



Department of Education

Indigenous Peoples Participation Framework (IPPF)

Teacher Effectiveness and Competencies Enhancement Project (TEACEP)

Preface

This document is called the Indigenous Peoples Participation Framework (IPPF) which was developed to support the Teacher Effectiveness and Competencies Enhancement Project (TEACEP). The IPPF provides guidance for the participation of Indigenous Peoples to ensure inclusive education for all.

While beset with communication limitations, initial consultations regarding this project were conducted by phone with key IP leaders and elders in Region's IX and XII who are actively involved in implementing the IPEd Program.

This document is considered a living document and could be modified and changed in line with available and emerging approaches on Indigenous Peoples education in the country.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | | |
|-------------|---|-----------|
| I. | Introduction..... | 3 |
| II. | IP Education in the Philippines..... | 4 |
| III. | Policy and Institutional Context..... | 5 |
| IV. | Mindanao Regional Context and Available Data..... | 9 |
| V. | The IP Education Program in the Pandemic Context..... | 9 |
| VI. | IP Participation Framework in TEACEP..... | 10 |
| A. | Description of TEACEP..... | 10 |
| B. | Strategies on IP Responsive TEACEP..... | 11 |
| C. | Ensuring Representation of IPs in Project Structure..... | 13 |
| D. | Monitoring Implementation of IPPF..... | 13 |
| E. | Resources for IPPF Implementation..... | 13 |
| F. | Disclosure..... | 14 |

I. Introduction

1 To promote the rights of indigenous peoples to basic education and as part of its mandate to provide inclusive basic education for all in accordance with the 1987 Philippine Constitution and the Indigenous Peoples Rights Act (IPRA) of 1997, the Department of Education (DepEd) adopts this Indigenous Peoples Participation Framework (IPPF) for the Teacher Effectiveness and Competencies Enhancement Project (TEACEP). This Framework is aligned with the National Indigenous Peoples (IP) Education Policy Framework, adopted by the Department through DepEd Order No. 62, s. 2011, and the Philippine Government's commitment to achieve its Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

2 This IPPF is likewise adopted in compliance with the World Bank Operational Policy on Indigenous Peoples (OP 4.10), which stipulates that all Bank-financed projects shall be designed and implemented "in such a way that Indigenous Peoples do not suffer adverse effects during the development process," and that these are also "designed to ensure that Indigenous Peoples receive social and economic benefits that are culturally appropriate and gender and intergenerationally inclusive" (Paragraph 1).

3 Accurate data on the population of indigenous peoples in the country continue to be lacking, which in turn poses as a perennial challenge in development planning.¹ To date, no recent population data disaggregated by ethnicity is available. The 2010 Census of Population and Housing by the National Statistics Office (NSO) has included a variable on ethnicity, with the intention of generating much needed demographic data on indigenous ethnic groups. However, full census results have yet to be officially released. Estimates by the National Commission on Indigenous Peoples (NCIP) approximate the population of indigenous peoples to be at 11.3 million (excluding the Bangsamoro Autonomous Region of Muslim Mindanao (BARMM), Region XIII, and the National Capital Region (NCR)).² It is commonly held that indigenous peoples, including those in BARMM, Region XIII and NCR, roughly comprise 10 to 15 percent of the total Philippine population of 108.3 million (2019) and are present in 65 of the 78 provinces of the country, with approximately 60 percent living in Mindanao, some 30 percent in Luzon, and the rest in Visayas.

4 Given a history of discrimination and disadvantage that continues to bear to their present social experience and transactions, indigenous communities remain among the most marginalized in Philippine society. Reports and anecdotal evidence show continued experience of neglect and discrimination in the provision of basic social services. A host of environmental challenges, such as those resulting from the destruction of forests and extractive industries, and the loss of ancestral lands have also contributed much to food insecurity and poverty among indigenous communities.

5 The dearth of population and socio-economic data on indigenous peoples also makes poverty analysis difficult, as well as determining the extent of their access to basic services, including education. One of the few major studies that provides an analysis on poverty and indigenous peoples in the Philippines suggests that overall in regions populated by indigenous communities the incidence of poor families and poor populations did not significantly improve (between the period 1988 and 1997), despite the rise in average income; and that in some cases, poverty incidence has even increased and, ironically, in regions

¹ The Indigenous Peoples Rights Act (IPRA) of 1997 defines Indigenous Cultural Communities (ICCs)/Indigenous Peoples (IPs) as "a group of people or homogenous societies identified by self-ascription and ascription by others, who have continuously lived as organized community on communally bounded and defined territory, and who have, under claims of ownership since time immemorial, occupied, possessed and utilized such territories, sharing common bonds of language, customs, traditions and other distinctive cultural traits, or who have, through resistance to political, social and cultural inroads of colonization, non-indigenous religions and cultures, become historically differentiated from the majority of Filipinos. ICCs/IPs shall likewise include peoples who are regarded as indigenous on account of their descent from the populations which inhabited the country, at the time of conquest or colonization, or at the time of inroads of non-indigenous religions and cultures, or the establishment of present state boundaries, who retain some or all of their own social, economic, cultural and political institutions, but who may have been displaced from their traditional domains or who may have resettled outside their ancestral domains."

² <http://www.ncip.gov.ph/indigenous-peoples-of-the-philippines.html>. Accessed August 12, 2012.

that showed more respectable growth rates in average income.³ More current reports and anecdotal evidence still suggest that poverty incidence is higher in IP areas compared to non-IP areas⁴ and that the benefits of growth still fail to substantially impact indigenous communities.

II. Indigenous Peoples Education in the Philippines

6. Access to basic education has been one of the most critical development concerns among IP communities. In terms of the public school system, indigenous communities in general, especially those located in remote rural and mountainous areas, experience difficulties in accessing government services. Many of those who have schools within their communities have to grapple with shortage of basic inputs, such as teachers and learning resources. Despite this general situation, there exists, of course, pockets of good models and desirable education practices based on successful interventions by the DepEd, non-government organizations (NGOs), IP organizations (IPOs), and other community-based initiatives which effectively respond to the learning needs of indigenous learners.

7. Anecdotal evidence and available reports suggest low survival and completion rates among IP learners. For example, one EED-TFIP (EED Philippine Partners Task Force for Indigenous Peoples Rights) study conducted in 2004 covering eight IP communities from different parts of the country provides some idea on the extent of this problem: “one out of three indigenous children entering primary school will most likely drop out and fail to graduate” and that an “indigenous person’s chance of availing of a secondary school education is around 27 per cent and completing it, a mere 11 per cent.”⁵

8. Aside from access, an equally important and more complex issue for indigenous communities is the relevance and appropriateness of what is taught in schools and other learning interventions. The lack of access to education services is usually compounded by the fact that in communities where there are schools accessible to IP learners, many of these have limited or no capacity to provide culturally appropriate education. Time and again, indigenous elders and leaders have articulated the observation that the educational system has failed to respect and recognize their communities’ knowledge, worldviews, and identities. Education under this kind of a system only contributes to the alienation of indigenous learners to their own culture and community.

9. In the main, this issue has its roots in the framework of wide-scale public education in the country that had its beginnings under a colonial regime at the turn of the 20th century. Under the colonial system of public education, communities that have not “assimilated” to or conformed with the colonizers’ own conception of “civilization” (i.e., those who have retained their own distinct indigenous culture) were discriminated and labeled as “uncivilized,” “wild,” “pagans,” and other false stereotypical labels. This developed a public education system wherein indigenous knowledge was viewed as “inferior” vis-à-vis “school knowledge” and thus, promoted the perception that indigenous peoples have “no education” despite the existence of their own indigenous learning systems that effectively imparted functional knowledge and relevant life skills.

10. The education sociologist, Ma. Luisa Doronila, aptly captured the critical implications of the “assimilationist” thrust that has marked the foundations of the country’s public education system: “the forcible introduction during colonization of a new literate tradition [in a foreign language] ... has developed a form of literacy as well as literate and educational practice which negates and alienates us from our

³ Asian Development Bank. 2002. *Indigenous Peoples/Ethnic Minorities and Poverty Reduction*. Philippines. Manila, Philippines. (p. 19)

⁴ See, for example: Reyes, Celia M., Anne Bernadette E. Mandap, and Kenneth C. Ilarde. *Dimensions of Poverty of the Indigenous People*. Proceedings of the 2003 Community-based Monitoring System (CBMS) Network Meeting.

⁵ As cited in: Cariño, Jacqueline K. 2010. *Country Technical Notes on Indigenous Peoples’ Issues: Philippines*. Draft. International Fund for Agricultural Development. (p. 17)

traditional knowledge, with value consequences on our conceptions of ourselves, of the world, of our place in it, and of the kinds of skills and competencies developed in the population.”⁶ The current system indeed needs to recognize and remove the remnants of the “assimilationist” tendencies that it has inherited from the past for it to be truly culturally inclusive and open to the diversity of communities, especially with respect to indigenous peoples.

11. Based on information and analysis derived from past consultations with IP communities and representatives and a review of secondary data, the current issues in IP Education can be summarized in the following:

- Lack of equitable access of IPs to quality education that is culture-responsive, relevant, and holistic in approach;
- Need for mechanisms to ensure that education offered to and accessed by IPs encompasses their aspirations and community vision; contributes to the sustainability and well-being of the ancestral domain; and enables them, individually and collectively, to face various social realities and challenges;
- Need for appropriate delivery and management of IP education/learning systems;
- Need for policy environment and support system conducive to the sustainability of IP education efforts; and,
- Lack of data for effective planning.

III. Policy and Institutional Context

12. The right of IPs to education is stipulated in the 1987 Philippine Constitution, the Indigenous Peoples Rights Act (IPRA) of 1997, and the numerous international human rights instruments, especially the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) (2007). In terms of international development commitments, responding to the learning needs of IP communities forms part of the DepEd’s commitment to the achievement of the country’s Education for All (EFA) targets and Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

13. Recognizing that many IP communities continue to be among the most marginalized in terms of basic education, IP Education was included as one of the reform items of the DepEd’s Basic Education Sector Reform Agenda (BESRA), which the World Bank-assisted National Program Support for Basic Education (NSPBE) Project supported throughout its implementation from 2005 to 2012. The single most important contribution of the technical work done under BESRA on IP Education within this period is the formulation and adoption by the DepEd of the National IP Education Policy Framework, considered a policy milestone in efforts to recognize and address the education issues and concerns of IP communities. The policy framework, formulated in consultation with representatives of IP communities, government agencies, and civil society organizations, articulates policy statements on key areas in IP education.

14. DepEd Order No. 62, s. 2011 (“DO62”) – “Adopting the National Indigenous Peoples Education Policy Framework” – primarily stipulates that access to culture-responsive basic education stands out as one of the most critical to address among the present disadvantages that IP communities face. This recognition is particularly central to the view that the right to basic education is an “enabling right” and hence, an essential means for IPs to claim their other rights, exercise self-determination, and expand the choices available to them.

⁶ As cited in: Arinto, Patricia B. 1996. *Reconstructing Educational Knowledge: Incorporating Community Knowledge in Functional Literacy Programs*. Volume 1. DECS and UP ERP-CIDS. (p. 257)

15. Previous to the National IP Education Policy Framework, the DepEd has issued specific policies in response to the distinct educational needs of IP communities, such as DepEd Order No. 42, s.2004 (“Permit to Operate Primary Schools for Indigenous Peoples and Cultural Communities”) and DepEd Order No. 101, s.2010 (“The Alternative Learning System (ALS) Curriculum for Indigenous Peoples Education”). The DepEd has recognized the need to build on these existing policies and to approach the issue of IP education more systematically so that policy gaps are addressed and that its offices and units, especially those in the frontline of service-delivery, are capacitated to effectively respond to realities on the ground.

16. Following the key concerns raised in the consultations during the formulation of the policy framework, DO62 states that the DepEd shall work towards the realization of these policy statements:

- a) Ensure the provision of universal and equitable access of all IPs to quality and relevant basic education services towards functional literacy for all;
- b) Adopt appropriate basic education pedagogy, content, and assessment through the integration of Indigenous Knowledge Systems and Practices (IKSPs) in all learning areas and processes;
- c) Provide adequate and culturally-appropriate learning resources and environment to IP learners;
- d) Strengthen the hiring, deployment and continuous development of teachers and learning facilitators in the implementation of its IP Education Program;
- e) Establish and strengthen appropriate multi-level units within DepEd responsible for planning, implementing and monitoring IP education interventions;
- f) Expand and strengthen institutional and civil society linkages to ensure proper coordination, knowledge-sharing and sustainability of the IP Education Program;
- g) Implement stronger affirmative action to eradicate all forms of discrimination against IPs in the entire Philippine educational system.

17. To pursue the policy directions laid down by the National IP Education Policy Framework, the DepEd has instituted the Indigenous Peoples Education (IPEd) Program which is DepEd’s response to the right of IP Communities to an education that is responsive to their context and aspirations, respects identities, and recognizes the indigenous knowledge systems, practices, and other aspects of their cultural heritage.

18. As the institutional mechanism within the DepEd to focus on the implementation of DO62 and its IP Education Program, the DepEd-Indigenous Peoples Education Office (IPsEO) was established (DepEd Order No. 103, s. 2011). The IPsEO serves as the focal point within the Department in the planning, implementation, coordination, and monitoring of activities related to IP Education. DepEd also requested from DBM a line item for the IPEd Program to ensure that Program Support Funds (PSF) are available to operationalize the Program.

19. For the period 2012-2015, a set of Strategic Priorities were identified by the DepEd based on an external and internal environment analysis derived from past consultations and a review of various documents and assessments. These priorities are linked to DO62 and ultimately lead to the overall Vision-Mission of the Department with particular focus on access to quality basic education for IP learners and laying the foundation for life-long learning.

20. In response to key strategic issues in IP education (cited in paragraph 13 above), the following strategic objectives were identified:

- To expand learning opportunities for IP learners through the design and implementation of culturally-appropriate learning modalities

- To increase participation of IP learners in culturally-appropriate learning modalities
- To put in place mechanisms for the effective implementation of IP education
- To put in place mechanisms for sustainability/institutionalization of IP education
- To strengthen support and collaboration among IP education implementers/supporters
- To support IP learning systems and other learning modalities.
- To improve learning outcomes/key performance indicators of IP learners

21. To further guide Program implementation in its initial years, the IPsEO together with the National ExeCom defined Program targets until 2016 to be the following:

- Capacitated the school heads and two teachers of 2,776 schools in the country with 100% IP enrollment (based on SY 2012-2013 BEIS data);
- Developed at least 500 lesson plans; and,
- Established DepEd services in at least 300 priority sites (areas with IP learners but with no access to education services at all).

22. The Program's national implementation started in 2013 and its immediate thrust was to strengthen the capacity of DepEd, especially its field offices, to respond to IP learning needs in a manner that is flexible, demand-driven, and evidence-based. Key to this was the levelling-off of Regional and Division IPEd Focal Persons about foundational concepts of the IPEd Program (e.g., the rights-based approach; the principles of inclusion, participation and empowerment; the concept of Indigenous Peoples and ancestral domain) and its implications for program implementation.

23. A major challenge encountered by the IPEd Program as it commenced implementation was the dearth of reliable and accurate data on IP learners. Major factors included the outdated national data on IP population that affect the generation of DepEd data like Net Enrollment Rate and Gross Enrollment Rate, and the general climate of discrimination still pervading in the country that has been pushing learners and even parents to withhold their indigenous ethnic identity. There is also the misconception about the term "IP" being "indigent learners" and the confusion between the 4Ps (*Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program*) of DSWD (DepEd is also keeping track of 4Ps learners as part of its institutional commitment in this DSWD program) and the term IP. Clarifying who are IPs and who are counted as IP learners was another major area of discussion with the IPEd Focal Persons in the beginning of Program implementation. This process also facilitated their initial encounter with the IP communities in their respective regions and divisions.

24. Equally foundational for the Program was institutionalizing community engagement and dialogue between DepEd and IP communities as an ongoing process, to ensure that all initiatives of the Program result from this dialogue and are responsive and appropriate to the local community. The establishment of community engagement mechanisms was also intended as a safeguard to ensure that the principle of free, prior and informed consent was being undertaken in the fostering of continued participation of IP communities in the IPEd Program. Such mechanisms would also engender community partnership and ownership of the IPEd Program as envisioned in the IPEd Policy Framework.

25. These foundational mechanisms and processes provided the anchorage for succeeding major initiatives which include the following:

- Training of School Heads and Teachers of schools with 100% IP enrollment
- Development of a contextualization process for lesson plans and other learning resources appropriate to IP learners
- Development of the prerequisites for the implementation of the Mother Tongue-based Multilingual

Education (MTB- MLE) of IP languages (e.g., orthography, spelling guide, simple dictionary, grammar book, collectively called the four minima)

- Regularized capacity building of community elders, leaders and representatives involved in the IPEd Program
- School establishment in areas with no education services
- Establishment of pioneer senior high schools designed and anchored on the community's Indigenous Knowledge Systems and Practices (IKSPs) and community context
- Development of key policies to support IPEd Program implementation.

26. At the end of 2016, targets set in 2013 were met, and IPEd-implementing divisions had established a working and relational rapport with the IP communities directly being served by the IPEd Program as institutionalized in what the Program calls an IPEd Framework crafted at the division level. The IPEd Framework is both a process promoting dialogue and participation, and a documentation of agreements, standards and protocols in the implementation of the IPEd Program at the local level. The latter made it possible for IP communities to be regularly consulted and invited to participate in IPEd activities, particularly the development of contextualized lesson plans, and later on, the development of the four minima needed to support full-blown implementation of the MTB-MLE Program in IP communities using their own language. The inclusion of IP community representatives in the quality assurance processes of developed learning materials were also put in place to ensure their participation in checking the accuracy of cultural content.

27. Data available to the Department relevant to IP Education also improved by this time in terms of a more accurate mapping out of what IP communities are present in each division and which schools have dominantly IP enrollment. Advocacy efforts to clarify misconceptions about the term Indigenous Peoples including the acronym IP were starting to bear fruit, with more divisions being able to “clean” their data from erroneous submissions. However, given the enormity of the Department and the quick turnover of teachers and school heads in terms of school assignments, much still needed to be done in this aspect. IPSEO has partnered with the Planning Service in undertaking this advocacy that still needs to be systematized and institutionalized. Generating disaggregated data on IP learners' learning outcomes has also been included as future steps to be undertaken.

28. By SY 2017-2018, the IPEd Program reached the school level with the national implementation of contextualized lesson plans in Kinder and Grade 1. It continues to expand progressively to the succeeding grade levels and will reach Grade 6 nationally by 2023. As of SY 2019-2020, there were 3,034 IPEd-implementing schools using contextualized lesson plans serving 168,364 learners.

29. To support the effective teaching of the contextualized lesson plans, DepEd issued DepEd Order No. 50, s. 2016 or Hiring Guidelines for Teacher I Positions for Schools Implementing IPEd Effective SY 2015-2016. Through this policy, teachers who know the language and the culture of IP communities were given premium since they could appropriately address MTB-MLE concerns and the need for culture-based delivery of lessons. As of SY 2018-2019, 2,177 teachers have been hired through this policy, most of them IPs themselves.

30. The Department also released in July 2017 Department Order 34, s. 2017 or the Guidelines on the Formation of Consultative and Advisory Bodies (CAB) on IP Education in Regions Implementing the IPEd Program. This policy directive further ensures the institutionalization of dialogue mechanisms between DepEd and IP communities and their role in ensuring the development and implementation of community safeguards and cultural standards in the IPEd Program.

31. As of 2019, the IPEd Program is being implemented in 117 divisions and 16 regions (including

BARMM), and additional divisions continue to be added based on IP learners data submitted by the region.

IV. Mindanao Regional Context and Available Data

32. Mindanao has six of the 16 IPEd-implementing regions, and 48 of the 109 implementing divisions. Region IX has eight implementing divisions serving eight Indigenous Cultural Communities (ICCs); Region XII has nine implementing divisions serving another eight ICCs; and, BARMM, while considered an implementing region, is still to firm up its IPEd implementing divisions, targeted to serve at least six ICCs.

33. For School Year 2019-2020, total elementary IP learners' enrollment in Mindanao was 1,050,128 which is 63 percent of all elementary IP learners in the country, and 27.69 percent of the total learners enrollment in Mindanao.

34. The need for urgent affirmative action for IP Education specific to Mindanao has been recognized by the Department of Education. In 2015, the Cabinet of then Pres. Benigno C. Aquino Jr. approved a Mindanao-wide initiative for massive school establishment to be piloted in the whole of Mindanao except in the then Autonomous Region of Muslim Mindanao (ARMM). This national initiative was spearheaded by DepEd with the active participation of the Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD) for the classroom construction component. Targeted areas were IP communities without access to any education services. A total of 290 sites were targeted with 605 classrooms for construction, serving over 18,000 learners. Teachers were provided by DepEd and all these schools became part of IPEd implementation in Mindanao. Region IX had a targeted 18 sites with 21 classrooms while Region XII had 50 sites with 135 classrooms.

35. As of SY 2019-2020, the following are the elementary level data available for these three regions (from the Basic Education Information System, Department of Education):

| Region | Number of IP learners | % of regional learner population | Number of schools with 50% and above IP population | Number of schools with 100% IP learners |
|--------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|--|---|
| IX | 157,265 | 26.58% | 628 | 46 |
| XII | 167,193 | 23.57% | 541 | 69 |
| BARMM | 305,448 | 52.14% | 1173 | 247 |

36. Similar to other regions in the country, all divisions of Region IX and XII have established an IP Education Framework that guides program directions and implementation of the division. This framework continues to be enhanced as issues and concerns are raised during implementation. BARMM has assisted in the development of the IPEd Framework of the Teduray ICC, and this process is being eyed as a model in the development of the IPEd Framework of other IP communities in the region.

V. The IP Education Program in the Pandemic Context

37. Plans for SY 2020-2021 were geared towards Grade 4 implementation of contextualized lesson plans, continued preparation for MTB-MLE prerequisites, developing cultural standards with IP communities, addressing the concerns of Last Mile Schools in IP communities, and the initial implementation of MTB-MLE in at least 15 IP languages. These will have to be shelved for SY 2021-2022 and all efforts are now realigned to the implementation of the Basic Education Learning Continuity Plan (BE-LCP) specifically for schools implementing the IP Education Program.

38. Preliminary rough surveys done with IP communities before enrollment reveal the following for Regions IX and XII (It was not possible to do the same survey with BARMM as the mechanism at the division level to undertake such initiatives has not been put in place by the Region):

| Key aspects surveyed | Region IX | Region XII |
|---|-----------|------------|
| No of IP communities surveyed | 14 | 13 |
| No of IP communities with no adults who can assist learners | 2 | 2 |
| No of IP communities with no gadgets | 4 | 0 |
| No of IP communities whose adults are mostly non-readers | 2 | 2 |

39. The following are additional data gathered after enrollment also for both regions:

| Data sets | Region IX | Region XII |
|--|-----------|------------|
| No of IPEd implementing schools | 545 | 375 |
| No of IPEd implementing schools without electricity | 95 | 142 |
| Number IPEd implementing of schools using modular/blended learning modality | 544 | 361 |
| Number of IPEd implementing schools using modified radio on the air (community based) | 341 | 89 |
| No of IPEd implementing schools using TV | | 2 |
| No of IPEd implementing schools needing printer | 533 | 300 |
| No of IPEd implementing schools whose parents and other adults in the community cannot assist their learners | 400 | 291 |
| No of IPEd implementing schools with no internet, TV and radio signal | 404 | 185 |
| No if IPEd implementing schools with learners having reading difficulties | 474 | 317 |
| No if IPEd implementing schools affected by the presence of armed groups in the area. | 24 | 38 |

40. As a response to the impact of the pandemic to national IPEd implementation, the main thrust of the IPEd Program during this time of crisis is “Protecting initial gains, maximizing opportunities”, as articulated by the IPEd Program Learning Continuity Plan Framework discussed in Department Memorandum 66, s. 2020 or the 2020 Supplementary Guidelines on the Use of the Indigenous Peoples Education Program Support Fund, and reiterated once again in Department Memorandum 05, s. 2021 on the same concern. This shall be operationalized through five specific Program directions that shall guide program implementation through the pandemic and until recovery:

- Wholistic recovery – efforts shall be contributory to the recovery of IP communities, which includes their interrelationships with their bio-geographical home and their intergenerational ties.
- Continuity of Inclusive Education - strengthened IPEd implementation through the crisis and into recovery will be the Program’s contribution to the Department’s commitment to Inclusive Education and the realization of Principle 4 of the National Learning Continuity Plan.
- Equity in education governance – the IPEd Program shall ensure that the Department provides adequate and appropriate resources for IPEd implementation throughout the crisis period
- Development of education innovations – the challenges posed by the pandemic shall serve as opportunities to explore innovations in the interface of Indigenous Learning Systems (ILS) with the

national curriculum, particularly in the areas of education resiliency and community and family involvement in the teaching-learning process

Sustainable development of the ancestral domain – initiatives shall be anchored on and contributory to the long-term aspirations of IP communities for sustainable development of their ancestral domains.

VI. IP Participation Framework for TEACEP

A. Description of TEACEP

41. TEACEP is an Investment Project Financing (IPF) with Performance-Based Conditions (PBCs) which support DepEd's institutional reform efforts in teacher professional development and competency standards. The Project Development Objective (PDO) is to improve the quality of and equitable access to teaching in Kindergarten to Grade 6 (K-6) in project-supported areas, namely Regions IX, XII and BARMM. The project aims to support DepEd initiatives related to teachers and instructional leaders through the institutionalization of a coaching model for teacher professional development. An important feature of the project is its alignment with the BE-LCP which DepEd formulated to enable the system to cope up with the challenges conditioned by the COVID-19 pandemic. DepEd's move to adopt multiple learning delivery modalities will be the focus of the coaching activities to be introduced under the project. Likewise, regional capacity to provide teaching and learning resources will be strengthened. Adjustments to project activities will be undertaken as it progresses over time to suit conditions obtaining in the grassroots.

42. The project components are as follows:

Component 1: Supporting teachers and school leaders in improving teaching practices

Component 2: Providing adequate resources for effective teaching and learning

Component 3: Project management, monitoring and evaluation

43. Component 1 will support professional development of teachers and instructional leaders by enhancing the DepEd's existing rapid response coaching program to provide support for teachers and instructional leaders in multiple learning delivery modalities to more advanced and comprehensive coaching program, focusing on effective literacy and numeracy instruction and socioemotional skills for K- 6. The three subcomponents supporting training and professional development are:

- a) Support to the development and delivery of professional development programs for teachers and instructional leaders (IPF)
- b) Support to policy reforms and implementation support to Regions IX and XII (PBC)
- c) Implementation support to BARMM (IPF)

44. Component 2 will support DepEd in providing adequate learning resources for select multiple learning delivery modalities for the most disadvantaged learners. The two subcomponents include:

- a) Implementation support for RBI and TV programs (IPF)
- b) Provision of teaching and learning materials (IPF)

45. Component 3 focuses on generating evidence of the interventions implemented in targeted regions and to support project management and monitoring for TEACEP. The evidence that will be extracted on both the process and outcomes is particularly critical to establish an effective feedback loop that will serve for continual improvement on teaching and learning during the pandemic. The three subcomponents include:

- a) Strengthen data analysis and reporting on teaching and learning (IPF)
- b) Support to project management, monitoring and reporting (IPF)

B. Strategies on IP Responsive TEACEP

46. TEACEP implementation directly contributes to realizing the national policy directions stated in DO 62, s. 2011. Component 1 directly addresses concerns regarding content and pedagogy (policy statement b), and also about developing teachers' and school heads' capacities for culture-based education (policy statement d). Component 2 is responsive to concerns related to access to quality education (policy statement a) and culturally appropriate learning resources and environment (policy statement c). Component 3 contributes to enhancing institutional mechanisms and sensitizing these to the diversity of learners including IPs (policy statement e). The combined contribution of these three Components can further support the eradication of discrimination against IPs in the national education system (policy statement g).

Cultivating and nurturing culture sensitivity and appropriateness in the education process

47. Foundational to implementing IP Education is culture- sensitivity and appropriateness while undertaking the education process, which needs to be inculcated and cultivated among DepEd personnel. This is aligned with the DepEd's thrust to implement the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST), the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH), and the Philippine Professional Standards for Supervisors (PPSS), all of which have indicators related to sensitivity to diverse contexts, including cultures. Given the present pandemic context that restrict face to face learning venues and the institutional mechanisms available, continued capacity building on culture- sensitivity and appropriateness can continue through the implementation of TEACEP's Component 1.

48. In this Component, the mechanisms for coaching, technical assistance and professional development shall align with existing NEAP-recognized courses of the IPEd Program and will provide venues for the following:

- a) initial discussions on culture- sensitivity and appropriateness especially for personnel who will be involved in IP Education for the first time;
- b) timely provision of technical assistance to ensure that culture sensitivity and appropriateness in IPEd implementation continues through the pandemic;
- c) conduct of local action research with the community on cultural practices that promote resilience of the community;
- d) effective feedback generation on concerns related to IPEd implementation; and,
- e) the development of culture-based education innovations, both in the area of curriculum delivery and school management.

49. IPSeO has coordinated with the National Educators Academy of the Philippines (NEAP) that is managing the Department's Learning Delivery Modality courses, and it has been agreed that mechanisms of coordination shall be set in place so that concerns of IPEd implementing schools are channeled to local IPEd Focal Persons, and if needed, to the IPSeO for timely support.

50. Feedback from IPEd implementing schools will also serve as inputs in making policies that shall further support all the TEACEP components relative to continued IPEd implementation.

Ensuring access to quality education through the pandemic

51. IPEd implementing schools in regions IX and XII shall benefit from Component 2 primarily via two means. First is through the provision of transistor radios for students of Last Mile Schools. Radios will allow the more disadvantaged learners, including those in IP communities, to have an additional avenue for learning that will complement the modules they will receive, thereby, strengthening the continuity of

learning during the COVID period. In addition, teachers will be provided with recordable radios which will enable them to use radio programs in school settings as well.

52. Second, Component 2 will provide printers to IPEd implementing schools that are included in the list of Last Mile Schools in these regions. Last Mile Schools are usually small schools in remote areas. In most cases, they have opted for modular distance learning given the resource limitations of families and the community. Since operating expenses are allocated based on the number of learners, these schools have limited funds. The provision of printers will boost the capacity of these IPEd implementing schools to produce the self-learning modules (SLMs) needed by learners.

Promoting education innovations through institutional support

53. For Component 3, support for the IPEd Program shall be through technical assistance by way of a TEACEP expert being involved in the IPEd Program dimension of the project. Specifically the TEACEP expert shall spearhead the development of a culturally appropriate monitoring and evaluation Framework and design for the IPEd dimension of TEACEP, including the monitoring of IPPF implementation across all components. Technical assistance will include the design and being project lead of the documentation of promising education practices and innovations, and the compilation of discussions with the IP communities regarding practices and values that promote community resilience. The documented promising education practices and innovations can be further studied for possible scale-up as the situation moves towards recovery. The documented practices and values that promote community resilience can become fortified by its becoming part of the curriculum through the contextualization process being done in IPEd implementation. These values and practices will thus be passed on to the IP learners, enabling them to effectively participate in the recovery process of their communities. The TEACEP expert will also ensure that the deliverables for component 1 and 2 for IP Education are achieved.

C. Ensuring Representation of IPs in Project Structure

54. The implementation mechanism of TEACEP will be comprised of the following entities: (a) the Project Steering Committee (PSC), (b) Project Management Committee (PMC), (c) Project Technical Working Groups (TWGs), and (d) Project Integration and Coordination Office (PICO). The Project Management Service (PMS) will serve as the PICO, and will be responsible in ensuring effective coordination with IPsEO, relevant officials in Regional Offices, MBHTE-BARMM, and Schools Division Officials. It shall also ensure safeguard compliance with national laws and department issuances relative to Indigenous Peoples (IPs), while providing necessary reports and evidence in close communication with the World Bank.

55. The TWGs, composed of technical staff from concerned bureaus and services of DepEd – including IPsEO – and target regions, will ensure that project activities are implemented as intended, and any issues/challenges are reported and discussed for solutions.

56. Participation of IP communities shall be ensured at the school, division and regional levels in Regions IX and XII, maximizing the existing dialogue and partnership mechanisms that have been established by the IPEd Program since 2013 and are institutionalized at the division and regional levels in all implementing regions and divisions. BARMM has not been able to establish this mechanism as it is still in the very initial stages of consultations with IP communities in their region. These mechanisms have been set-up in accordance with the Indigenous Peoples Rights Act (IPRA) that specifies the participation of IP communities **through their customary governance structures** (Chapter IV, Section 16) in decision-making bodies to ensure that their right to decide on development directions of their communities are promoted and protected (Chapter IV, Section 17). These mechanisms are also anchored on the view that the principle of free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) should be an ongoing process and commitment of the Department

and not a one time requirement.

57. The institutionalized dialogue mechanism involves community leaders and elders who are members of their respective ICC's customary governance structures. These customary governance structures are organized by ancestral domain (AD) and may be located within one or more divisions. Each division is in dialogue with a counterpart body of community elders and leaders who represent the ICCs specific for IPEd operationalization. This body was set up by the communities with support from DepEd and they have been consistently involved in most IPEd activities that require the participation of community representatives. These bodies are convened at least twice a year at the division level separate from the activities attended. At the regional level, these division-level bodies convene twice a year too, so that concerns that cut across divisions are discussed. These gatherings at the division and regional levels serve as a venue to consult elders and leaders for upcoming activities or initiatives, gather and give feedback regarding program implementation, and update them about developments of ongoing initiatives. Planning sessions are also conducted during these gatherings, and the resolution of issue and concerns, if any.

58. While the pandemic does not allow for division and regional gatherings, IPEd Focal Persons continue to maintain the communication network with their respective elders and leaders through various means for updates and information. Their continuing presence in Program implementation is crucial to maintaining the integrity of the IPEd Program.

59. Plans to institutionalize school level dialogue mechanisms were initiated in 2019, with discussions with community elders and leaders commencing in some regions in the last quarter of last year. More specific and nationally coordinated steps would have been taken in 2020 but these could not push through given the mobility restrictions nationwide and the major shifts in the whole education system to respond to the challenges of the pandemic. While so, the pandemic has, on the other hand, catalyzed a national awareness of the importance of partnership with the community and family as partners in the teaching-learning process, and that there is an urgency to foster these linkages. This catalyzed shift in the policy environment is a very welcome development, since this is a view that has been difficult to foster institutionally before the pandemic. With this changed appreciation, the setting up of mechanisms at the school level with IP communities will not be only appreciated as an act of a duty bearer complying with legal provisions of IPRA but as a necessity in the teaching-learning process itself.

60. The interface of the body of elders and leaders at the school governance level with the Parent-Teacher Association (PTA) will be one area of discussion which will include the complementation of their mandates and jurisdiction.

61. Aside from the shift in the policy environment, the Department of Education has put in place a national mechanism to support school level implementation through the pandemic, the Learning Action Cells (LAC). All schools are part of a LAC group and the LAC is designed to provide coaching, mentoring and technical assistance support to school heads and teachers. The IPEd Program hopes to contribute to this mechanism by providing guidance to all IPEd implementing schools in setting up the dialogue and partnership mechanisms with IP communities at their level of governance. Community resiliency and education innovations may be the starting point for consultations with local community leaders and elders, the results of which shall be the setting up of the dialogue mechanism and initial agreements on IPEd implementation at the school level given the pandemic context. The aim is to cultivate at the school level the same degree of active participation of community elders and leaders in IPEd Program implementation as seen at the division and regional levels. In Regions IX and XII, the community (school level) FPIC for the TEACEP project will be included in the community discussions.

62. The IPEd Program's partnership with NEAP has moved forward given the approval of the participation of the IPEd Program in LAC implementation through the provision of technical support to NEAP, specifically for schools implementing the IPEd Program. This will be done nationally except in BARMM, and will include Regions IX and XII. TEACEP provides an opportunity to model this set-up with a foreign-assisted project that has a participation framework for IP communities. The latter can potentially contribute to institutionalizing the development of a participation framework that will guide all external stakeholders when work with DepEd will involve IP communities.

63. The participation of the NCIP in program implementation shall be facilitated by IPSEO through the Technical Working Group (TWG) for IPEd that is composed of DepEd and NCIP offices. This body meets on concerns related to IPEd implementation. The NCIP, as the government's primary agency responsible for promoting and protecting the rights of ICCs/IPs, shall be a partner of DepEd in facilitating dialogue processes as needed at the field level.

D. Grievance Redress Mechanism

In the past five years of active implementation of the dialogue and partnership mechanism with IP communities, the periodic meetings with them at the division and regional levels have served as the venue to address grievances, if any. This is consistent with the cultural practice of resolving issues first through consultation and dialogue before resorting to formal conflict resolution mechanisms (community-based or local government based). The IPEd Program hopes to continue this practice in the implementation of TEACEP.

E. Monitoring Implementation of IPPF

64. As the IP Education Program has been institutionalized in the Department, the monitoring of the outputs outlined above shall be integrated into the overall monitoring and evaluation scheme of DepEd's IP Education Program and also the BE-LCP. As contained in the TEACEP design document, the data and information required to monitor and evaluate project indicators are to be gathered by divisions and regions and: a) reported during quarterly Division Monitoring, Evaluation and Adjustment (DMEA) and Regional Monitoring, Evaluation and Adjustment (RMEA), and b) reported to DepEd central office and discussed through the Programs Committee or through Program Implementation Review (PIR). These project indicators should include those on the IPEd component of the project, including IPPF implementation. These mechanisms will ensure that M&E is embedded in DepEd mechanisms, aside from being part of the regular M&E of the project.

65. For progress monitoring of IPPF implementation at the school level, data can be gathered during LAC sessions as much as possible, to avoid additional schedules for the school heads and teachers who are challenged enough with the sudden shift to distance learning. These data can then be consolidated at the division and regional levels for analysis to guide improvements for both IPPF and program. Implementation.

66. Community participation in IPPF monitoring will be ensured by the dialogue and partnership mechanism to be established at the school level.

67. TEACEP shall give particular attention to the monitoring and evaluation of its impact on IPs during project review missions, midterm review, and end-of- project review.

F. Resources for IPPF Implementation

68. The budget requirement for ensuring compliance to the IPPF shall be drawn from the regular DepED's annual budget (General Appropriations Act), which will be specified on an annual basis beginning calendar year 2021.

G. Disclosure

69. IPPF is a document subject to public disclosure and consultation. The document has been prepared in consultation with relevant units of the DepEd central, regional and division levels.

70. The IPPF was disclosed at the DepEd on October 26, 2020_ for comments. The World Bank website also disclosed the same on _____ after receiving a no objection clearance for its disclosure from DepEd.

71. No further comments were received on the document. The final IPPF has been disclosed on the DepEd and World Bank Inforshop on _____.