

**立法會 CB(2)1170/17-18(01)號文件**  
**LC Paper No. CB(2)1170/17-18(01)**

To the subcommittee on the rights of ethnic minorities,

On behalf of the 15 ethnic minority youths who attended the second session of the Subcommittee on Rights of Ethnic Minorities meeting on February 27, discussing “education for children of ethnic minorities”, I am writing to respond to the comments presented by members of the Education Bureau.

We respectfully ask for responses regarding the following points:

**1. CSL Teacher Training**

From Dr. CHOI and Mr. LEE’s responses to Ms. Claudia Mo regarding the structure of the Chinese Language Framework, we were told that the current Learning Framework heavily relies on schools and CSL teachers to design a curriculum for themselves based on the students’ needs and the value of providing “professional latitude”.

However, given the sentiments shared by Ms. RAHMAN, Ms. GURUNG and Mr. SUNAR as well as the experiences of most of our deputation, there have been many incidents where CSL teachers have failed to properly account for the needs of particular EM students and had not adjusted their pedagogy despite this.

This, of course, may be due to different factors, but the fact remains: we have heard a substantial number of accounts that suggest that many CSL teachers are still not adequately trained to handle teaching Chinese to EMs, and schools make some questionable decisions within the given Framework. With this in mind, despite our belief in their good intentions and appreciation for their efforts, it is difficult to give teachers and schools our full trust.

It is evident that the Framework, especially due to its infancy, is heavily reliant on teachers and schools who are inexperienced in teaching CSL effectively. Given the situation, should the guidelines be as flexible and lenient as they are currently? In the long-term, the Education Bureau has promised to continue revising the Framework and training programs for teachers. However, are there any short-term measures that can be introduced to at least minimise the frequency of ineffective pedagogy? Moreover, are there any plans for improving transparency on the contents of the teachers’ training so the EM community and other relevant stakeholders can provide feedback on the materials?

**2. Accountability**

Based on the comments from the Education Bureau during the meeting, it appears the government has already been responding to various concerns that we have raised. However, although this may be the case, it is also true that the intended benefits of government programs have largely gone unnoticed based on our experiences, those we have consulted for our presentations, and what we have heard from other EMs within our social networks.

Seeing as the government has spent HK\$190 million on supporting EMs in learning Chinese and integrating into the community, any positive outcomes should be more apparent to members of the public. Whether our current perception on the lack of positive outcomes from the government’s efforts is a result of the efforts’ ineffectiveness or ignorance on our part, we cannot be certain until more information is available.

Therefore, would it be possible for the government to provide data, statistics and/or reports to the general public regarding the effectiveness of CSL and integration efforts, and ensure that EMs and educators in particular understand the current situation? This would provide a

more accurate picture for all stakeholders involved, further facilitating constructive discussions on the topic of education for EMs. In case the government has already made plans to provide such information, is there a timeline as to when such information would be available?

We hope the Education Bureau would be able to elaborate on these questions, as we are very eager to work together towards the better integration of EMs in Hong Kong.

Yours sincerely,

Kristeen Romero