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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modules</th>
<th>Formats</th>
<th>No. Candidates</th>
<th>No. Revised Scores</th>
<th>Pass rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethics – Common Law</td>
<td>Original</td>
<td>1,026</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revised</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics – Civil Code</td>
<td>Original</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revised</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Insurance</td>
<td>Original</td>
<td>1,287</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revised</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A&amp;S Insurance</td>
<td>Original</td>
<td>1,498</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revised</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seg. funds</td>
<td>Original</td>
<td>1,255</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revised</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2 Overall data

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modules</th>
<th>Attempt No.</th>
<th>No. Candidates</th>
<th>Pass rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethics – Common Law</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,272</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Insurance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,408</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A&amp;S Insurance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,687</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seg. funds</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,363</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2 Overall data (cont.)

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modules</th>
<th>Attempt No.</th>
<th>No. Candidates</th>
<th>Pass rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethics – Common Law</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Insurance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A&amp;S Insurance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seg. funds</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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!