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Introduction
In September 2006, the Department of Education and Early Childhood Development of Prince Edward Island (to be henceforth referred to as “The Department”), in conjunction with the Eastern School District and the Western School Board, began a three-year pilot of the Intensive French (IF) program in Grade 6 at the following schools: Cardigan Consolidated; Morell Consolidated and O’Leary Elementary.

The purpose of this report is to provide information about the Intensive French (IF) pilot program during the 2006-2007 and 2007-2008 school years, as well as during the first semester of the 2008-2009 school year. Please note that the results regarding the final two pilot classes of Intensive French will not be available until after these classes have completed the program in June of 2009.

What is Intensive French?
Intensive French is a literacy-based French second language program taken by Grade 6 students over a five month period, one semester. The majority of IF classes run from the beginning of the school year until the end of January, though some classes begin the IF program in February and finish at the end June. During the intensive semester, in addition to their French class, students study Math, Physical Education and Music in English. Schools also offer a thirty-minute class of their choice in English every second day. All Grade 6 curriculum is taught, despite the change in scheduling. This is made possible by the English teachers’ use of curriculum integration and by the transfer of some skills learned in French to English classes.

Students usually receive French instruction for 3-4 consecutive hours per day during the intensive semester. In most cases, a Grade 6 Core French student would receive 90 hours of instruction in French during the course of the school year¹. A student in IF typically receives 315 hours of French instruction, 270 of which are intensive. The increase in instructional time in French and the intensity² of this time are two of the key elements of the program.

---

¹As there is currently no minister’s directive on the time allotted to Core French at the elementary level, the number of hours of instruction can vary considerably from one school to another. The figure “90 hours of instruction” is based on the current recommendation of “30 minutes per day or the equivalent”.

²What do we mean by “intensity”? When French instruction is concentrated during a specific period of time and is not broken up by classes in other subject areas, we refer to it as being intense. In general, the more intensity there is, the better the results. For example, a person taking a 30 day French course for a period of thirty consecutive days would have better results than someone taking a 30 day French course one day a week for thirty weeks.
Why Intensive French?
Several factors contributed to our interest in the Intensive French program.

*Core French Survey: a Regional Report (2002)*
In April 2002, the Atlantic Provinces Education Foundation (APEF) surveyed Grade 11 students in Atlantic Canada who had opted to discontinue taking Core French in order to determine their attitudes and opinions about the program. The majority of students on Prince Edward Island indicated that they had dropped the course due to their perceived lack of success and to the difficulty of learning French. In its report, *Core French Survey: A Regional Report (2002)*, APEF made ten recommendations, including the following:

- *A paradigm shift in methodology and curriculum content of the Core French program is required. French has to become more interesting, more relevant and more oriented to the goal of learning to speak the language. This is the most obvious first step towards motivating students to continue their study in French* (p.19);

- *Because one of the recurring concerns of students was the lack of effective teaching methodologies which promoted oral proficiency, there is a compelling need to embrace approaches which maximize speaking* (p.19);

- *There should be a review of the research project on the Grade 6 Intensive Core French program being conducted by Joan Netten and Claude Germain. Although this project is in the pilot stages in several provinces their preliminary findings could be instructive* (p.19).

Based on this report, the Department felt that the Intensive French program had the potential to improve student competencies and to decrease attrition at the secondary level, thus it merited closer study.

*The Next Act: New Momentum for Canada’s Linguistic Duality (2003)*
In the spring of 2003, the federal government launched its Action Plan for Official Languages in Canada, entitled *The Next Act: New Momentum for Canada’s Linguistic Duality*. One of the objectives of this plan was to double the proportion of high school graduates that were functionally bilingual. As approximately 85% of students taking French as a second language on P.E.I. are in Core French, the objective set out by the federal government would only be achievable in our province if improvements were made to the Core French program. Intensive French is viewed as an improvement of the Core French program.

In April 2004, the Department of Canadian Heritage published a report in response to the 2003 Action Plan for Official Languages to encourage reflection and suggest concrete steps that could be taken towards the achievement of the 2013 objective. Some of the steps recommended in this report were:

- to overhaul Core French programs...with a view to developing courses that focus on authentic communication...(p.34);
- to implement Intensive Core French in all provinces and territories as the approved program for Grade 6 (p.40).

An Examination of Intensive French: A Pedagogical Strategy for the Improvement of French as a Second Language Outcomes in Canada (2005)

In April 2005, the Canadian Association of Second Language Teachers (CASLT) published a report on the Intensive French program. This report indicated that the oral proficiency of students who take IF is comparable to that of high school Core French students, in that these students are able to “show considerable spontaneity in language production and to initiate and sustain general conversation” (p.14). This report also underlined the importance of having an appropriate follow-up program for students who’ve taken Intensive French.

The Relative Effectiveness of Different Core French Delivery Models, Review of the Research (2008)

In September 2008, CASLT published a review of the relative effectiveness of different Core French delivery models currently used in Canada. This report highlighted the importance of a communications-based pedagogy as well as the need to allocate “consistent, sufficient and dedicated time to Core French” (p.17). As well, emphasis was placed on the idea of using the compact Core French format, wherein longer, more intense blocks of time (though no additional time) are utilized for program delivery. This reinforces the idea of intensive scheduling that is an important component of Intensive French.

Implementation process

The Intensive French program started in Newfoundland and Labrador in 1998. The Department followed the progress of the program for several years, with the intention of piloting it should it prove to be successful in other jurisdictions.

In the winter of the 2005-2006 school year, Imelda Arsenault, director of French programs at the Department, along with Monica Rafuse and Betty-Joy Harris met with representatives of the Eastern School District and the Western School Board to discuss the possibility of a three-year pilot of the program. The school boards opted to pilot the program in schools where students did
not have access to an immersion program - Cardigan Consolidated, Morell Consolidated and O’Leary Elementary.

Once the schools had been selected, meetings were held in May of 2006 at each school to discuss the proposal with parents. Parents, teachers and school administrators attended these meetings which were facilitated by Imelda Arsenault and Betty-Joy Harris. Monica Rafuse continues to have parent information meetings each May for parents whose children will be entering the IF program each fall.

**Intensive French training - curriculum specialists**
In the summer of 2004, curriculum specialist Monica Rafuse attended a nine-day national symposium on Intensive French. Likewise, curriculum specialist Betty-Joy Harris attended a similar training session in Saskatchewan in the summer of 2006. The curriculum specialist continues to attend national and regional meetings about the IF program as well as follow-up training sessions.

**Intensive French training - teachers**
All Intensive French teachers are strongly encouraged to attend a summer training session prior to teaching their first class of Intensive French. This training is crucial to the success of the program. The training, which typically runs one week, is offered in the summer, usually in August. All Intensive French teachers on P.E.I. have chosen to attend these sessions. Initially, this training was only available out of province. The Department covered all expenses for teachers who took this training.

As well, during the IF semester, the curriculum specialist and the IF teacher take part in a sort of mentoring program, whereby the specialist goes out to the school, observes the class, then meets with the teacher afterwards to give feedback on what was observed. These sessions are a very important part of the teacher training process.

**Building capacity**
In February of 2008, two curriculum specialists from the Department attended a three-day training session in Moncton. They learned how to assess the compositions written by IF students at the end of their IF semester. By training these curriculum specialists, the Department eliminated the need to send these written compositions to la Société GRICS - la société de gestion du réseau d’instruments pour les commissions scolaires in Québec, as was the practice during the first year of the pilot.

In May of 2008, the curriculum specialist attended a three-day training session in Halifax in order become qualified to facilitate teacher-training sessions. At the same time, three IF teachers from the Island attended a two-day session in order to become qualified to be teacher-leaders at summer teacher-training sessions. This allows us to offer the important teacher-training sessions in our own province, thus eliminating the expense and the inconvenience of having to send teachers out of province for training.
In-services and meetings
During each of the pilot years, teachers of IF as well as the Grade 6 English teachers were invited to attend meetings and in-services, either separately to allow them to concentrate on their specific subject areas, or together to allow them to look at the outcomes of the Grade 6 curriculum and to plan their year. Curriculum specialists from the various subject areas (science, social studies, visual arts, health, language arts) offered assistance with curriculum integration to the Grade 6 English teachers. In addition, the Department provided substitute time to the schools to allow the IF and English teachers the opportunity to meet and plan during the IF semester.

At the end of each school year, a meeting was held with principals, IF and English teachers, the curriculum specialist and the director of French programs to provide feedback on the program as well as to plan for each coming school year.

Resources
Once the participating schools had been selected, the Department purchased the necessary resources for each school based on the resource list provided in the Interprovincial Intensive French guide as well as on the advice from colleagues in other provinces.

Results
Oral production
At the end of the intensive semester, students’ oral and written abilities are evaluated. For the oral evaluation, students participate in a one-on-one interview with a curriculum specialist from French programs at the Department. Students’ oral production is rated using an adapted version of the New Brunswick Oral Proficiency Scale known as the New Brunswick Middle School Scale (MSS). Students can receive one of seven possible ratings:

- **Unrateable (10):** *no indication of any ability to communicate in French*

- **Novice 1 (11):** *isolated words or memorized expressions. Essentially, no ability to communicate.*

- **Novice 2 (12):** *phrases, not sentences. Frequent long pauses. Ability to identify objects (colors, clothing, numbers...). Some ability to put 2 to 3 words together (incorrect phrases).*
  
  *ex.: avoir soeur*

- **Novice 3 (13):** *phrases and short memorized sentences. Ability to create longer phrases.*
  
  *ex.: manger le restaurant hier*

- **Basic 1 (14):** *ability to use simple sentences (Subject + V + Complement). Can maintain a very simple conversation with some spontaneity.*
• **Basic 2(15):** *some concept of ‘past time’. Can maintain simple conversation about autobiographical details, leisure-time activities, daily schedule, etc.*

• **Basic 3(16):** *ability to initiate and sustain a simple conversation with spontaneity. Ability to use language creatively. Ability to narrate and use complex sentences*  
  ex.: le livre que je préfère; ... parce que...

The average score for the 10 classes that have thus far completed the Intensive French program on P.E.I. was **13.8** (there are two final pilot classes currently taking the program). This means that 64% of students who have completed the IF program are consistently able to speak at the Basic level and that another 22% of students are able to speak at this level at least part of the time.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post-IF oral production averages</th>
<th>2003-2008</th>
<th>6 provinces/territories, 35 Grade 6 classes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003-2004</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National provincial/territorial Grade 6 average</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEI average Sept.2006-Mar. 2009</td>
<td>10 Grade 6 classes, n=180</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because we did not have any pre-testing information on the first cohort of students, it was difficult to interpret the end results, as we had no way to measure the progress they had made. As a result, it was decided that all students would henceforth participate in an oral pre-interview with a member of French programs. This has been the practice since February 2007.

While it may seem initially disappointing that our provincial average thus far (13.8) is lower than the average of comparable students in other provinces/territories (14), one must look more closely at the data. Students in seven classes on P.E.I. participated in a pre-IF interview. If we compare the results of their pre-IF interviews with those of their post-IF interviews, this allows us to calculate the average gain\(^3\) made by these students as a result of their participation in the IF program (see Table 2).

\[^3\]We measure gain in terms of the number of levels of oral proficiency a student advances.
No data was available for the 2004-2005 school year.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School year</th>
<th>No. of classes</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Pre-IF score</th>
<th>Post-IF score</th>
<th>Gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The overall average gain for students is 3.1, meaning that students were able to advance 3.1 levels on the New Brunswick Middle School Scale. According to the research of Joan Netten and Claude Germain (in-press), this is considerably higher than the gain made by Grade 6 students in other provinces/territories (see Table 3).

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School year</th>
<th>No. of classes</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Pre-IF score</th>
<th>Post-IF score</th>
<th>Gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003-2004</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-20054</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the Island average for oral production is lower than the national average for Grade 6 students, our students, on average make a greater gain in terms of oral proficiency than do Grade 6 students in other jurisdictions.

4No data was available for the 2004-2005 school year.
Written production
For the writing assessment, students write a composition over a two-day period. During the first year of the pilot, this composition was then sent to la Société GRICS - la société de gestion du réseau d’instruments pour les commissions scolaires in Quebec, where each student’s work was assessed using twelve different criteria before receiving a final mark. Classes received an overall average score, as well as a score for fluency and accuracy. This process was costly and results were not necessarily received in as timely a manner as we would have liked.

During Years 2 and 3 of the pilot, the assessment of students’ writing continued, but rather than sending the compositions to la Société GRICS, they were assessed by curriculum specialists from the Department (The compositions from Year 3 have yet to be assessed.). This method proved to be very time consuming and did not result in the calculation of an overall average score, nor in the calculation of scores for fluency and accuracy, as was the case during the first year of the pilot. It did, however, allow for direct feedback to teachers on areas where classes or individuals needed more support. Although there continues to be discussion about the best way to assess students’ writing in this program, we have not abandoned the practice as it gives valuable information about the balance of literacy activities being offered in the classroom. In general, there is still room for improvement in the area of writing.

Effects on student performance in English
With the introduction of the provincial Elementary Literacy Assessment in Grade 6 in 2008, parents and teachers of students in IF expressed concerns about the potential negative effects of the IF program on students’ performance on this assessment. Research from other provinces had indicated that we should expect no negative effect on students’ skill level in English. In fact, the P.E.I. provincial assessment results for reading comprehension in spring 2008 show that students in Intensive French score the same or higher on these assessments than students who have not participated in Intensive French (See Appendix D).

Conclusion
Upon completion of the IF program, 86% of students are able to speak at the Basic level at least part of the time compared with only 9% of students capable of this prior to taking IF. Overall, we are very pleased with the results of the pilot program (See Appendix E for more detailed information on pre and post IF scores).
Recommendations

The success of Intensive French hinges on several factors. If we are to maintain and/or expand the program on P.E.I., the following recommendations should be taken into careful consideration:

Training and support

• All IF teachers should attend a one-week training session prior to beginning their teaching assignment in order to learn the specific methodology required by the IF program.
• This training should be followed up with classroom visits to each IF teacher’s classroom, either by a curriculum specialist or an experienced IF teacher or mentor. After each classroom observation, IF teachers should be granted time to meet with the specialist/experienced teacher to receive specific feedback.
• New IF teachers who so desire should have the option of observing the classes of an experienced IF teacher.
• New IF teachers should have access to the mentor program currently offered by the French programs division of the Department.
• In-services should be offered during the school year/IF semester on a continuing basis. These could be offered on a pull-out model or could be offered on an individual basis during the afternoon, on site at an IF teacher’s school.
• School boards should consider creating an IF mentor position. An IF mentor would be an experienced teacher who, during the first semester (when most IF classes would be offered), would mentor other IF teachers. During the second semester, the IF mentor, would be teaching IF at a designated school.
• In schools where students take IF during the first semester, the second-semester French teacher should also be trained in the Intensive French methodology to allow for a smooth transition between semesters. Ideally, this teacher would attend the same training session as IF teachers prior to the start of the school year.
• In schools where students take IF during the first semester, the second-semester French teacher should continue to follow the Intensive French themes found in the Interprovincial guide to complete the school year.
• IF teachers should have an Advanced level of French oral proficiency, as defined by the New Brunswick Oral Proficiency Scale.
• A committee of English teachers of IF classes should be created. Ideally, this committee would meet prior to, during and after the IF semester for continuing support with curriculum integration.

• Experienced English teachers of IF classes should be identified as teacher leaders and be allowed to mentor new English teachers of IF classes who desire this support.

• Curriculum specialists from English programs should offer feedback and guidance with regards to curriculum integration in their specific subject areas as the need arises.

• The Department should continue to offer substitute days to both the IF and English teachers for a turn-around day between semesters.

• If the program continues to expand to other schools, a separate curriculum specialist should be designated for Intensive French and its follow up program, Enhanced French.

• The French curriculum specialist should continue to attend regional and national sharing and information sessions and training events related to the delivery of the Intensive French program.
• The French curriculum specialist(s) should receive additional training on the administration of the Oral Proficiency Interview as it specifically applies to the IF context.

**Scheduling**

• IF classes should receive a **strict minimum of 270 hours** of intensive instruction during the intensive semester. This means that the French class in the morning would not be broken up by classes in Physical Education, Music, Math or other subject areas.

• If it is impossible to avoid breaking up the IF instructional time, schools should offer more than the minimum 270 hours of intensive instruction to try and compensate for the lack of intensity of the IF program.

• During the non-intensive semester, French classes should be block scheduled. Ideally, this would mean a 60 minute class every second day. This is particularly important when the non-intensive semester follows the IF semester.

• If possible, the IF teacher should not be scheduled to teach other subject areas in English to their Grade 6 IF class as this makes it harder to establish French as the language of use in their classroom.
Assessment and evaluation

• Students from at least the original three cohorts should continue to participate in annual one-on-one interviews until the end of Grade 12 to allow the tracking of their progress over time.

• If individual interviews are to continue with students in the long term, these interviews should be contracted out to a separate organization rather than being conducted by curriculum specialists from the Department.

• The schools and/or school boards and/or the Department should decide whether or not they wish to evaluate students’ written production at the end of the IF semester. They should also decide if they wish to use running records as an assessment tool in IF.

• If running records are to be used by IF teachers, the Department should provide the necessary training for IF teachers and curriculum specialists.

• IF students should not be exempted from the provincial assessments done in the spring.

• IF teachers should continue to use the common IF progress report to report students’ progress (See Appendix F).

Public relations/correspondence with parents

• A curriculum specialist from the Department has traditionally offered IF parent information sessions in the spring for parents of students in Grade 5 at those schools where IF is offered. While communication with parents is still judged to be an important part of the process, attendance at these meetings has dropped dramatically over the past three years. As well, should larger numbers of schools begin offering the IF program, it will be difficult or impossible for the curriculum specialist to host meetings at every school. Alternate methods of offering these sessions should be explored (for example, one meeting per family of schools).

• The Department should continue to distribute FAQ brochures in the spring to parents of children who will be entering the IF program in the fall.

• The Department should create a promotional brochure for the program, similar to the brochure created for the new Elementary Core French program nine years ago.
Long-term impact of IF and questions for further discussion

While the results of the IF program have been very encouraging, very few students are currently able to benefit from this program. This raises questions about the IF program and its impact on other FSL programs in the province. Questions for further discussion include:

• Will IF become a province-wide program, replacing Core French in Grade 6?

• If IF does become a province-wide program, what will become of the Core French program currently offered in Grades 4 and 5?

• If IF does not become a province-wide program, how and who will determine which schools and teachers offer the program and which don’t?

• If IF is not a province-wide program and a school has two Grade 6 classes, do they offer one Core French class and one IF class? Only Core French? Only IF? Who will decide this? Will parents register their children?

• In schools where there are split grades (eg. 5/6 or 6/7), how will the IF program be offered and what will curriculum integration look like for English teachers in these classes?

• What criteria will be used to decide if a child is exempt from taking IF?

• If a child is exempted from IF in a school where all Grade 6 students are enrolled in IF, what program will he/she follow during the intensive semester? Who will responsible for teaching him/her?

• In schools where there is only one Grade 6 class, what options do parents have if they do not want their child to participate in the IF program?

• To what extent will testing of IF students continue?

• Who will be responsible for doing this testing?

• How can we take what we know about modeling and the impact of intensity on second-language learning and use it to improve other FSL programs currently offered (Core French, Immersion)?

• Will Late Immersion be offered in areas where it is currently not an option? If so, how would this affect enrolment in Early Immersion?
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Appendix A - Intensive French Pilot Year 1
At a Glance

Schools involved in pilot: Cardigan Consolidated
Morell Consolidated
O’Leary Elementary

Number of classes in 2006-2007: 4 (3 first semester, 1 second semester)

Number of students in 2006-2007: 79 students began the program; 1 student moved and thus didn’t finish the program, 1 student transferred into the program in mid-November

Number of hours of French during intensive semester: 243 - 300 hours, depending on the school

Oral production provincial average: 13.9
Appendix B - Intensive French Pilot Year 2
At a Glance

Schools involved in pilot:  
Cardigan Consolidated  
Morell Consolidated  
O’Leary Elementary

Number of classes in 2007-2008:  4 (2 first semester, 2 second semester)

Number of students in 2007-2008:  78 students began the program; 1 student moved and thus didn’t finish the program

Number of hours of French during intensive semester:  270 hours at all schools

Oral production provincial average:  14.2
Appendix C - Intensive French Pilot Year 3
At a Glance

Schools involved in pilot: Cardigan Consolidated
Morell Consolidated
O’Leary Elementary

Number of classes in 2008-2009: 4 (2 first semester, 2 second semester)

Number of students in 2008-2009: 68 students enrolled in the program

Number of hours of French during intensive semester: 267 - 282 hours, depending on the school

Oral production provincial average (two of four classes): 13.7
## Appendix F - Intensive French Progress Report
### Grade 6

### Achievement key
- 4 - Exceeding expectations
- 3 - Meeting expectations
- 2 - Approaching expectations
- 1 - Experiencing difficulty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oral communication</th>
<th>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; term</th>
<th>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; term</th>
<th>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use of language</strong> - uses basic sentences learned in class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fluency</strong> - speaks with some spontaneity and communicates ideas without support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accuracy</strong> - uses most learned structures correctly and with good pronunciation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Message/ideas</strong> - communicates message but message may have some gaps or confusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effort</strong> - participates, is attentive and attempts to speak French without prompting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Written communication</th>
<th>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; term</th>
<th>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; term</th>
<th>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use of language</strong> - uses basic sentences learned in class with many personalized variations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accuracy</strong> - correctly uses most learned structures and grammatical forms; uses appropriate vocabulary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Message/ideas</strong> - communicates message but message may have some gaps or confusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effort</strong> - writes independently and stays on task; makes a consistent effort to complete all writing assignments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Teacher’s comments - Term 1

### Teacher’s comments - Term 2

### Teacher’s comments - Term 3

---
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## Eastern School District

### Reading Comprehension (Grade 6) Results

**English and French Immersion Programs Combined (In English)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eastern School District</th>
<th># of Students</th>
<th>Average % Correct</th>
<th>% Experienced Success</th>
<th>% Approached Success</th>
<th>% Experienced Difficulty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Redfield Consolidated</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carling Consolidated</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Queen Elementary</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donagh Regional</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dundas Consolidated</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Kings Consolidated</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elliott River Elementary</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engewod</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown Elementary</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenn Stewart Elementary</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Tracadie Elementary</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulf Shore Consolidated</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LM Montgomery Elementary</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortague Consolidated</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muld Consolidated</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Stewart Consolidated</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tantale Elementary</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince St. Elementary</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherwood Elementary</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Park Elementary</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Jean Elementary</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary Consolidated</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Consolidated</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Kings Consolidated</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Peter's Consolidated</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Teresa's Consolidated</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracadie Union Consolidated</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vernon River Consolidated</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West End Elementary</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Royalty Elementary</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>195</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Small discrepancies in average score and average % score are due to rounding.

In order to protect the privacy of students, schools with five or fewer students and/or schools with 100% or 0% of students "Experiencing Success" or "Experiencing Difficulty" are not reported.

November 2008
Assessment and Evaluation Unit
Department of Education and Early Childhood Development
Western School Board
Reading Comprehension (Grade 6) Results
English and French Immersion Programs Combined (in English)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Western School Board</th>
<th># of Students</th>
<th>Average % Correct</th>
<th>% Experienced Success</th>
<th>% Approached Success</th>
<th>% Experienced Difficulty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aberton Elementary</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amherst Cove Consolidated</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens Consolidated</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloomfield Elementary</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmsfield Elementary</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elm Street Elementary</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenfield Elementary</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mecouche Consolidated</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Leary Elementary</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkside Elementary</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Elizabeth Elementary</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis Elementary</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset Elementary</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tignish Elementary</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Province     | 1,553 | 81 | 71 | 9 | 20

Small discrepancies in average score and average % score are due to rounding.

In order to protect the privacy of students, schools with five or fewer students and/or schools with 100% or 0% of students "Experiencing Success" or "Experiencing Difficulty" are not reported.
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7 classes, n = 117
Schools pre and post EF
Student scores from all pilot
Appendix E - Comparison of
Oral interview scale

- UNRATABLE

- NOVICE
  - Novice 1
  - Novice 2
  - Novice 3

- BASIC
  - Basic 1
  - Basic 2
  - Basic 3
Rating scale and descriptors

- **Unrateable**: no indication of any ability to communicate in French
- **Novice 1**: isolated words or memorized expressions. Essentially, no ability to communicate.
- **Novice 2**: phrases, not sentences. Frequent long pauses. Ability to identify objects (colors, clothing, numbers…). Some ability to put 2 to 3 words together (incorrect phrases).
  ex.: avoir soeur
- **Novice 3**: phrases and short memorized sentences. Ability to create longer phrases.
  ex.: manger le restaurant hier
- **Basic 1:** ability to use simple sentences (Subject + V + Complement). Can maintain a very simple conversation with some spontaneity.

- **Basic 2:** some concept of ‘past time’. Can maintain simple conversation about autobiographical details, leisure-time activities, daily schedule, etc.

- **Basic 3:** ability to initiate and sustain a simple conversation with spontaneity. Ability to use language creatively. Ability to narrate and use complex sentences
  ex.: le livre que je préfère; ... parce que...
Comparison of student scores from all pilot schools pre and post IF

- **Unrateable**: 27
- **Novice 1**: 45
- **Novice 2**: 4
- **Novice 3**: 15
- **Basic 1**: 22
- **Basic 2**: 40
- **Basic 3**: 32
- **Total students**: 117

Legend:
- □ Pre Intensive French
- ■ Post Intensive French

Note: The first three IF classes were not interviewed prior to taking IF and are not represented on this graph.
Comparison of student scores from all pilot schools pre and post IF
7 classes, n = 117

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Pre-interview</th>
<th>Post-interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of students</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consistently able</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to speak at the Basic level</td>
<td></td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sometimes (but not consistently) able to speak at the Basic level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All student scores from all pilot schools post IF

Number of students

- Unrateable: 29
- Novice 1: 1
- Novice 2: 12
- Novice 3: 13
- Basic 1: 39
- Basic 2: 41
- Basic 3: 18

Level of oral competency achieved

- n = 180
- 10 classes

Note: This graph represents the level of oral competency of all students interviewed following the IF program, including those who did not do pre-interviews.
All student scores from all pilot schools post IF
10 classes, n = 180

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Post-interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of students consistently able to speak at the Basic level</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of students sometimes (but not consistently) able to speak at the Basic level</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>