REPORT ON LANGUAGE OF INSTRUCTION IN SENEGAL

EdData II: Data for Education Research and Programming (DERP) in Africa

JANUARY 2015

Table of Contents

Acronyms and Abbreviations

ARED	Associates in Research and Education for Development
CNRE	*Centre National de Ressources Educationelles*
CRFPE	Centres Régionaux de Formation de Personnels de l'Education
EGRA	Early Grade Reading Assessment
ELAN	*Ecole et Langues Nationales en Afrique*
EMiLe	*Education Multi-Langue;* the French term for multilingual education
L1	first language that a child or adult speaks best, or with a high level of proficiency
L2	second language that a child or adult may learn in addition to L1
LOI	language of instruction
NGO	nongovernmental organization
OIF	*Organisation Internationale de la Francophonie*
ONECS	*Office National de l'Enseignement Catholique du Sénégal*
PDEF	Programme de Développement de l'Education et de la Formation
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization

Introduction

Education research and practice have shown the benefit of using a child's home language as the medium of instruction in the classroom. This is true in relatively homogeneous settings and in linguistically diverse environments. In countries with several national languages, such as Senegal, using familiar languages, or first languages (L1s) for instruction in the formal education system requires careful planning and communication.

This report, prepared for the USAID/Senegal Mission, summarizes applicable research on education in multilingual contexts and on the use of L1-based, bilingual instruction in particular. It also briefly presents the education and sociolinguistic environment in Senegal, as well as a summary of relevant national language education programs in the country. Lastly, the report makes recommendations aimed at supporting a transition toward the use of national languages for instruction in primary schools.

Both the research and recommendations presented in this report are based on a review of applicable evidence on language use in education, particularly as it relates to bilingual instruction in multilingual contexts. The information included in this report draws from that assembled in a larger document prepared for USAID, *Planning for language use in education: Best practices and practical steps to improve learning outcomes* (RTI, forthcoming). Readers of this report are encouraged to refer to this document for more in-depth information on specific topics. Lastly, information on Senegal-specific programs was gathered via personal communications and a search of publicly available reports (for a list of organizations and individuals contacted, see ***Annex B***).

Concepts and Definitions

This section of the report discusses some of the basic terms used throughout the guide. Additional terms are provided as needed within the text of this document.

L1— An individual's first language (L1) is the one he or she speaks best, often referred to as a *mother tongue* or *home language*. In the context of education, L1 refers to the language that students understand and speak proficiently when they first enter school, a characteristic that makes that language particularly well suited for learning both concepts and content in the early grades. Individuals tend to have a lifelong advantage in proficiency in the first language learned at home through natural interactions with caregivers, family, friends, and community members. People living in multilingual contexts may have more than one L1, and they may have a greater proficiency in one language or another at different points in their lives and in different contexts.

L2—A second language (L2) or (Lx to denote a language in addition to the second language) is a language that someone learns in addition to his or her first language. An L2 may be learned formally (at school) or informally (such as through working in a market).

Lingua franca—A language used as a common means of communication, sometimes referred to as a *language of wider communication* (LWC). For some speakers, the lingua franca will be their L1, while for other speakers it will be an additional language (e.g., Wolof in Senegal, Amharic in Ethiopia, or Kiswahili in Kenya).

Language of instruction—The language used to teach curricular material. Teachers may use more than one language of instruction (LOI) intentionally throughout the day as part of a bilingual or multilingual program.

Language planning—A process designed to influence the function, structure, or acquisition of languages. Language planning generally includes decision making and potentially changing communication and language use throughout a society, including the education sector.

Literacy—The skills and practices of reading and writing, which are the concrete forms of a language in which one communicates. Reading combines decoding (the association of written symbols with sounds) with meaning-making (the understanding of and interaction with what is decoded). Writing is the productive skill of encoding sounds into symbols to create meaningful communication that others can read.

Mother tongue-based multilingual education (MTB-MLE)—A systematic approach to learning that emphasizes the use of learners' L1 to teach literacy, curricular subjects, and other languages. Additional languages are gradually integrated into teaching and learning through a planned and careful approach.

Language of Instruction in Multilingual Contexts

Senegal, similar to many countries in the world, has a linguistically and culturally diverse population. Research in Africa and around the world has shown that children benefit when they are taught in a language that is familiar to them. In multilingual settings, a successful system rests on using the child's first language (L1) to build language and literacy skills before transitioning to a second language (L2). The success of a multilingual education system rests on proper planning and implementation, as well as effective communication. This section presents some advantages of bilingual education and examples of successful programs.

Advantages of Using L1 Instruction

Using a familiar or home language—referred to throughout this paper as first language, or L1—as the medium of instruction in primary school presents many advantages, including the following:[1]

- *Improves access and equity.* Children are more likely to enter school on time, attend school, and remain in school longer—particularly girls when gender disparities exist in access to schooling.

- *Improves reading acquisition.* Learning to read in one's own language is facilitated by the existing vocabulary and the knowledge of sounds. Prior knowledge facilitates learning to read and comprehension. Furthermore, building a foundation to read in L1 supports reading in L2.

---

[1] This list is adapted from the forthcoming document from RTI titled *Planning for Language Use in Education: Best Practices and Practical Steps to Improve Learning Outcomes*. A detailed description of each point and a full list of studies and citations can be found in this report.

- *Improves learning outcomes.* The ability to read and understand the LOI leads to improved language and cognitive development and to academic achievement in other subjects. Research has shown that children who develop strong language skills in their first language also develop higher L2 skills, while outcomes in other curricular subjects improve as well.

- *Promotes effective teaching.* When both teachers and students understand the LOI, the teacher–student interactions are more dynamic and teaching techniques are more varied.

- *Supports parental and community involvement.* Using the language of the community in school encourages parental involvement in schools and enables parents to support their children with school work.

- *Provides socio-cultural benefits*. Use of familiar languages in school helps to validate and preserve children's and their communities' language and culture.

Multilingual Education in Africa

There are many examples of educational programs in Africa that use national languages. Further, research has shown that children learning in their first language (L1), or a familiar language spoken at home, perform better than their peers who are not, or are not being supported by a well-implemented program.

For example, in South Africa, data show that students who are taught in the same language they speak at home perform better by Grade 6 than their peers who speak a different language at home, with 69 percent and 32 percent achievement rates, respectively (South Africa Department of Education's *Grade 6 Systemic Evaluation National Report*, 2005, as cited in Heugh, Benson, Bogale, & Yohannes, 2007).

In Zambia, an evaluation of the Primary Reading Programme, which served 1.6 million students, revealed that students who were taught in both Zambian languages and English performed better in writing and reading scores, although average scores were low in both groups (Sampa, 2005).

Smaller-scale projects, although limited in scope, further illustrate the potential of using national languages when good instruction and enough resources are made available. For example, in Cameroon, a pilot program demonstrated that children taught in a familiar language performed significantly better than their peers in multiple subjects, including mathematics and English, throughout Grades 1 to 4 (Walter & Chuo, 2012).

Implementing a bilingual program at the national level requires sustained political effort. Several African countries have integrated national languages in the formal education system. In Mali, Niger, and Burkina Faso, bilingual education was introduced in the formal education system in the 1970s, and implementation practices have been adjusted several times since then. In Mali, there are currently more than 2,500 bilingual schools in the country, and national languages are part of the subjects on the exams, and Niger and Burkina Faso each boast of more than 500 bilingual schools (Nikièma, 2011).[2] In Mali, children in bilingual

---

[2] In 2012–2013, there were 15,505 primary schools in Niger and 13,397 in Burkina Faso (Institut National de la Statistique [INS; National Institute of Statistics], 2014; Institut National de la Statistique et de la Démographie

schools (called *Pédagogie Convergente* schools) use their first language (L1), or mother tongue, exclusively in the first few years of schooling, and then use French for half of the school day in Grades 5 and 6. These children consistently outperform their peers in French-only schools at the end of primary school national exams (United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organisation [UNESCO], 2008).

Both pilot projects and large-scale efforts indicate that the use of national languages in multilingual settings can have a positive impact on educational policies (see RTI, forthcoming, for additional references to programs in Africa and elsewhere). These experiences have also demonstrated that careful planning across the education sector, as well sustained support over the long-term, are needed for such efforts to result in improved learning outcomes.

Successful Bilingual Education

The success of bilingual education programs requires strong development of L1, strong instruction in L2, and gradual and appropriately timed transition from L1 to L2. Success in transition depends in large part on the pace of transition from L1 to L2. Several approaches have been used to transition students from learning in an L1 to learning in an L2, often depending on the goals of the policy. These approaches can be described along a continuum from using only one language (L2) to full bilingual education models in which both languages are used throughout the system. Early exit models, such as those implied by language policies in Uganda or Kenya, use L1 for three years or fewer and transition to L2 rapidly. They have generally been shown to be less effective at developing bilingualism because they do not encourage the long-term development of the first language, focusing instead on L2. Recent research from Kenya indicates that such an early transition may not be effective in solidifying L1 skills, nor in helping children to acquire an L2 (Piper, Schroeder, & Trudell, 2014).

In comparison, additive models make use of L1 for 6 years or longer and promote bilingualism and biliteracy. Studies have shown that additive models are more successful than earlier models in developing long-term L2 skills, since children can continue to build a strong L1 foundation and use those skills to learn an L2 (Cummins, 2009, 2012; Thomas & Collier, 2002).

The time needed to gain proficiency in an L2 for academic learning depends on several factors, including the quality of teaching, the content that is covered, the intensity and thoroughness of instruction, teacher language proficiency, teacher preparation, and how well learning is monitored and evaluated (CA Linguistics, 2006), and may take six years or greater depending on the context (Geva, 2006). Another factors that will influence the amount of time needed to provide instruction in an L2 is how similar (or different) the language is from children's L1. (See RTI International, forthcoming, for a more in-depth discussion regarding language models, linguistic transfer and related issues.)

[INSD; National Institute of Statistics and Demography], 2013). In 2013–2014 there were 12,519 primary schools in Mali, including public schools (6,765), private schools (1,689), community schools (1860), and Madrassa schools (2205) (Ministère de l'Education Nationale [MEN], 2014). It is not clear that all bilingual schools in Mali implement the bilingual program in all grades (Spratt, King, & Bulat, 2013.) The programs represent approximately 3 percent of schools in Niger, 4 percent in Burkina Faso and 20 percent in Mali.

To be effective, research has shown that instruction should be supported by appropriate and sufficient materials in both L1 and L2 across all curricular subjects. Teachers also must be trained to provide instruction in the appropriate language. For example, in Uganda, a pilot program was implemented in nine schools to support literacy instruction in a national language. By the end of Grade 1, the students at schools provided with training and materials for L1-based instruction performed better; they correctly identified 20 letters per minute and read 7 words per minute), compared with their peers in control schools (who did not receive the training and materials), who correctly identified 6 letters per minute and read 1 word per minute) (Brown, 2011).[3] Similarly, in Mali, children in the *Institut pour l'Education Populaire* program, which provides teachers with structured reading lessons and materials in national languages, performed better than their peers in control schools at the end of two years of instruction (Spratt, King, & Bulat, 2013).[4]

A recent guidance document submitted to USAID (draft title: Planning for Language Use in Education: Best Practices and Practical Steps to Improving Learning Outcomes) contains more detailed information on the need for appropriate teaching and learning materials, as well as other conditions necessary for effective L1 and bilingual education (RTI International, forthcoming.)

Senegalese Context

Senegalese Educational System

Senegal has invested heavily in its educational system since the Education for All and Millennium Development Goals were declared (Assises de l'Education, 2014). The country's current investment of 6 percent of GDP for the education sector—which is higher than the West African regional average of 4.6 percent—has resulted in a large increase in access to education. At the primary school level, enrollment increased from 1.1 to 1.7 million students between 2000 and 2011, with a gross enrolment rate (GER) increasing from 67 percent in 2000 to 90 percent in 2008 (Government of Senegal [GOS], 2012; Conférence des ministres de l'Education des États et gouvernements de la Francophonie [CONFEMEN; Conference of Education Ministers of the States and Governments of Francophone Africa], 2010). There were also important gains in primary school completion rates, which increased from less than 50 percent in 2006 to 66 percent in 2011 (Assises de l'Education, 2014). However, these important gains were not consistent across the country—the regional level completion rates ranged from 29 percent in Kaffrine to 94 percent in Dakar in 2013. During the same period, gender parity was reached in access to pre-primary and primary schools, and girls slightly outnumbered boys, with the girl-to-boy ratio at 1.17 in 2011 (GOS, 2012).

This large influx of students has contributed to the challenge of providing high-quality education, despite the high level of resources invested. Regional assessments found that slightly more than half of students in Grades 2 and 5 have basic competencies in mathematics

---

[3] All schools in this program, including the control schools, use national languages for the first three years of schooling. The program was extended to serve more than 80 schools.

[4] Although results for treatment schools were higher, students in Grade 3 were still reading only 11 words per minute, indicating the need to further improve training and materials for bilingual instruction.

and reading, placing Senegal in the middle of the distribution in Francophone Africa (CONFEMEN, 2010; GOS, 2012). In 2007, an Early Grade Reading Assessment (EGRA) conducted in French in Grades 1, 2, and 3 (*Cours d'initiation [CI]*, *Cours Préparatoire [CP]* and *Cours Elémentaire 2 [CE1]*) and in Wolof in Grades 1 and 3 found that few students could read with adequate fluency.[5] Approximately half of the students assessed (45 percent in French and 51 percent in Wolof) could read fewer than 5 words per minute (RTI International, 2008). Similarly, in 2009, an EGRA was conducted in French in Grade 3 in 50 schools. The results of the 2009 EGRA found that 18 percent of students were unable to read 1 word correctly, with an average reading score of 22 words per minute for the remaining students (Pouezevara,Sock, & Ndiaye, 2010).

Some of the important challenges to providing high-quality education noted in recent government documents include addressing the low number of trained teachers in the system (48 percent of teachers in the primary sector meet training qualification requirements) and weak infrastructure. Additional important challenges include insufficient time for instruction, teacher-centered pedagogy, and lack of teaching materials and large classrooms (Assises de l'Education, 2014; GOS, 2013).

Improving the quality of education provided in primary schools will require a number of different responses. Clearly, introducing national languages in the formal education system is an important strategy. In the recent *Assises Nationale de l'Education*, the use of national languages in the formal educational system was highlighted as vital to improving quality. Quality instruction is defined as "guaranteeing socioeconomic and cultural integration to all children" (Assises de l'Education, 2014).

Sociolinguistic Environment

Senegal is characterized by its rich linguistic diversity. The Constitution of Senegal recognizes French as the official language and six other languages as national languages: Wolof, Pulaar, Seereer, Joola, Mandinka, and Sooninke (GOS, 2001).[6] However, the Constitution also provides an avenue for additional national languages to be recognized if an orthography is developed and approved. Local efforts have resulted in a gradual increase in the number of recognized national languages. Twenty-one languages are now officially recognized.[7]

Most national languages in Senegal are transparent, which means that letters and graphemes consistently correspond to one sound. Research shows that the degree of transparency of grapheme–phoneme correspondence in alphabetical languages affects reading instruction and acquisition (Seymour Aro, & Erskine, 2003). Children learn to read faster in more transparent languages. As a result, children in Senegal should have an easier time learning to read in a national language than in French, which is a more opaque language (less one-to-one correspondence between letters/graphemes and sounds).

---

[5] Reading fluency benchmarks vary by language and by grade level, but it largely accepted that fluency is associated with reading comprehension.

[6] Spelling of language names is different in French, English, and the national language. In French, the six languages are spelled as follows: Wolof, Poular, Sérère, Diola, Malinké, and Soninké.

[7] The 21 national languages, as listed by the Government of Senegal, are as follows: Wolof, Pulaar, Seereer, Joola, Mandinka, Sooninke, Hassanya, Balant, Mankaañ, Noon, Manjaaku, Mënik, Oniyan, Saafi-Saafi, Guñuun, Laalaa, Kanjaad, Jalunga, Ndut, Bayot, and Paloor (GOS, 2012).

Linguistic diversity is sometimes presented as a challenge to using multilingual education, for two different reasons. First, having a large number of languages increases the diversity of resources that need to be developed initially, although it does not impact the overall number of resources to distribute. Second, linguistic heterogeneity within a school can make it difficult to choose the LOI in the classroom. However, these two challenges—which are sometimes based more on perception than on-the-ground reality—do not pose an insurmountable obstacle, especially in Senegal. Indeed, although the country is linguistically diverse, approximately 90 percent of the population speaks one of the six languages recognized in 2001 (CONFEMEN, 2010; Leclerc, 2013). While it is not suggested that these six languages be the only ones used, it is worth noting that a large proportion of Senegalese uses one of these languages. Ultimately, the choice of languages should be based on several factors, including percentage of the population speaking the language, whether a given language's orthography has been standardized, and availability of materials in the language. Consideration to minority languages should also be made, particularly if such groups have been marginalized and have historically low rates of education participation. Furthermore, the selection of language to use as the LOI should be the result of a participatory process. In addition, with good planning it is possible to develop a large number of resources in a relatively short amount of time, as demonstrated by the USAID-funded School Health and Reading Program in Uganda, which developed materials for Grades 1 and 2 in eight national languages in the first two years of the project (Tracy Brunette, personal communication, November 16, 2014). Similarly, in Ethiopia, the USAID READ Technical Assistance project worked with the Ministry of Education to develop student books and teachers' guides to support reading and writing skills instruction for eight grades and seven of the country's most widely-spoken languages (Wendi Ralaingita, personal communication, November 20, 2014). Cost, too, should not be considered a barrier to providing L1 or bilingual instruction: Research in Senegal and Guatemala estimated that the cost of producing L1 materials would be 1 percent of the education budget where orthographies and language development exist (Vawda & Patrinos, 1999, as cited in RTI International, forthcoming.) Furthermore, the initial costs are estimated to be recovered in the long-term through improved efficiency. Thoughtful planning can help the government to estimate costs, and cost-savings, over the medium and long term.

The bilingual education experiences in Senegal described below have shown that it is rarely a problem to choose an appropriate language at the school level. Although some students may speak a different language at home than the majority in school, they are likely to understand and often speak the language better than French. Senegal has a long history of linguistically diverse communities living together, which should inform the LOI decision at the school level. As a comparison, a language mapping exercise in Mali showed that 68 percent of schools in one region enrolled students who spoke the same language at home. In the remaining 90 percent of the remaining schools, students shared one of four national languages (Rhodes, 2012; USAID/Mali, 2011). This information helped ease concerns about the complexity of providing bilingual instruction.

International Context

Supporting the use of national languages in education is an explicit goal of many national governments and international organizations. This commitment was stated early in Pan-

African conferences and reiterated by18 African Ministers of Education, including from Senegal. These African Ministers of Education adopted a set of common guidelines to integrate African languages and culture into curricula (UNESCO, 2010).

The recent *Education Strategy* developed by USAID identifies LOI as an area important to reinforce when designing and implementing early grade reading programs. The *Education Strategy* states that a "strong foundation in a first language, especially in the first years of school, is crucial to education success" (USAID, 2011).

Government of Senegal and Language

Throughout official documents from the Ministry of Education and the Government of Senegal, it is clear that political will to support the use of national languages in the formal education sector is strong. However, there is no official language policy for the sector. One of the major recommendations from the 2014 *Assises Nationale de l'Education* is to develop a clear and coherent language policy (Assises de l'Education, 2014, p. 35). Official documents supporting national languages include the following:

- The **Constitution of 2001** recognizes all national languages that are codified and states in Article 22 that all institutions have a duty to develop literacy in national languages (GOS, 2001).

- The *Lettre de Politique Générale* states as one of its seven priorities to gradually develop the use of national languages in the education system (GOS, 2013).

- The **vision of the Government of Senegal,** stated in the *Programme de Développement de l'Education et de la Formation* (PDEF 2012–2015), includes the introduction of national languages in the early years of schooling (GOS, 2012).

- The *Assises Nationale de l'Education* (2014) defines the "school of success" as being based on the use of national languages.

Multilingual Education Experience in Senegal

National languages have been used in formal and non-formal education settings in Senegal. Government and civil society have made use of national languages in both types of settings.

Government Programs in Schools

The largest education program using national languages in Senegal was led by the government in 465 classrooms between 2002 and 2008. The overall results of the evaluation of this program, implemented in six national languages, show a positive impact on primary school completion, with 43 percent completion for students in experimental classrooms compared with 33 percent in control schools (Couralet, P-E., 2009 [World Bank, 2010, p. 58]). Implementing challenges were identified and linked with the lack of significant differences in test scores at the end of primary school (Couralet, P-E., 2009 [World Bank, 2010]). Several important lessons learned from this experience include the following:

- Selecting an appropriate language for instruction in each school was feasible.

- Principals, teachers, and parents supported the program in many schools.
- Success was prominent in schools and communities that received support from regional education officials.

Equally important to note is that the project was severely hampered by a lack of L1 materials and insufficient teacher training in L1-based instruction, which are both key to effective implementation. This point is worth underscoring because initiatives that seek to provide instruction in national languages will only be successful if appropriate teacher training is provided prior to roll-out, while additional support must be regularly provided during the first years of implementation as teachers adjust to a new approach to instruction. Similarly, teaching and learning materials appropriate for the target grade levels and languages need to be available in sufficient quantities at the beginning of the school year, and need to be replenished accordingly.

Since the 2002 to 2008 experience, the government has partnered with a regional program called *Ecole et Langues Nationales en Afrique* (ELAN) with the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and the *Organisation Internationale de la Francophonie* (OIF). Currently, the program is supporting education by using national languages in 30 classrooms.

Civil Society

In addition to the government, several nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) are leading bilingual education programs in the country with the support of the Ministry of Education. The Associates in Research and Education for Development (ARED), a Senegalese NGO, has been implementing a bilingual education program in 100 classrooms in two languages (Wolof and Pulaar) in three regions. ARED's success in improving reading in French and mathematics skills was highlighted in an external impact evaluation. In Grade 1 (*Cours d'Initiation*), students in the bilingual program increased their French reading skills by 13 percentage points, compared with 7 percentage points in control schools (ARED, 2014). In Grade 2 (*Cours Préparatoire*), similar results were found with students in bilingual classrooms increasing by 19 percentage points, compared to 14 percentage points in control schools. As a result, ARED's program is scaling up in the 2014–2015 school year to reach more than 200 classrooms.

Similarly, EMiLe (*Education Multi-Langue;* the French term for "multilingual education") is a project implemented by a consortium formed by World Vision, SIL Senegal, and ONECS. EMiLe is piloting a bilingual Seereer–French program in government and Catholic schools, but preliminary evaluations of the program indicate positive results. For example, children in pilot schools read correctly an average of 13 graphemes per minute, compared with 5 in control schools (EMiLe, 2014).

Non-formal Education

Literacy instruction in national languages in Senegal has been implemented both inside and outside the formal system. The Ministry of Education, the *Centre National de Resources Educationelles (CNRE),* and civil society have been active in using national languages to develop literacy skills through the non-formal sector, mainly with adults.

In 2013, the CNRE implemented literacy classes reaching 14,000 Senegalese over the age of 15. Tostan, a regional NGO focused on community empowerment, has introduced literacy instruction using mobile phones and reached more than 40,000 people, mostly women.[8] Tostan has also worked with 230 communities to promote home-based active learning in national languages. Teachers in these communities assist students and their families with the transition to formal schooling (Molly Melching, personal communication, November 21, 2014). Tostan emphasized that communication and partnership with community members were critical to the success of their programs.

These experiences collectively demonstrate the potential to use national languages, as well as the ability of communities to support local language use themselves. Furthermore, the success of adult literacy programs in national languages offers an opportunity for parents and community members to support children enrolled in schools in a more meaningful way than when instruction is provided only in French. Indeed, parents who can read and write in the national language used as the LOI in school can support their students academically and engage with the material taught in school.

Toward a Successful Bilingual Educational System in Senegal

As previously described, the current political context is favorable to the introduction of national languages in the formal education sector. The cumulative experience gained by the government and civil society programs should serve as the basis to develop and implement a bilingual education system in Senegal. *Annex A* presents a detailed list of actions that could be implemented in the short or medium terms. These activities include the following:

- **Language mapping and selection.** One of the foundations of a successful plan for language use in education is an accurate language map that allows for decisions to be made regarding which languages to use. In addition, community- and school-based mapping can help to identify the appropriate language at the school level.[9]

- **Language policy.** As noted in the *Assises Nationale de l'Education*, development and dissemination of a policy document to guide all stakeholders in the system is crucial.

- **Instructional approach.** Selecting the most effective approach for using languages to provide instruction will determine specific needs for materials and training. Research suggests that sustaining L1 at least through the end of primary school is important, with instruction of and/or in additional languages taking place gradually and continuously supported through ongoing L1 use. A language policy should determine which specific instructional model should be implemented.

---

[8] For more information about the Mobile Phone for Literacy and Development module, see Tostan's Web site at http://www.tostan.org/area-of-impact/education.

[9] The national language policy will determine all the languages that should be used and supported in the country. This could include only one, the six languages originally recognized in the 2001 constitution, or a larger number of languages. At the school level, the decision of which of these languages to use will take place based on the needs of the children in the community. This should be determined through an inclusive process with community members and local education officials. It is likely that in urban heterogeneous areas, children may have more than one L1, including the language spoken at home and the local lingua franca (often Wolof).

- **Curriculum and materials.** Based on the policy and language model adopted, new pedagogical materials will need to be developed. The Ministry of Education and civil society have already developed a large number of documents that can serve as the basis for the initial implementation of the policy.

- **Teacher qualifications and training.** Training and supporting current and new teachers is crucial to the success of a new language policy. In 2011, a new policy mandated the decentralization of teacher training for primary education through the Centres Régionaux de Formation de Personnels de l'Education (CRFPE). Working with CRFPE and language specialists at universities to adapt teacher training is important to ensure the teaching force is adequately prepared.

- **Teacher recruitment and placement.** Teachers will need to be proficient in the L1 of learners, which may require adapting the recruitment and placement system. Pre-service and in-service training should be provided in the language used in the school. Teachers' language proficiency should be assessed prior to deployment to ensure they are proficient in the language(s) of instruction. Following the language mapping, a strategy should be developed to identify the languages spoken by teachers vis-à-vis the needs of the system. An outreach program to recruit speakers of languages underrepresented in the teaching corps may be needed.[10]

- **Assessment and evaluation.** Assessments will have to be adapted or translated to align with the new language policy. Assessment of language and literacy skills also should be developed for each language.

- **Stakeholder engagement, advocacy, and support.** Involvement of all relevant stakeholders within the education sector, and communication and inclusion of local communities, is essential to developing and implementing an acceptable and effective language policy and plan for education. Current efforts in the formal and non-formal sector in Senegal have shown that local communities can be successfully engaged in the process of selecting national languages and supporting literacy programs.

Senegalese leaders have clearly expressed the political will to introduce national languages in the formal education system. Experience in Senegal, in the region, and around the world has shown that children can benefit from learning to read and write in a familiar language. However, experience has also shown that careful planning followed by good implementation is crucial to the success of multilingual education policies.

---

[10] Multiple avenues are available to receive teacher certification in Senegal, but working with the regional teacher training centers (CRFPE) should be prioritized. Efforts to reach officials from the Division of Training and Communication in the Ministry of Education in order to provide more specific recommendations to USAID were unsuccessful.

Bibliography

* Indicates document was provided directly by author/organization and is available upon request.

ARED (Associates in Research and Education for Development) (2014). Notes sur le programme bilingue d'ARED (Notes on the bilingual program of ARED).*

Assises de l'Education (2014). *Recommendations*. Retrieved from http://www.assises-education.sn/images/stories/files/PropositionsAssises.pdf

Brown, V. (2011). *Mango Tree Lango Literacy Project. Early Grade Reading Assessment End of Year Survey*. Retrieved from http://mangotreeuganda.org/downloads/NULP%202011%20EGRA%20Report.pdf

Brunette, T. (16 November 2014). Personal communication with the author.

CA Linguistics (CAL). (2006). Executive summary. In D. August & T. Shanahan (Eds.), *Developing literacy in second-language learners: Report of the National Literacy Panel on Language-Minority Children and Youth* (p. 4). Mahwah NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum. Retrieved from http://www.bilingualeducation.org/pdfs/PROP2272.pdf

Conférence des ministres de l'Education des États et gouvernements de la Francophonie (CONFEMEN; Conference of Education Ministers of the States and Governments of Francophone Africa) (2010). *Evaluation PASEC Senegal 2007*. Retrieved from http://www.confemen.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/06/Rapport_PASEC_Senegal_version_janvier_2010-2.pdf

Couralet, P-E. (2009). Senegal—Etudes sur l'expérimentation de l'enseignement bilingue. (Studies on Experimental Bilingual Education in Senegal) Washington, DC: World Bank. Retrieved from http://www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSContentServer/WDSP/IB/2012/08/29/000020953_20120829141747/Rendered/PDF/722130ESW0P1040N00200500IDEA00CFEE0.pdf (English version: World Bank (2010). Studies on Experimental Bilingual Education in Senegal*)

Cummins, J. (2009). Fundamental psycholinguistic and sociological principles underlying educational success for linguistic minority students. In T. Skutnabb-Kangas, R. Phillipson, A. Mohanty, A., & M. Panda, (Eds.), *Social justice through multilingual education* (pp. 19–35). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Cummins, J. (2012). The intersection of cognitive and sociological factors in the development of reading comprehension among immigrant students. *Reading and Writing, 25,* 1973–1990.

Education Multi-Langue (EMiLe; Multilingual Education) (2014). Rapport étude longitudinale enquête « base-line » (Report of the baseline study for a longitudinal assessment).*

Geva, E. (2006). Learning to read in a second language: Research, implications, and recommendations for services. In R. E. Tremblay, R. G. Barr, & R. DeV. Peters (Eds.), *Encyclopedia on early childhood development*. Montreal, Quebec: Centre of Excellence for Early Childhood Development. Retrieved from http://www.child-encyclopedia.com/sites/default/files/textes-experts/en/614/learning-to-read-in-a-second-language-research-implications-and-recommendations-for-services.pdf

Government of Senegal (GOS) (2013). *Lettre de Politique Générale pour le secteur de l'Education et la formation*. (General Policy Letter for the Education and Training Sector).*

GOS (2013). Programme d'Amélioration de la Qualité, de l'Equité et de la Transparence (PAQUET) (Program to Improve Quality, Equity and Transparence). Retrieved from Rttp://www.gouv.sn/IMG/pdf/PAQUETEF.pdf

GOS (2001). *Constitution de la Republique du Senegal, du 22 Janvier 2001* (Constitution of the Republic of Senegal, January 22, 2001). Retrieved from http://www.constitutionnet.org/files/Constitution_fr.pdf

Heugh, K., Benson, C., Bogale, B., & Yohannes, M. A. G. (2007). *Final report: Study on medium of instruction in primary schools in Ethiopia*. Addis Ababa: Ministry of Education.

Institut National de la Statistique (INS; National Institute of Statistics) (2014). *Annuaire Statistique 2009–2013, Edition 2014* (Annual Statistics 2009–2013). Niger.

Institut National de la Statistique et de la Démographie (INSD; National Institute of Statistics and Demography) (2013). *Annuaire Statistique 2012* (Annual Statistics 2012). Burkina Faso.

Leclerc, J. (2013). Sénégal dans *L'aménagement linguistique dans le monde.* (Senegal in *Linguistic planning around the world*).Québec, Trésor de la language française au Québec (TLFQ) (Treasure of French Language in Quebec), Université Laval. Retrieved from http://www.axl.cefan.ulaval.ca/afrique/senegal.htm

Melching, M. (21 November 2014). Personal communication with the author.

Ministère de l'Education Nationale (MEN) Mali (2014). *Annuaire Succint National des Statistiques de l'Enseignement Fondamental 2013/2014* (Brief Statistical Annual Report for Basic Education).*

Nikièma, N. (2011). A first-language-first multilingual model to meet the quality imperative in formal basic education in three "francophone" West African countries. *International Review of Education 57*(5–6): 599–616.

Piper, B., Schroeder, L., & Trudell, B. (2014). *Oral reading fluency and comprehension in Kenya: Reading acquisition in a multilingual environment.* Manuscript submitted for publication.

Pouezevara, S., Sock, M., & Ndiaye, A. (2010). *Evaluation des Compétences Fondamentales en Lecture au Sénégal, Rapport d'Analyse* (Evaluation of basic reading skills in Senegal, analysis report). Retrieved from https://www.eddataglobal.org/countries/index.cfm?fuseaction=pubDetail&ID=250

Ralaingita, W. (20 November 2014). Personal communication with the author.

Rhodes, R. (2012, June). Moving towards bilingual education in Mali: Bridging policy and practice for improved reading instruction (PowerPoint slides). Retrieved from http://mlenetwork.org/content/moving-towards-bilingual-education-mali-bridging-policy-and-practice-improved-reading-instru

RTI International (Forthcoming). Planning for language use in education: Best practices and practical steps to improve learning outcomes.

RTI International (2008). *Senegal Early Grade Reading Assessment (EGRA). Results from Senegalese primary school students. Learning to read in French and in Wolof.* English version retrieved from https://www.eddataglobal.org/countries/index.cfm?fuseaction=pubDetail&ID=117 French version retrieved from file:///C:/Users/apflepsen/Downloads/EGRA%20Report%20Senegal%20French%20Final%202-11-08.pdf

Sampa, F. (2005). *Zambia's Primary Reading Programme (PRP): Improving access and quality education in basic schools.* African Experiences Country Case Studies 4. Paper commissioned by ADEA for its Biennial Meeting, December 2003. Retrieved from http://www.adeanet.org/adeaPortal/adea/downloadcenter/CD/04_zambia_en.pdf

Seymour, P.H.K., Aro, M., & Erskine, J.M. (2003). Foundation literacy acquisition in European orthographies. *British Journal of Psychology 94:*143–174.

Spratt, J., King, S., & Bulat, J. (2013, June: Revised). *Independent evaluation of the effectiveness of Institut pour l'Education Populaire's "Read-Learn-Lead" (RLL) Program in Mali. Endline report*. Prepared for the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, Grant No. 2008-3229 (RTI Project No. 0212015). Retrieved from https://www.rti.org/pubs/mali_rll_eval_endline_report.pdf

Thomas, W., & Collier, V. (2002). *A national study of school effectiveness for language minority students' long-term academic achievement.* Berkeley, CA: Center for Research on Education, Diversity, and Excellence (CREDE). Retrieved from http://www.usc.edu/dept/education/CMMR/CollierThomasExReport.pdf

United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) (2014). Améliorer les acquis de la lecture dans les trois premières années du primaire: Intégration du curriculum, enseignement, support d'apprentissage et évaluation. Rapport de recherche « Enseignement et apprentissage de la lecture dans un contexte multilingue.» Analyses, observations et pistes pour trois pays de l'Afrique subsaharienne (Burkina Faso, Niger, Sénégal). (Improving reading acquisition in the first three years of primary school: Integrating curriculum, instruction, teaching materials and evaluation. Research report "Teaching and learning to read in a multilingual context." Analysis, observations and ideas for three sub-Saharan African countries [Burkina Faso, Niger, Senegal]). Geneva: Bureau international d'éducation de l'UNESCO.

UNESCO (2010). *Policy guide on the integration of African languages and cultures into education systems*. Retrieved from http://uil.unesco.org/fileadmin/keydocuments/Africa/en/policy_guide_sep_web_en.pdf

UNESCO (2008). *Mother tongue matters: Local language as key to effective learning*. Retrieved from http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0016/001611/161121e.pdf

US Agency for International Development (USAID) (2012). *The influence of language on learning: Recommendations on planning for language use in education*. Prepared under the Malawi Teacher Professional Development Support Project. Washington, DC: USAID.

USAID (2011). *Education strategy*: *Technical notes*. Washington, DC: USAID.

USAID/Mali (2011). *Etude sociolinguistique sur l'adéquation entre la demande et l'offre d'enseignement bilingue dans la région de Mopti* (Sociolinguistic study of the match between demand and supply of bilingual education in the Mopti region). Washington, DC: USAID. Retrieved from http://mlenetwork.org/sites/default/files/Mali_EtudeSociolinguistique_Rapport_Partie1_(Analyse).pdf

Vawda, A.Y., & Patrinos, H. A. (1999). Producing educational materials in local languages: Costs from Guatemala and Senegal. *International Journal of Educational Development, 4*(5), 287–299.

Walter, S.L., & Chuo, K.G. (2012). *The Kom experimental mother tongue education pilot project report for 2012*. Mother Tongue Based-Multilingual Education Network. Available at http://mlephil.wordpress.com/2012/08/06/the-kom-experimental-mother-tongue-education-pilot-project-report-for-2012

Annex A: Recommended Actions and Time Frame[11]

Activities and Time Frame
Language Mapping, Standardization and Selection

Short term: Language mapping
- Work with key stakeholders to review existing or to conduct new language maps. If new maps are needed, identify the geographic and linguistic scope of the mapping.
- Select languages to use for instruction, and/or to teach as L2, based on several factors, including percentage of the population speaking the language, whether the language has been standardized, and availability of materials in the language. Consideration to minority languages should also be made, particularly if such groups have been marginalized and have historically low rates of education participation.
- Conduct school-level oral language assessments to inform policy makers on appropriate national languages at the local level.
- Use language maps to identify languages appropriate to use in specific schools, as well as particularly complex linguistic environments. If more than one L1 is spoken by children in the same school, consult with parents and teachers to identify an appropriate instructional approach. For example, would Wolof be appropriate for all children in the classroom even if they do not all speak it in their homes? It is often better to use a language of wider communication, or regional language – such as Kiswahili in Tanzania or Amharic in Ethiopia – to introduce literacy as there is often greater linguistic proximity.

Medium to long term:
- For languages that do not yet have standardized orthographies, establish (and clearly communicate) a plan and process for developing and/or harmonizing those orthographies. (Many of the 21 national languages were only recently codified, and some may need more support to develop standardized orthographies.)
- Develop, standardize, and harmonize orthographies for additional L1s, as prioritized by a consultative committee based on criteria such as the number of speakers and the availability of qualified teachers who are speakers. Languages that are less widely spoken should not be overlooked, and clear plans will need to be developed for how and when these languages will be included.
- Identify strategies to support L1 acquisition among children who speak languages that are different from the majority of learners in a classroom (e.g., providing after-school support or enlisting the help of family or community members).

Language Policy and Plans

Short term:
- Convene a senior-level working group to review existing policies and plans regarding LOI. This working group should include government officials, language experts from the universities, development partners, and civil society members who are active in education.
- Identify the goals of language use and discuss the levels of proficiency needed in French before it is used as the language of instruction.

Medium term:
- Develop (or revise) a *plan* for language use in education.
- Develop (or revise) official *policy* for language use in education (if deemed necessary and feasible).
- Identify (and carry out) a clear set of strategies for promoting the policy or plan and for ratification that includes specific institutions, departments, and individuals and identify key stakeholders who are able and willing to guide the process.
- Align teacher education and deployment policies and practices with those related to language of instruction. The regional education training institution, CRFPE, responsible for both pre- and in-service trainings should be engaged from the beginning of the consultation process to identify changes that may need to be made.

Instructional Approach

Short term:
- Develop a framework for language use in education that prioritizes the use of L1 at least through the end of primary school. This will ensure that children have adequate instructional time to develop a high level of proficiency in their L1 and sufficient proficiency in French to be used as the language of instruction in higher academic levels.
- Develop an instructional approach to teaching French as a second language, starting in Grade 1 with oral language development and gradually introducing reading and writing. The experiences in Mali and other French-speaking countries in the region can be used to develop the French as a second language curriculum. EMiLe is also developing a curriculum in Senegal that can inform the process.
- For speakers of languages other than the L1s that have initially been selected as LOI, ensure that decisions are made locally by the families and schools.

---

[11] Adapted from Table 5 in USAID, 2012.

Report on Language of Instruction in Senegal

Activities and Time Frame
• Identify strategies for increasing the amount of time available in the curriculum to teach reading and languages. At least 1 hour per day should be spent on teaching to read in L1. Instruction for French will also be necessary. • Identify effective and acceptable approaches for LOI use in linguistically diverse environments, such as urban settings. This process should include discussions with parents and school leaders, as well assessments of students in the languages spoken in the community. When one language is chosen, additional support will need to be provided to non-native speakers of that language. For example, if Wolof is selected as the LOI in an urban area such as Dakar, Pulaar speakers in the school will need additional instruction in Wolof to support their language development. **Medium and long terms** • Assess the success of the particular approach to language of instruction. Specific questions to be asked include the following: Are children learning to read in L1? Are children gaining a sufficient level of L2 proficiency to begin using the L2 to learn academic subjects? What academic outcomes are achieved in L1 and L2? Depending on the answers to these questions, the grade at which bilingual methods are used and the amount of instruction provided in each language at different grade levels may need to be adjusted.

Curriculum and Materials
Short term: • Review existing teaching and learning materials (curriculum, teachers' guides, textbooks, and other supplementary reading materials across all subjects) to identify what is available and where gaps exist. This inventory will be helpful in both identify which languages may be able to be used for instruction in the near- and medium-term, while other languages may require more materials development The need for a large number and variety of books of different genres is crucial, but a large amount of material in some national languages already exists. • The Ministry of Education has already developed literacy facilitators guides in nine languages (Wolof, Pulaar, Seereer, Joola, Mandinka, Sooninke, Balant, Ndut and Laalaa), as well as some preliminary documents in the 21 national languages (GOS, 2012). Additional materials are also available from the work performed by the CNRE and ARED, and during the 2002–2008 experience. • Identify teams of language, reading, and other technical experts (from universities, teacher training colleges, language and linguistics organizations, among others) to develop and/or modify teaching and learning materials for the languages that will be used in the classroom. • Develop L1 and L2 language learning materials, as well as academic content books (in mathematics, science, and other subjects) and consider whether these should be L1 or bilingual. All materials should be in line with national curriculum standards, adjusting for language. • Develop the time line and budget for developing the materials across grades and languages. Materials should be appropriate for L1 instruction, with a focus on early grade reading. Teachers, parents, community members, authors, linguists, education specialists, and children should all be involved in the development of reading and other materials.

Teacher Qualifications and Training
Short term: • Consult with lecturers from the CRFPE and universities, with teachers' unions, and with teachers to obtain their input for the language policy and plan and how it will affect teacher training and professional development. • Assess teachers' current levels of L1 and French proficiency to identify additional training needed. **Medium term:** • Develop/revise pre- and in-service teacher education curricula and programs to align with the language policy and/or plan for language use in education. This will include preparing teachers to teach the L1s *as subjects* (with an emphasis on reading) and to teach *curricular content* using L1s, in the applicable grade levels and subjects. • Develop and provide teacher training materials in L1 (including monolingual and bilingual resources, as appropriate). • Provide teachers with opportunities to strengthen their own L1 literacy levels, as needed, to feel comfortable teaching these languages as subjects and teaching curriculum content through them. • Consider identifying language specialists to ease the burden of teaching French as a second/foreign language so the majority of teachers can focus on teaching curricular content in familiar languages. • Train teacher educators and other education officials who supervise teacher in instructional approaches to be used, curriculum, and materials.

Teacher Recruitment and Placement
Short term: • Review current teacher recruitment and deployment practices and identify how language can be included for consideration—in consultation with a wide array of stakeholders (e.g., teachers' unions, teachers). • Involve stakeholders in the development of guidelines for recruitment and deployment. Teachers need to be proficient in learners' L1s to be effective. If there are not enough teachers with the necessary L1 skills in the

Activities and Time Frame
schools or in teacher training institutions, temporary measures need to be taken (e.g., community-based teacher assistants, alternative certification routes, distance learning).

- Conduct mapping exercises to identify the extent to which teacher training college personnel, head teachers, and teachers may need to be redeployed.
- Teacher deployment policies and practices should be sensitive to teachers' personal needs and professional goals, and should not unfairly constrain teachers' employment opportunities. Teachers' unions and others should be involved in any teacher deployment policy discussions and development to ensure buy-in.

Medium to long terms:
- Deploy teachers according to their proficiency in the appropriate languages.
- Use assistant teachers to help meet the needs for more teachers in specific languages, if necessary.
- Develop a strategy to reach out and recruit speakers of underrepresented languages in the education system.

Assessment and Evaluation

Short term:
- Review all tests and exams used to assess and evaluate learner performance and identify which languages need updated or assessments need to be translated.
- Prepare guidelines for assessing reading and language skills.

Medium term:
- Train teachers in assessment practices, emphasizing the importance of evaluating children in familiar languages so they can demonstrate their knowledge.
- Develop promotional exams or other high-stakes tests in the L1 or bilingually for all curricular subjects; pilot test the exams and modify them as needed.

Medium to long terms:
- Collect data on students' and teachers' levels of proficiency in the languages used in the classroom, and then review these data over time to identify vocabulary and literacy performance thresholds that can be used to evaluate knowledge levels.

Stakeholder Engagement, Advocacy and Support

Short term:
- Develop strategies for engaging a wide range of stakeholders, including education officials at all levels, parents and community members, NGOs, teachers unions, and others.
- Involve communities in developing and implementing the local language plan by soliciting their ideas and communicating the advantages of L1–based instruction. For example, parents and community groups can be involved in language mapping.

Monitoring and Evaluation

Short term:
- Develop a plan for monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of all aspects of the language plan for education, including curricula and materials, teacher training, and student assessments; identify relevant institutions (e.g., Ministry of Education, CNRE) and individuals to guide this process technically.

Medium term:
- Use monitoring and evaluation results to inform continued planning; make adjustments to curricula, teacher training, teacher deployment and others as needed.

Annex B: List of Organizations Contacted

Organization	Contact Name	Contact Information
ARED	Mamadou Ly	lymadou2001@gmail.com
EMiLe	Chris Darby	chris_darby@sil.org
SIL	Ruddy Klaas	rudy_klaas@sil.org
Tostan	Molly Melching	mollymelching@tostan.org
World Bank	Nathalie Lahire	nlahire@worldbank.org
World Vision	Diegane Ndiaye	ndiayediegane@gmail.com
Ministry of Education	Mamadou Mara	marafev56@yahoo.fr
UNESCO	Rokhaya Diawara	r.diawara@unesco.org

United States Agency for International Development

Catherine Powell Miles
Bureau for Africa
1300 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20523

www.USAID.gov