



LLQP Stakeholder Meeting

Toronto, April 11, 2016

Agenda

1. Welcome & Agenda Review
2. Review of validity control mechanisms
3. Exam data
4. Transition period
5. 2016 Updates
6. Governance structure and applications
7. Next meetings

2. Validity control mechanisms

- Objective: to ensure well-prepared candidates who have mastered all evaluated competencies pass all modules.
- 3 ongoing control mechanisms:
 - Rigorous development process;
 - Statistical control of exam validity and level of difficulty (transitional and ongoing);
 - On-going qualitative monitoring.

2. Control mechanisms (cont.)

- Criteria to apply transitional statistical controls:
 - Module pass rate below 70%;
 - Less than 300 responses/question;
 - Average pass rate of 70% maintained for less than 4 consecutive weeks.
- Basis for control:
 - Difficulty index (40% benchmark);
 - Discrimination index (considered for questions with pass rate between 40% and 70%).

2. Control mechanisms (cont.)

- Additional criteria for cancellation:
 - M&E specialist discretion, especially for borderline cases;
 - Reliability of data – validation of representation.
- Result of statistical control:
 - Exclusion of unduly difficult questions;
 - Exclusion of questions unable to discriminate between candidates that are well-prepared and those that are not.

2. Control mechanisms (cont.)

- Practical considerations
 - Passing grade adjusted based on number of questions included (never above 60%);
 - Points obtained for invalid questions considered in total score;
 - Time required to process control mechanisms.
- Example
 - Candidate obtained a score of 17/30 (failing grade) but successfully answered a question later deemed invalid and cancelled;
 - Revised score becomes 17/29 (passing grade because closest score equal to or lower than 60%).

3. Exam data

- Original formats administered until early March
 - Validity control mechanisms applied in 5 business days, as planned
- Revised formats administered for the past 4 weeks (results compiled for 3 weeks)
 - Questions replaced in all modules based on results of weekly statistical analysis
 - Ongoing validity control mechanisms but only minor tweaks left
- “Final” changes to original formats set for early May

3.1 Data for two sets of formats

- National modular results (all attempts combined)

Modules	Formats	No. Candidates	No. Revised Scores	Pass rate
Ethics – Common Law	Original	1,026	N.A.	83%
	Revised	543	N.A.	86%
Ethics – Civil Code	Original	493	69	69%
	Revised	210	N.A.	81%
Life Insurance	Original	1,287	212	66%
	Revised	714	14	75%
A&S Insurance	Original	1,498	104	77%
	Revised	763	N.A.	80%
Seg. funds	Original	1,255	252	65%
	Revised	705	59	70%

3.2 Overall data

- “National” modular results for original and revised formats (excluding Quebec for revised formats)

Modules	Attempt No.	No. Candidates	Pass rate
Ethics – Common Law	1	1,272	86%
	2	52	77%
Life Insurance	1	1,408	68%
	2	139	60%
A&S Insurance	1	1,687	79%
	2	134	71%
Seg. funds	1	1,363	65%
	2	146	59%

3.2 Overall data (cont.)

- “National” modular results for revised formats only (excluding Quebec)

Modules	Attempt No.	No. Candidates	Pass rate
Ethics – Common Law	1	428	86%
	2	19	79%
Life Insurance	1	395	74%
	2	47	72%
A&S Insurance	1	426	85%
	2	44	73%
Seg. funds	1	384	66%
	2	52	64%

3.2 Overall data (cont.)

- First attempt pass rate on all four modules since implementation: 49%
- Preliminary data indicates higher pass rate in Alberta, where compensatory option was not offered.

3.3 Results reports

- Provider-specific quarterly reports
- Pedagogical objective, to help improve LLQP training
- Includes comparison with National data for benchmarking
- Targeted data
 - First attempt pass rates overall
 - Modular pass rates split by attempt
 - Average scores and distribution of scores
 - Pass rates per competency component

4. Transition – selected model

- Modular marking in Quebec (no change to current model)
- Pilot in Alberta
- Compensatory marking option in most other jurisdictions for transition period
- 644 modular writes (where compensatory available) vs. 391 compensatory writes

4.1 Length of transition

- Sufficient time to gather statistically significant data
 - 1,000 writes on 3 sets of formats per module
 - Ongoing adjustments by AMF
 - Independent psychometric report
 - 45-day notice period of end of transition following publication of expert report

4.1 Length of transition (cont.)

- Anticipated end of application of validity control mechanisms: early June 2016
- Anticipated end of transition period: TBD

4.2 Independent review

- Selection process
 - Submissions by Stakeholders
 - Analysis of service offerings
- Selected expert: Yardstick – Testing & Training Experts
- Scope of psychometric review:
 - Measurement of LLQP processes against best practices (question structure, exam development, validity controls, etc.)
 - Review of exam questions and exam results
 - Publication of findings and recommendations

4.2 Independent review (cont.)

- Progress to date
 - Submission of LLQP documentation
 - Ongoing analysis of exam development process
 - Review of exam question structure
- Preliminary feedback
 - Positive outlook on processes used
 - Main suggestion to further document decisions and processes
- Expected timeline
 - Preliminary analysis based on revised formats
 - Publication of report TBD

5. 2016 Updates

- Additional sample questions
 - Publication on CISRO website by end of June
- 3rd edition of the exam preparation material
 - Publication set for early November 2016
 - Last comments to be integrated into the review will be those submitted before end of May – unless major issue discovered
- Licence fee review set for September
 - Consideration of registration data and actuals

6. Gov. Structure and Applications

1. Feedback from Stakeholders



2. Submission channels



3. Analysis



4. Response and resolution

6.1 Feedback from Stakeholders

- LLQP GC receives and analyzes:
 - Specific comments relating to exam preparation material and exam questions
 - Formal complaints regarding the program overall
 - Positive feedback

6.2 Submission channels

- GC Chair
- Educational Service Provider
(llqp.pqap@lautorite.qc.ca)
- Comments sheet or other means provided during exam session (privileged for specific exam feedback)
- Jurisdiction
- Exam administrator
- Stakeholder meetings and committees

6.3 Analysis

- Analysis by Educational Service Provider
 - Information gathering – could involve SMEs
 - Statistical analysis
 - Classification of issue (type and impact)
- Submission of issue to GC
 - Specific comments with significant impact on candidate preparation and evaluation
 - Formal complaints

6.4 Response and Resolution

- Response provided by Educational Service Provider or entity that initially received the submission
 - General response provided in 5-10 business days
 - Detailed report in 60 business days for issues submitted to GC
- Potential resolutions
 - Corrections to material and/or exams
 - Notice to all Providers if issue affecting candidate preparation and evaluation
 - Dialogue with Course Providers
 - Planning for formal review

6.5 Process in action

- Submissions received
 - 32 specific comments on exams
 - 42 specific comments on exam preparation material
- Type and impact of submissions
 - No significant impact on material and/or exams but minor corrections planned during next reviews
 - No issues submitted to GC for more formal analysis

7. Next meetings

- Suggested timing
 - Late June : during comment period on independent expert's report
 - September: to discuss end of transition and licence fee review
 - December: for recap of 1st year of new exams and planning for ongoing stakeholder engagement



Questions?



Thank you!