Une offre francophone vers un enseignement bi-plurilingue pour mieux réussir à l’école.
ELAN monde arabic: Lebanon, Morocco, Tunisia
ELAN monde créole: Haïti, Seychelles
ELAN Afrique:
  - phase 1: (2012-2015) 8 countries
  - phase 2: (2016-2018) 12 countries
  Benin, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Ivory Coast, Guinea, Madagascar, Mali, Niger, DRCongo, Senegal, Togo

The ELAN-Afrique initiative is the product of collaboration from four (4) technical and financial partners
  AUF, MAEDI, AFD, OIF

Aim:
Improve the quality of education

Strategy:
Support French-mother tongue language bilingual education

Approaches:
- Defining educational linguistic policies (legal and course documents)
  - Training educators, particularly teachers and their tutors
  - Creating of didactic materials
- Raising awareness of the benefits of bilingual education
  - Formative assessment
Principles of bilingualism

• Bilingualism which can be comfortably entered into existing or new teaching programmes in partner countries;

• Bilingualism based upon comparative language approaches: possibly using *bi-grammaire* models;

• Bilingualism which uses the transfer of skills:
  • from L1 to L2: linguistic and skill transfer
  • from L2 back to L1: ability in French allows a fresh look at the L1
Student Skill Areas

- Language tools
- Rules for reading texts
- Knowledge of vocabulary
- Fluency (pace and rhythm)
- Comprehension
- Characteristics of written texts
- Production of a message taking into account a written communication situation
- Coherence and cohesion of a text
- Style

- 75 schools
- +4 000 students
- 32 trained national trainers
- 2 or 3 cohorts of 10 teachers in each country
- 75 targeted headteachers
- 8 national language subjects and teaching mediums

The pilot project in numbers
External assessment of students’ knowledge

✓ Measures the impact of the ELAN approach to reading-writing during the first two years of primary school (CP1 and CP2), in 8 countries (oral and written linguistic performance in African languages and French);

✓ Evaluates whether the ELAN approach allows each student to demonstrate the effects of interlanguage transfer between L1 (African language) and L2 (French).
Characteristics of a CREN assessment presentation

1. one national language per country
2. comparison between control group and trial group, initially 200 students per group, 400 students per country ⇒ we are interested in the difference between these groups
3. longitudinal protocol: the same students evaluated 3 times in 2 years:
   • At the beginning of CP1 (October-November 2013)
   • At the end of CP1 (April-May 2014)
   • At the end of CP2 (April-May 2015)

⇒ Highlight progress made rather than level obtained!
4. Comparable skills in L1 and in French evaluated in the 8 countries
matched pairing of the 2 groups (control and trial) in the following: sex, student age, socioeconomic factors
« reported » linguistic practice in family
practice reported from using the book on a daily basis
5. Statistical processing (repeated measures variance analysis, correlations, multiple regressions, etc.)
Choice of tools:

✓ Indicators of writing dominance + reading/spelling precursors
✓ Scientifically proven choice of tools (EGRA: evaluating students’ first steps in reading, Sprenger-Charolles, 2009 + other tools from CREN)
✓ Tools easily adapted to L1 in the 8 countries
✓ Tools easily used by non-professional evaluators

✓ Instruction booklet for evaluators
✓ Exercise booklet for the student
✓ Stimulus notebook for the student
✓ Questionnaire for parents
Démarche

2013

Assessment procedure in French
Supervisor Workshop n°1
Evaluator training
Beginning of CP1 evaluation
Data collection

2014

Evaluator training
End of CP1 evaluation
End of CP2 assessment in Cameroon and Benin
Data collection
session 2 data processing

2015

End of CP2 assessment procedure in French
Supervisor workshop n°3
Evaluator training
End of CP2 assessment
session 3 data processing

Session 1 data processing
Supervisor Workshop n°2
Evaluator training

Interim Report

Final Report
ELAN Assessment Procedure - Presentation of longitudinal procedure
(beginning of CP1 - end of CP1 or beginning of CP2 - end of CP2)

**beginning of CP1**
- Vocabulary (L1 & L2)
- Knowledge of letters (L1 & L2)
- Syllable segmentation (L1 & L2)
- Initial phoneme identification (L1 & L2)
- Oral comprehension (L1 & L2)
- Familiarisation of writing

**end of CP1 or beginning of CP2**
- Vocabulary (L1 & L2)
- Knowledge of letters (L1 & L2)
- Syllable segmentation (L1 & L2)
- Initial phoneme identification (L1 & L2)
- Oral comprehension (L1 & L2)
- Familiarisation of writing
- **1 minute reading**
- Reading words

**end of CP2**
- Vocabulary (L2)
- Knowledge of letters (L1 & L2)
- Syllable segmentation (L1 & L2)
- Initial phoneme identification (L1 & L2)
- Oral comprehension (L2)
- Familiarisation of writing
- **1 minute reading**
- Reading words
- Spelling
- Reading comprehension

In black : added tests

Family survey
Sociofamilial and sociolinguistic characteristics
# Progress Report/differences between control and trial groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Bénin</th>
<th>Burkina Faso</th>
<th>Burundi</th>
<th>Cameroun</th>
<th>Mali</th>
<th>Niger</th>
<th>RD Congo</th>
<th>Sénégal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N (Ne)</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Section 1: Progrès des groupes témoins et pilotes sur les épreuves orales proposées en début et fin CP1 ou en début CP1 et CP2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vocabulaire L1</th>
<th>Neutre</th>
<th>Neutre</th>
<th>Neutre</th>
<th>Neutre</th>
<th>Neutre</th>
<th>Neutre</th>
<th>Neutre</th>
<th>Neutre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compréhension orale L1</td>
<td>Neutre</td>
<td>Neutre</td>
<td>Neutre</td>
<td>Neutre</td>
<td>Neutre</td>
<td>Neutre</td>
<td>Neutre</td>
<td>Neutre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monde de l'écrit</td>
<td>Neutre</td>
<td>Neutre</td>
<td>Neutre</td>
<td>Neutre</td>
<td>Neutre</td>
<td>Neutre</td>
<td>Neutre</td>
<td>Pilote-P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Section 2: Progrès des groupes témoins et pilotes sur les épreuves orales proposées aux 2 ou 3 temps de l’expérimentation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segmentation syllabique L1</th>
<th>Neutre</th>
<th>Témoin-R</th>
<th>Neutre</th>
<th>Témoin-R</th>
<th>Neutre</th>
<th>Pilote-P</th>
<th>Pilote-P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identification du phonème initial L1</td>
<td>Pilote-P</td>
<td>Neutre</td>
<td>Neutre</td>
<td>Pilote-P</td>
<td>Neutre</td>
<td>Neutre</td>
<td>Pilote-P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segmentation syllabique Fr</td>
<td>Neutre</td>
<td>Témoin-R</td>
<td>Pilote-P</td>
<td>Neutre</td>
<td>Pilote-P</td>
<td>Pilote-P</td>
<td>Pilote-P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification du phonème initial Fr</td>
<td>Pilote-P</td>
<td>Neutre</td>
<td>Neutre</td>
<td>Pilote-P</td>
<td>Pilote-P</td>
<td>Pilote-P</td>
<td>Pilote-P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulaire Fr</td>
<td>Pilote-P</td>
<td>Témoin-P</td>
<td>Pilote-P</td>
<td>Neutre</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Neutre</td>
<td>Pilote-P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compréhension orale Fr</td>
<td>Pilote-P</td>
<td>Neutre</td>
<td>Neutre</td>
<td>Neutre</td>
<td>Neutre</td>
<td>Pilote-P</td>
<td>Pilote-P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Section 3: Progrès des groupes témoins et pilotes sur les épreuves de maîtrise de l’écrit proposées en fin CP1 et fin CP2 ou début CP2 et fin CP2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lecture en une minute L1</th>
<th>Pilote-P</th>
<th>Neutre</th>
<th>Pilote-P</th>
<th>Neutre</th>
<th>Pilote-P</th>
<th>Pilote-P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identification du mot écrit L1</td>
<td>Pilote-P</td>
<td>Neutre</td>
<td>Neutre</td>
<td>Neutre</td>
<td>Neutre</td>
<td>Pilote-P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture en une minute Fr</td>
<td>Pilote-P</td>
<td>Pilote-P</td>
<td>Neutre</td>
<td>Neutre</td>
<td>Neutre</td>
<td>Pilote-P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification du mot écrit Fr</td>
<td>Pilote-P</td>
<td>Neutre</td>
<td>Neutre</td>
<td>Neutre</td>
<td>Neutre</td>
<td>Pilote-P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Section 4: Différences entre les groupes témoins et pilotes sur les épreuves de maîtrise de l’écrit proposées en fin CP2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compréhension écrite L1</th>
<th>Neutre</th>
<th>Neutre</th>
<th>Pilote-P</th>
<th>Pilote-P</th>
<th>Pilote-P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compréhension écrite Fr</td>
<td>Témoin-P</td>
<td>Neutre</td>
<td>Pilote-P</td>
<td>Pilote-P</td>
<td>Pilote-P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthographe L1</td>
<td>Témoin-P</td>
<td>Pilote-P</td>
<td>Pilote-P</td>
<td>Pilote-P</td>
<td>Pilote-P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthographe Fr</td>
<td>Neutre</td>
<td>Pilote-P</td>
<td>Pilote-P</td>
<td>Pilote-P</td>
<td>Pilote-P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Fr : français ; début : début et fin ; Ne = effectif témoins ; Ne = effectif pilote cas échéant ; Neutre = progression identique ou absence de différences entre les deux groupes ; Témoin-R = progrès en faveur du groupe témoins et réduction des écarts initiaux entre les deux groupes ; Pilote-P = (cas vert) progrès ou différences en faveur des élèves du groupe pilotes ; Témoin-P = (cas rouge) progrès ou différences en faveur des élèves du groupe témoins ; ? = cas particuliers.
Conclusions

Overall positive and very encouraging results given the teaching contexts of the countries involved (cf Opéra report from Burkina)

Yet a low level of writing comprehension and skills obtained by the end of CP2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Benin</th>
<th>Burkina</th>
<th>Burundi</th>
<th>Cameroun</th>
<th>Mali</th>
<th>Niger</th>
<th>RDC</th>
<th>Sénégal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ortho fr</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUM</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IME</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written comp.</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentages of test success in French at the end of CP2 calculated from overall sample (control + trials) in each country
**Recommendations**

Work on the knowledge of letters and phonological awareness in the two languages (skills closely linked to student progress in trial groups through the effect of intra and interlanguage transfer on understanding writing)

reinforce acquisition of decoding/automatisation to improve written comprehension

consolidate measures for a time period of several years (chronologically variable dynamic of acquisitions, weakness of skills acquired to understand writing by students at the end of ce2 and provision of bilingualism research)

make bilingual assessments available to teachers so they can base the students’ I2 acquisitions on their I1 competencies

train teachers in the advantages of bilingualism and in the culture of bilingual assessment

Raise awareness among families of the success of using I1 with French for their child’s schooling (mismatch between positive questionnaire results and withdrawal from some elan classes).

Raise awareness among families and teachers of the importance of learning to read and write in I1, in order to better understand writing in I2.

Our results are in line with PASEC 2014 recommendations: promoting pre-school and bilingual education, articulating in I1 and I2, reinforcing the learning of reading in CP

(This presentation was translated by Suzanne Atherton, United Nations volunteer translator)