



National  
Defence

Défense  
nationale



# CAF Official Languages Review A Baseline for Building Capacity

June 2021

Reviewed by ADM(RS) in accordance with the *Access to Information Act*. Information UNCLASSIFIED

Canada 



## Table of Contents

Acronyms & Abbreviations	3
Introduction	4
Key Observations	5-9
Main Conclusions	10
Action Plan	11
ANNEX A—Action Plan	13-14
ANNEX B—Methodology	15-17
ANNEX C—Relevant Definitions	18
ANNEX D—Two Factors that Determine CAF OL Requirements	19

**Reviewed by ADM(RS) in accordance with the *Access to Information Act*. Information UNCLASSIFIED**



# Acronyms & Abbreviations

ADM(RS)	Assistant Deputy Minister (Review Services)
CAF	Canadian Armed Forces
CDS	Chief of the Defence Staff
CFLS	Canadian Forces Language School
CMP	Chief of Military Personnel
CMPC	Commander Military Personnel Command
DGMPRA	Director General Military Personnel Research and Analysis
DOL	Director Official Languages
FOL	First Official Language
HRMS	Human Resource Management System
MITE	Military Individual Training and Education
MOS ID	Military Occupational Structure Identification
OL	Official Language
OPI	Office of Primary Interest
PL	Progress Level
SID	Chief of the Defence Staff Strategic Initiating Directive on CAF SOL Capacity Building
SLE	Second Language Evaluation
SOL	Second Official Language
SOLET	Second Official Language Education and Training
SPL	Single Progress Level
TA	Training Authority
YOS	Years of Service

**Reviewed by ADM(RS) in accordance with the *Access to Information Act*. Information UNCLASSIFIED**



## Introduction

The Review of Official Languages (OL) was undertaken in two phases between December 2018 and October 2019 (refer to Annex B for methodology). This report presents the key observations and main conclusions of this review, with an action plan from Chief of Military Personnel (CMP) addressing these observations (refer to Action Plan on slide 11 and Annex A).

### Areas of focus and key questions examined:

- **OL Capacity**: What is the current situation with respect to Second Official Language (SOL) profiles among Canadian Armed Forces (CAF) members?
- **Second Official Language Education and Training (SOLET) Utilization**: To what extent are SOLET resources utilized?
- **SOLET and Second Language Evaluation (SLE) Effectiveness and Efficiency**: Who benefits from SOL training? What are the success rates? Is SOLET cost-effective?
- **SOL Maintenance**: Are SOLET graduates maintaining valid language profiles? Who benefits from additional SOL Training?

Reviewed by ADM(RS) in accordance with the *Access to Information Act*. Information UNCLASSIFIED



## Key Observations

### 1. The majority of CAF members employed in bilingual (minimum BBB) positions do not meet the language profile of the position

- Total CAF positions: 54,117; Bilingual positions: 8,819
  - 5,599 or 63% do not meet language requirements
  - 7,059 or 13% are undefined language positions

### 2. OL proficiency challenges are not limited to bilingual positions

- Anglophones in French Essential positions and Francophones in English Essential positions are expected to have a certain level of proficiency in their SOL.
- 31,795 - Total English Essential Positions
  - 4,732 Francophone CAF members occupy an English Essential position
  - 1,246 persons (26.3%) do *not* have a minimum profile of BBB
- 6,444 - Total French Essential Positions
  - 1,026 Anglophone CAF members occupy a French Essential position
  - 790 persons (76.9%) do *not* have a minimum profile of BBB

Reviewed by ADM(RS) in accordance with the *Access to Information Act*. Information UNCLASSIFIED



### 3. OL training needs are dependent on the occupation and rank

- CAF requires 1.5 to 2.5 members to staff a single bilingual position consistently within a given occupation and rank (based on Director General Military Personnel Research and Analysis (DGMPPRA) mobility factor).
- 87.7% of occupations show a capacity shortfall\* and 17.9% of occupations have a capacity shortfall exceeding 20% of its total number of bilingual positions.
- Overall, occupations can expect to lose 1,347 members with valid language profiles a year due to normal job attritions (retirement, transfer to civilian employment etc.,).

### 4. CAF members receive OL training in line with career development/progression

- Years of service (YOS) at time of SOLET registration varies by rank.
  - 15.8 YOS - average for candidates (officers and non-commissioned officers) in continuous class course type
- Average YOS for Master Warrant Officers and Chief Warrant Officers (reflecting seniority and SOL requirements of positions).
  - 22.3 and 26.2 YOS for Master Warrant Officer and Chief Warrant Officer at registration respectively
- Most common officer ranks registering for SOLET early in their careers are those of second lieutenant/acting sub-lieutenant and Captain.
  - 7.2 and 9.3 YOS for second lieutenant/acting sub-lieutenant and Captain at registration respectively

\* An occupation with insufficient members with valid OL profiles of the appropriate skill level (reading, writing, oral) can be considered to have a capacity shortfall

**Reviewed by ADM(RS) in accordance with the *Access to Information Act*. Information UNCLASSIFIED**



## 5. **CAF members require SOLET for career progression (i.e., Selection Board points)**

- 55.4% of CAF members do not have the language profile required for their next rank (as per the incentive system).
- Members requiring A and B-level classes represent the bulk of the shortfall for the next rank - Anglophones are most likely to require SOL training.

## 6. **CAF SOL Training Costs are dependent on the type of training**

- CAF SOL Training costs are comparable with those of other federal departments and agencies.
- Cost-effectiveness could be improved by increasing the number of course participants in the CAF Single Progress Level (SPL) courses. Currently SPL courses are on average only at 50% capacity.

## 7. **Overall Success Rates for Continuous and SPL Classes are similar; however, there are differences when the level a student is attempting to achieve is considered**

- Combined English and French courses success rate for all class types is 63%.
- Overall success rates for students in SPL Level B and C classes show a drop in their success with SPL C-level students experiencing the largest decrease (39.5% success rate).

**Reviewed by ADM(RS) in accordance with the *Access to Information Act*. Information UNCLASSIFIED**



**8. There is no systematic collection or standardized format for student feedback which makes reporting on students' perceptions as a whole difficult**

- For 2012-18, approximately 1,500 student feedback responses were obtained by the Army, Navy, Air Force and Canadian Forces Language School (CFLS).
- Student critiques are collected at various times during language training - this information is used by the schools to correct issues with the training (e.g., teacher, facility or accommodation).
- The course critique process monitors the quality of teaching and learning service delivery by gathering feedback from the students, teaching personnel and administrators on all aspects of the course.

**9. Over half of CAF members still had valid language profiles 7+ years after SOLET**

- 54.8% of active members who successfully completed their continuous course between 2009-2012 had valid profiles as of February 2019.
- 33.6% of members had expired SOL levels when they were retested.
- 16.5% of members required classes to reacquire previously earned language levels (usually through SPL courses).

**Reviewed by ADM(RS) in accordance with the *Access to Information Act*. Information UNCLASSIFIED**



## 10. Rank influences the number of SOLET classes that members take

- To maintain their level, higher ranking officers take more classes
- 38.9% of the total additional classes were taken by Colonel/Captain(N) and above (400 members out of 1,038).
- 42.9% of members of the rank of Colonel/Captain(N) and above used both retention and reacquisition classes.



## Main Conclusions

- A large number of designated language profiles of CAF positions are not met by the current incumbents.
- It will be difficult for the CAF to consistently staff bilingual positions with members that meet the language profile (by occupation and rank).
- Opportunities to increase the cost-effectiveness of the SPL courses exist, such as increasing course participation rates by employing alternative teaching platforms (e.g., online courses).
- The systematic collection and reporting of student feedback does not exist – this limits the ability to report on students' perceptions regarding second language training.

Reviewed by ADM(RS) in accordance with the *Access to Information Act*. Information UNCLASSIFIED



## Action Plan

- The Director Official Languages (DOL) in Military Personnel Command collaborated closely with Assistant Deputy Minister (Review Services) (ADM(RS)) on the development of this Review. Management agrees with the conclusions, and has developed an action plan to address the findings.
- To address observed challenges in OL capacity, Military Personnel Command is implementing a plan for SOL capacity building, based around eight Lines of Operation in the Chief of the Defence Staff Strategic Initiating Directive on CAF SOL Capacity Building (SID):
  1. Determine mandated and institutional requirement for bilingual positions
  2. Develop a requirement and merit-based concept for access to SOLET
  3. Conduct end-to-end review of CAF SOL acquisition, testing and maintenance system
  4. Develop an employment plan balancing operational requirements with need to maximize SOLET Return on Investment
  5. Revise SOL acquisition and maintenance scheme
  6. Publish an OL culture change plan
  7. Improve the SOL governance structure
  8. Revise policies to clearly establish and communicate CAF OL-related obligations and requirements
- Work on this capacity building plan is ongoing and anticipated to carry into mid-2022.
- For details on the plan and timelines for implementation, refer to Annex A.

**Reviewed by ADM(RS) in accordance with the *Access to Information Act*. Information UNCLASSIFIED**



# Annexes

Reviewed by ADM(RS) in accordance with the *Access to Information Act*. Information UNCLASSIFIED



## ANNEX A—Action Plan

CMP acknowledges the observations of this Review, and has developed the following three-phased approach to address the issues noted.

1. **Review:** Perform a comprehensive review of the entire SOL capacity building system with the intent of identifying the solutions to issues identified in the SID Problem Definition annex and the ADM(RS) Review.
  - Present initial recommendations to Commander Military Personnel Command (CMPC) for guidance and comments (April 2021)
  - Decision Brief to CMPC: Recommendations to be submitted to CMPC for decision (July 2021)
  - Engagement of appropriate governance bodies (as required) based on CMPC Decision Brief (Fall 2021)
  - Decision Brief to CDS (October 2021)

**OPI:** CMP

**Target Date:** October 2021

**Reviewed by ADM(RS) in accordance with the *Access to Information Act*. Information UNCLASSIFIED**



## ANNEX A—Action Plan (Cont'd)

### 2. Drafting of implementation directive:

- Engagement of governance bodies (as required) (November 2021)
- Approval of Implementation Directive by CDS (March 2022)

**OPI:** CMP

**Target Date:** March 2022

### 3. Start of implementation of approved changes

**OPI:** CMP

**Target Date:** June 2022

Reviewed by ADM(RS) in accordance with the *Access to Information Act*. Information UNCLASSIFIED



## ANNEX B—Methodology

Evidence from the following data sources supported the key observations:

- **Document Review** – to understand the context related to CAF and federal government SOL-related policies, directives and orders
- **Database Analysis** – data from various databases were analysed in order to examine success rates, participation rates, position language profiles and shortfalls
- **Financial Data** – to examine and compare SOL training costs
- **Interviews with key stakeholders** – to provide qualitative context to the quantitative data

**Population examined:** CAF Regular Force members only

Reviewed by ADM(RS) in accordance with the *Access to Information Act*. Information UNCLASSIFIED



## ANNEX B—Methodology (Cont'd)

### OL activities documentation

- Canadian Defence Academy's Publications on the Curriculum
- Qualification Standards
- Student Course Evaluation reports
- Technical Authorities Annual Reports
- DOL Project on Line of operations for OL Operation Order

### Available Databases

- 2013 Review made by DLO
- Guardian (former Human Resource Management System (HRMS))
- 1000-liner
- Military Individual Training and Education (MITE)
- Local database in TAs

### Personnel Consulted or Interviewed

- DOL Subject Matter Experts
- Canadian Defence Academy Language OPIs
- OL Technical Authorities for the Canadian Army, Royal Canadian Navy and Royal Canadian Air Force
- CFLS Staff in St-Jean and Gatineau
- Canadian Army Subject Matter Experts involved in language training (St-Jean)

### On hold

- Online survey of former SOLET continuous class students

**Reviewed by ADM(RS) in accordance with the *Access to Information Act*. Information UNCLASSIFIED**



## ANNEX B—Methodology (Cont'd)

**MITE data**: The MITE data was analysed to determine historical success rates. The MITE database was cross-referenced with financial data to estimate historical cost, and with the DOL “Thousand Liner” enough students were sent to language training.

**HRMS data**: HRMS data was used to determine compliance rate regarding language requirement of positions by CAF personnel. An extract of the HRMS database with Human Resources information of former continuous course student was used to track job history following language training.

**DOL “Thousand liner”**: An analysis was conducted to determine CAF Occupation needs and shortfalls in terms of language training.

**Financial review**: Financial numbers provided by the TAs for Fiscal years 2016/17 and 2015/16 were used to estimate the cost of OL activities for the 2009-2017 period.

**Additional sources of information**: Interviews with stakeholders were conducted as needed to provide qualitative context to the quantitative data. In total, 7 interviews with 13 individuals were completed over the course of the review. ADM(RS) also conducted document review of available Type 2 and Type 3 documentation to provide additional context.

Reviewed by ADM(RS) in accordance with the *Access to Information Act*. Information UNCLASSIFIED



## ANNEX C—Relevant Definitions

- **Bilingual Position**: Bilingual positions require the use of both English and French. These positions have a level of proficiency required for one or more of language skills
- **Continuous Course**: Consists of full time SOL training with a duration of four months (one semester) or more than six months (up to one year) which usually requires a specific posting of the CAF member
- **Language Profile**: All three language skills (Reading, Written, Oral) at a point in time. Each skill is evaluated separately and, therefore, has different validity periods
- **Language Skills**: Each of the three skills evaluated through the SLE – Reading comprehension (R), Written expression (W), Oral interaction (O)
- **Mobility Factor**: Coefficient developed by DGMPRA applied to the number of bilingual positions within a MOS ID at a given rank; it is used to determine the number of bilingual members required to fill bilingual positions on a continuous basis
- **Single Progress Level (SPL) Course**: Training modules defined under the CAF SOLET training plan which can be taken individually or sequentially, leading to a target proficiency level (A, B, C)

Reviewed by ADM(RS) in accordance with the *Access to Information Act*. Information UNCLASSIFIED



## **ANNEX D—Two Factors that Determine CAF OL Requirements**

### **1. Language designation of organization/unit:**

- Bilingual unit
- English language unit
- French language unit
- Unspecified language unit – applicable only to Rangers units

### **2. Linguistic requirements of positions:**

- Bilingual position – Requires the use of both English and French
- English Essential position – Requires the use of English only
- French Essential position – Requires the use of French only
- Either/Or – Either English or French can be used, as determined by the incumbent

**Reviewed by ADM(RS) in accordance with the *Access to Information Act*. Information UNCLASSIFIED**