Consultative meeting – all countries will strive to GET EVERYONE IN THE PICTURE.

b. Question from OBEC:
i. Language issue – students in MLCs using ethnic languages rather than Myanmar languages. This must be considered for placement tests.
   ii. Answer from Andrea Costa and Tim Murray: things taught in mother taught had better literacy, and were better able to pick up good Myanmar language skills than throwing them directly into complete Myanmar language based education. Do not create barriers to language access.

c. Jessica Ball (OSI): Thai government attempts to circumvent barriers of inclusion (specifically due to ID) - What steps is the Myanmar government to circumvent these barriers as well?
   i. We are trying to improve on ID part. (Translation problems)

d. Review of Myawaddy case (Karen State Education Minister)
   i. Only 7 students pass the test. Conducted test again for 100 students, only 35 passed. 175 students to take examination. Starting from last year, students coming from Thailand tried to register in formal schools in Thailand. Students are happy they have the opportunity to study in Burma. They are of course welcomed. Burmese migrants are our children and we wish to receive them back if they wish to return. Talk to township officer in different regions and divisions.

e. Question again – Andrea repeats Jessica’s question.
   i. Information centers: Anyone can come to ask questions about their concerns to help inform them about their return. Lots of questions about education: “If I want to go back and enroll in Grade 6, do I need Myanmar ID?”
   ii. Answer: We are trying to apply EFA – warmly welcome our students back. For placement tests, we are having placement tests in Burmese, English, and Mathematics. When creating placement test – when they wish to join the school, all they need is to bring their documentation from school where they attend. Student can then take placement test. But: but if student is not really qualified, that will be an issue.
   iii. Answer part 2: with Ministry of Education and ministry of Immigration, trying to issue birth certificates and IDs. This is still in the works. There will be administrative meeting in the next few weeks on how to issue birth registration to migrant
students. Deputy minister of immigration will attend and work on this issue.

f. Question (Mon Aye)
   i. Clarification needed: for those who were born in Thailand without documentation – can these students return to Myanmar to study or not?
      1. Answer: Still in process of improvement.

g. Is there a long-term plan for migrant, refugee, and IDP camp individuals?
   i. No difference as long as they are Myanmar.

h. We have students from Burma who completed grade 5, but the student does not have certificate of completion. After two years in Thailand (grade 7), he wishes to go back to Burma. Would that certificate be accepted by MoE of Myanmar?
   i. Placement test for grade 6 must be passed.

5. Session 6: Prioritized Actions for the Next 5 Years (UNICEF Thailand Office)
   a. Standardized Curriculum (NFE/NFPE)
   b. Myanmar Curriculum having been reformed (in place by 2016)
   c. Issue of complexity which reflect on local contexts to be considered
   d. Core subjects, Equivalency and Accreditation standards reiterated and summarized
   e. Inclusivity (EFA, create networking, learning community, remedial teaching in Myanmar and Thailand, improve relations and promote involvement of townships)
   f. Resource allocation (commitment on CRC/EFA – no discrimination), “school within a school” program, pool funds, involve private sectors, create sustainable issues
   g. Follow up consultation workshops in 2015, discussion for specific needs
   h. ABC – Across border committee review (registration, core-curriculum, resources)

6. Ichiro Miyazawa– delay will affect children! This must be a priority!

CLOSING SESSION:

Director of Tak Province Thai ONIE to give closing remarks (Mr. Suripon)

2. On behalf of representatives of MoE Thailand – would like to congratulate organizations for initiating this meeting. Will be useful to all - hopes it will serve as a model for all to take initiative together. Improve education for migrant education.

3. Future: MoE will continue to develop curriculum and arrangements for children. ASEAN family reminds us to collaborate further in the future and develop ASEAN citizens together.
4. Thanks to MEII, all UN agencies and NGOs, MoE of Thailand and Myanmar representatives

Mr. Gwang-Jo Kim Regional Director UNESCO Bangkok
A. Thanks to all, farewell to all
B. Work ahead formidable – wide development goals. Invest in education, democratic participation. All children must benefit from inclusive quality education.

Closing remarks BijayaRajdhandari – UNICEF representative for Thailand
A. Hopeful future, but lots of children – EFA EFA EFA.
B. Education system must be fully implemented and enforced for all children – includes migrants, disabled, and otherwise vulnerable or susceptible to exclusion
C. Reason for optimism: Local authorities working tirelessly for children – universal right to education acknowledged.
D. Special thank you to officers from Myanmar and Thailand, NGOs, INGOS, MEII, Cynthia Maung, and many others.