



## PHASE III: Implementation of CELBAN January – June 2004

### FINAL REPORT

Please address all correspondence to:

*Canadian English Language Assessment Services (CELAS) Centre  
CELBAN Assessment  
Red River College: Language Training Centre  
400-123 Main Street  
Winnipeg, Manitoba  
Canada R3C 1A3*

*phone: (204) 945-0588*

*fax: (204) 948-3214*

*e-mail: [lepp@rrc.mb.ca](mailto:lepp@rrc.mb.ca); [clewis@rrc.mb.ca](mailto:clewis@rrc.mb.ca)*

© Copyright 2004: Centre for Canadian Language Benchmarks (CCLB), 200 Elgin Street, Suite 703, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada. The CCLB is a national, not-for-profit organization, primarily serving the adult English as a Second Language (ESL) community in Canada including learners, teachers, program administrators, and materials, curriculum and test developers. A Canada-wide combination of language training specialists, assessment service providers and both federal and provincial government members forms the CCLB Board of Directors and staff of the CCLB are committed to maintaining and promoting language proficiency standards based on the Canadian Language Benchmarks

## **Acknowledgments:**

The Centre for Canadian Language Benchmarks (CCLB) would like to thank the Governments of British Columbia, Alberta, and Ontario as well as Citizenship and Immigration Canada-Ontario Region, for funding the first project in Phase III: Implementation of CELBAN.

This project was completed through the dedication and hard work of the following members of the Project Team:

- Lucy Epp (Principal investigator, test developer, CELBAN trainer)
- Catherine Lewis (Co-investigator, test developer, CELBAN trainer)
- Leslie Palson (CELBAN trainer, Business Plan coordinator)
- Audrey Bonham (Project Manager, Red River College)
- Shelley Bates (Development Consultant, Red River College)
- Margaret Des Brisay (Consultant, CanTEST Project Office, University of Ottawa)
- Amelia Hope (Consultant, CanTEST Project Office, University of Ottawa)
- Tom Harrigan (Statistics Consultant, Red River College/University of Manitoba)
- John Baryliuk, Computer Services, Red River College
- Don Wiebe, Computer Services, Red River College
- Adam Halstrom, Computer Services, Red River College
- Chris Kwasniowski, Computer Services, Red River College

The CCLB wishes to acknowledge the following groups and individuals who generously gave of their time and energy to make this project possible:

- individuals who were members of the National Advisory Committee (NAC)
- college administrators and ESL program providers and staff from the following locations: Grant MacEwan College, Vancouver Community College, George Brown College, Centennial College, Red River College
- internationally educated nurses who participated as candidates
- individuals who assisted in setting up focus groups in Vancouver, Toronto and Edmonton
- stakeholders who participated in focus groups
- Audrey Bufton, interim CCLB project manager
- CCLB Nursing Committee of the Board: Rob Boldt (Committee Chair), Jim Jones, Peggy Frederikse, Carolyn Dieleman, Margaret Pidlaski, Pauline McNaughton (CCLB Executive Director)

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary .....	3
1 Introduction.....	5
2 Setting up Administrative Sites.....	7
1.0 Site Selection	
2.0 Registration Procedures	
3.0 Training of CELBAN Administrative Site Team Members	
4.0 Ongoing Licensing of CELBAN Administration Sites	
5.0 Challenges in Setting Up Administrative Sites	
6.0 Lessons Learned Regarding Setting Up Administrative Sites	
2 Ongoing Feedback from Stakeholders.....	20
1.0 National Advisory Committee (NAC)	
2.0 Focus Groups	
3.0 Internationally Educated Nurses	
1 Role of Consultants.....	36
2 Comparison of Candidates' Scores on CELBAN and Scores on Other Tests.....	36
3 Potential Future Projects/Areas of Research.....	39
4 Three Year Business Plan.....	40
5 Computer Data Base.....	41
6 Recommendations.....	41
7 Policies and Procedures.....	42
8 Appendix A.....	43

## Executive Summary

During the last 5 years, a multi-phase project has been undertaken to address the need for a nursing-specific English language assessment tool for internationally educated nurses seeking licensure in Canada. This multi-phase project involves the following four steps:

1. A Feasibility Study (completed in 2001)
2. Phase I: An Analysis of the Language Demands of the Nursing Profession Across Canada (completed in 2002)
3. Phase II: The Development of a Nursing Specific Language Assessment Tool (CELBAN) (completed in 2003)
4. Phase III: Implementation of CELBAN (commenced in 2004)

The present project represents the beginning of Phase III, *Implementation of CELBAN*. As a first step in the implementation of CELBAN, the purpose of this project was to pilot the administration of CELBAN at three locations: Vancouver, Edmonton, and Toronto.

A central office, Canadian English Language Assessment Services (CELAS) Centre was set up at Red River College (RRC) in Winnipeg to oversee the administration of CELBAN. Then, assessment sites were selected in Vancouver, Edmonton, and Toronto. Qualified CELBAN administration team members were identified at each assessment site, including one site administrator, two invigilators (for CELBAN Listening, Reading and Writing), and three CELBAN Speaking Assessors. Research was done regarding the administration policies and procedures followed in other high stakes test administrations, and CELBAN policies and procedures were drafted. Altogether sixty-three test candidates (internationally educated nurses) were identified by the three sites to participate in the pilot administration. A qualified CELBAN administration training team was established and sent to each location to carry out training. The CELBAN was administered twice at each location, and these administrations were used to train new personnel. Statistics were gathered from both trainees and candidates to provide feedback regarding the process; these statistics were analyzed to identify the strengths and weaknesses of the process. All materials related to the administration of CELBAN were revised based on data gathered during the project. This includes policies, procedures, and assessor training materials.

Throughout the project, feedback was gathered from stakeholders in three ways. First, a National Advisory Committee (NAC) was established to review reports and provide feedback to researchers. Second, focus groups made up of stakeholders were organized in each of the three locations: Vancouver, Edmonton, and Toronto. These focus groups provided a forum for researchers to inform stakeholders, field questions, and gather feedback. Third, feedback was gathered from internationally educated nurses who participated in the project. They were asked to fill out a survey form and the results were analyzed.

At the CELAS Centre, a secure computer database was set up to organize and record data related to the administration of the CELBAN. A *Three Year Business Plan*<sup>1</sup> was also developed for the on-going implementation of CELBAN and CELBAN-related development projects.

This report describes the project in detail, including methodology, data gathered, analysis of data, and recommendations based on best practices as identified through the process.

As a result of this project, official CELBAN administration sites have now been established in Vancouver, Edmonton, and Toronto. CELBAN is gaining acceptance by a number of professional nursing bodies, with strong indication that it will continue to be accepted by a growing number of nursing licensing bodies.

---

<sup>1</sup> The *Three Year Business Plan* was developed for the CCLB as part of this project.

# 1 Introduction

A growing shortage of nursing professionals in Canada has been projected over the next ten years. Internationally educated nurses entering the profession in Canada could ease this projected shortage. However, one of the issues involved in licensing these nurses is language proficiency, and how it is measured. To address this issue, the Centre for Canadian Language Benchmarks (CCLB) has embarked on a project, *Benchmarking the Nursing Profession Across Canada*. The process involves the following four steps:

1. A Feasibility Study (completed in 2001)
1. Phase I: *An Analysis of the Language Demands of the Nursing Profession Across Canada* (completed in 2002)<sup>2</sup>
2. Phase II: *The Development of a Nursing-Specific Language Assessment Tool (CELBAN)* (completed in 2003)<sup>3</sup>
4. Phase III: *Implementation of the CELBAN*

The results of the first stage of Phase III, *Implementation of CELBAN*, are presented in this report. The time frame for this phase of the project has been January to June, 2004. It has been funded by the Governments of British Columbia, Alberta, and Ontario, as well as Citizenship and Immigration Canada-Ontario Region. The goal of this project has been to pilot the administration of the Canadian English Language Benchmarks Assessment for Nurses (CELBAN) in three locations across Canada: Vancouver, Edmonton and Toronto.

CELBAN administrative sites were set up by the Canadian English Language Assessment Services (CELAS) Centre<sup>4</sup> at these three locations. At each of these locations, the CELAS Centre team trained a CELBAN administration team to deliver the CELBAN, and the test administration was piloted with candidates as part of that training. Feedback from team members was gathered in two ways: informally during the process, and formally through a survey that was completed by these individuals, after the first phase of training and again at the end of the training. The results of this feedback indicated the strengths and weaknesses of the process. It provided direction for improving the training process. In addition, the feedback helped to inform the trainers in revising policies and procedures for the administration of the CELBAN to reflect best practices.

During the project, an effort was made to involve stakeholders in various ways. These stakeholders included representatives of nursing licensing bodies, nurses (including internationally educated nurses), nursing educators, employers, immigrant serving agencies, policy analysts, and representatives of nursing unions. These stakeholders were involved in various ways. First, a National Advisory

---

<sup>2</sup> The final report on Phase I, *An Analysis of the Language Demands of the Nursing Profession*, is available from the CCLB website ([www.language.ca](http://www.language.ca)).

<sup>3</sup> The final report on Phase II, *The Development of a Nursing-Specific Language Assessment Tool (CELBAN)*, is available from the CCLB website ([www.language.ca](http://www.language.ca)).

<sup>4</sup> CELAS Centre is the central administrative office for the CELBAN, and oversees its administration. The CELAS Centre is located at the Language Training Centre, Red River College, Winnipeg, MB.

Committee (NAC) was set up. This committee is made up of a range of stakeholders from across the country. Interim reports were sent to the NAC to inform them at each stage of the project, and to invite feedback and questions. Second, focus groups were conducted at each site (Vancouver, Edmonton, and Toronto). These focus groups were also composed of a range of stakeholders. Information was provided, and input from these stakeholders was invited in the form of a discussion. Minutes of each focus group meeting were provided to each participant. Third, the administration of the CELBAN provided an opportunity to invite feedback from internationally educated nurses in the form of a survey.

As part of this project, a *Three Year Business Plan* has been developed. It is a separate document from this report, and includes plans for ongoing development/validation of new versions of CELBAN and other related projects. This business plan includes an analysis of the market, as well as costing based on setting up the CELBAN administrative sites at each of the three locations. The business plan also includes marketing option and revenue sources. In addition, a secure computer data base has been set up at the CELAS Centre in order to enter data related to CELBAN administration.

# **1 Setting Up Administrative Sites**

## **2.1 Site Selection**

The locations selected for the piloting of CELBAN administrative sites were Vancouver, Edmonton, and Toronto. The Centre for Canadian Language Benchmarks (CCLB) took the responsibility to select administrative sites at these locations. In Vancouver and Toronto, Requests for Letters of Qualification (RFQs) were sent out to institutions in the region. Responses were analyzed by the CCLB with input from the CELAS Centre. Based on this analysis, sites were selected at these two locations. In Alberta, the CELBAN administrative site was selected by the funding agency in accordance with funding criteria and to address identified needs.

### **1.0 Registration Procedures**

For this project, three aspects of registration were addressed: method of registration, types of identification required, and payment of fees. Candidates initially registered in person as they arrived for testing. Photo ID and a secondary piece of ID were required. A Candidate Information Form was completed, and candidates were placed on lists and assigned CELBAN identification numbers. No fees were paid by candidates, because this was a piloting project and scores were not official. Therefore, a process for payment of fees was not piloted as part of this project. However, site administrators were interviewed regarding the feasibility of various methods of payment. At some sites, infrastructure allowed for efficient methods of payment. At other locations, a procedure for payment was not already in place. In discussing options, it became clear that in some cases, the establishment of on-site payment processes would be unduly complicated.

Research was also done regarding registration procedures followed by other widely used tests. Consultants at the CanTEST Project Office at the University of Ottawa provided feedback as well. The possible registration procedures at the three sites were reviewed, and recommendations regarding registration were made based on the data gathered. It was determined that registration through a central office (CELAS Centre) would provide the most convenient and accessible method of registration for candidates. (See Lessons Learned, p. 10, and Recommendations, p. 42, for further discussion of registration procedures).

### **2.0 Training of CELBAN Administrative Site Team Members**

A process for training CELBAN administrative site team members was developed.

Policies and procedures for the administration of CELBAN were developed. Drafts of policies and security procedures were vetted through the CanTEST Project Office, requesting feedback. Preliminary assessor training materials were also developed.



Survey questions were developed for feedback from CELBAN administration team members. These surveys were developed to provide data for statistical analysis to measure the success of pilot site administration of CELBAN and assessor training. They also helped to inform the final procedures for training.

Training was carried out in the following two formats, depending on scheduling at the CELBAN administrative site:

1. Trainers visited the selected site two times, 2.5 days the first time and 2.5 days the second. During the first visit, CELBAN was delivered to five candidates, with trainers taking the lead and trainees observing. During the second visit, the trainees took the lead in delivery of CELBAN with 15 to 20 candidates, with trainers observing.
2. Trainers would visit the selected site one time, for a period of five days. The format would be similar, with 5 candidates tested during the first 2.5 days, and 15 to 20 candidates tested during the last 2.5 days.

The advantages and disadvantages of the two formats were noted during the training period.

### Vancouver Training

The first pilot of administration of the CELBAN was carried out at the Vancouver Community College (King Edward Campus) Assessment Centre. The Vancouver training was undertaken during two visits by the trainers. Epp and Lewis spent 2.5 days (February 10-12, 2004) in Vancouver for the first phase of training. Sessions were held with the CELBAN test administration team: one administrator, two invigilators, and three assessors. After introductions of team members, and signing of Agreements of Commitment, content was provided by the trainers, and was presented in five sessions including the following:

#### Session One:

- CELBAN - background and overview
- Inspection of site to determine if site requirements are met
- Draft policies and procedures
- Job description of each team member
- Duties of administrator and invigilators for the administration of CELBAN

#### Session Two:

- Training of assessors for CELBAN Speaking assessment

#### Session Three:

- CELBAN Speaking Assessment practice with five candidates (one at a time) for new assessors with trainers

#### Session Four:

- Training of invigilators for administering CELBAN Listening, Writing, and Reading (LWR) assessments

- Administration of CELBAN L/W/R with five candidates (as a group)

#### Session Five:

- Debriefing
- Evaluation and feedback re: training process

Revisions to the first draft of assessor training materials were made based on the experience gained in the Vancouver piloting.

The second phase of training in Vancouver was carried out during the week of March 22-26, 2004. Epp and Lewis returned to Vancouver, where the administration of the CELBAN was piloted with 20 candidates who are internationally educated nurses. Trainees took the lead in this administration of the CELBAN.

Two administrations of the group test (LWR) were carried out with a total of 20 candidates. Epp and Lewis provided feedback regarding the process. The invigilators and the site administrator demonstrated a high level of professionalism, and their feedback was extremely helpful.

Twenty speaking assessments were conducted. The whole experience was helpful in reinforcing the need for high standards, and the need for full participation by trainees. Again, the process provided ideas for improving the speaking assessment interview, the training process, and the evaluation of trainees.

All tests were scored and recorded. Reports (including strengths and weaknesses) were mailed to candidates within 10 working days.

#### Toronto Training

Piloting of the administration of the CELBAN was also carried out in two phases in Toronto. During the first phase of training, trainers Palson and Lewis spent four days (February 22–25) in Toronto. Two assessors from Centennial and one from George Brown College were trained. The training process followed the outline used for training in Vancouver. One site administrator, two invigilators, and three speaking assessors were trained.

Epp and Palson were in Toronto for the second phase of training CELBAN administrative centre site staff (April 13 to 16, 2004). Three individuals completed the speaking assessor training successfully. As part of the training, CELBAN was administered to 16 candidates. (Test scores and feedback were mailed to candidates within ten working days. Again, revisions to policies and procedures were made based on the Toronto experience. It was decided that official administration of CELBAN would be carried out at the Casa Loma Campus of George Brown College.

## Edmonton training

The third pilot of administration of the CELBAN was carried out in Edmonton from April 26 to 30, 2004. The two phases of the piloting of the Edmonton site were carried out during this five day time frame, with Epp and Lewis conducting the training.

The format for training and testing was the same (except for minor revisions) in Edmonton as in Vancouver and Toronto. The delivery was changed in that the training and the testing were conducted during a 5 day time frame. (In the other two locations, the training was provided over two 2.5 day sessions.) There were pros and cons to combining the training and testing into one time frame rather than two. These issues are discussed in the Lessons Learned Section of this report (p. 19).

In Edmonton, CELBAN was administered to 18 candidates at Grant MacEwan College. The test results were mailed to candidates within 10 working days of testing. Each of the three speaking assessors being trained met the requirements to be certified during this preliminary stage of piloting the administration of the CELBAN.

It was decided that Alberta College Campus would be used for CELBAN Administration. This site is also used to administer the Canadian Assessment of English Language (CAEL). This site is also conveniently located in downtown Edmonton.

## Feedback from Trainees at Pilot Sites

Each trainee filled out feedback forms after each phase of training. Statistics based on this feedback indicate that, of the survey respondents:

- 92% agreed/strongly agreed that their task was clearly defined.
- 100% agreed/strongly agreed that their questions and concerns were addressed to their satisfaction.
- 100% agreed/strongly agreed that they received the support they needed from the coordinators.
- 95.5% agreed/strongly agreed that feedback was helpful. (4.5% said it did not apply.)
- 68.2% agreed/strongly agreed that evaluation was fair. (31.8% said it did not apply.) *Explanation: This item applied only to speaking assessors.*
- 100% agreed/strongly agreed that test protocol was clear.
- 100% strongly agreed that coordinators interacted with them in a professional manner.
- 100% agreed/strongly agreed that coordinators encouraged them in non-threatening way.
- 83% agreed/strongly agree that they feel confident in carrying out the CELBAN speaking assessment. *Explanation: This response was much more positive after the second phase of training.*

- The last two charts indicate that there was concern about adequate time allowed for sites to carry out preparations and recruit candidates. The project was not actually initiated until late January, and by that time deadlines indicated by funders were unrealistic. Also, in some cases CCLB did not inform sites of needed information, and, as a result, recruiting enough candidates became a problem.

The following charts provide the data for the statistics cited above.

**I felt that my task was clearly defined**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid disagree	2	8.0	8.0	8.0
agree	7	28.0	28.0	36.0
strongly agree	16	64.0	64.0	100.0
Total	25	100.0	100.0	

**My questions and concerns were addressed to my satisfaction**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid agree	7	28.0	28.0	28.0
strongly agree	18	72.0	72.0	100.0
Total	25	100.0	100.0	

**I received the support I needed from the coordinators**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid agree	6	24.0	25.0	25.0
strongly agree	18	72.0	75.0	100.0
Total	24	96.0	100.0	
Missing System	1	4.0		
Total	25	100.0		

**Feedback was helpful**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid agree	4	16.0	18.2	18.2
strongly agree	17	68.0	77.3	95.5
NA	1	4.0	4.5	100.0
Total	22	88.0	100.0	
Missing System	3	12.0		
Total	25	100.0		

**Evaluation was fair**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	agree	5	20.0	22.7	22.7
	strongly agree	10	40.0	45.5	68.2
	NA	7	28.0	31.8	100.0
	Total	22	88.0	100.0	
Missing	System	3	12.0		
Total		25	100.0		

**Test security protocol was clear**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	agree	1	4.0	4.0	4.0
	strongly agree	24	96.0	96.0	100.0
	Total	25	100.0	100.0	

**The coordinators interacted with me in a professional manner**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	strongly agree	25	100.0	100.0	100.0

**The coordinators encouraged me in a non-threatening manner**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	agree	1	4.0	4.5	4.5
	strongly agree	21	84.0	95.5	100.0
	Total	22	88.0	100.0	
Missing	System	3	12.0		
Total		25	100.0		

**I feel confident in carrying out the CELBAN speaking assessment**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	no opinion	3	12.0	12.5	12.5
	3.50	1	4.0	4.2	16.7
	agree	7	28.0	29.2	45.8
	4.50	1	4.0	4.2	50.0
	strongly agree	12	48.0	50.0	100.0
	Total	24	96.0	100.0	
Missing	System	1	4.0		
Total		25	100.0		

**Adequate time was provided to make necessary arrangements**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	disagree	1	4.0	50.0	50.0
	agree	1	4.0	50.0	100.0
	Total	2	8.0	100.0	
Missing	System	23	92.0		
Total		25	100.0		

**Recruiting enough test candidates was manageable**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	no opinion	1	4.0	50.0	50.0
	agree	1	4.0	50.0	100.0
	Total	2	8.0	100.0	
Missing	System	23	92.0		
Total		25	100.0		

After the training sessions typical remarks included by trainees on their survey feedback forms included:

Administrators:

- *This has been a shared learning experience.*
- *Contract timing did not allow adequate time for arrangements and recruitment of candidates.*
- *Extremely thoughtful preparation.*
- *It really should have been a day or two longer.*
- *The timelines for this project were extremely problematic, and the RFQ presented was an incomplete/inaccurate picture of the process.*
- *The training itself was excellent, especially under the circumstances.*

Invigilators:

- *The administration guide was very helpful.*
- *For future training, it would be helpful if invigilators could observe one full "run-through" of the L/W/R.*
- *More clarification is needed in the administration of the Listening Section of the CELBAN.*
- *There should be a written guide for the invigilators regarding instructions to candidates.*
- *Trainers have been very supportive and very receptive to our comments and ideas.*
- *Everything thought of and planned for.*
- *Provide the invigilators with a copy of the assessment tools prior to the testing date so they can go over the material and return it to administrators.*
- *Congratulations to the test developers for creating such a good tool!!*
- *The test itself is well-done and appropriate for the candidates.*
- *A worthy instrument to be trained in.*

### Speaking Assessors:

- *Need better audio tape quality. (Revised in later sessions.)*
- *Need examples of types of comments regarding strengths and weaknesses. (Included in later sessions.)*
- *The environment was very non-threatening.*
- *The trainers were very open to discussion and feedback.*
- *It was a very valuable learning experience.*
- *Problems were pointed out in ways to rectify those problems in a clear and concise manner.*
- *Great modeling of interview skills.*
- *I would have benefited from more practice time and opportunity to observe. (Subsequently, it was clarified that trainees need to attend all sessions.)*
- *Easily usable forms and charts.*
- *Maybe listen to one or two complete taped assessments as practice.*
- *It was very well organized.*
- *Organized in a steady progressive fashion.*
- *The number of hands-on opportunities was great.*
- *Some key information could be captured in a Power Point presentation to help create a “mind map”.*
- *Problem with time lag between this training and the time I would have to do it “for real”.*
- *Debriefing was valuable.*
- *I would like to see booklets with dividers for ease of flipping from one page to another.*
- *The test is very well thought out and as an assessor I feel it is a very valid test.*
- *I would like to say that this test is a very effective and fair tool and congratulate you on the work you have done so far.*

Subsequently, one of the test site administrators commented in an e-mail:

- *We remain very interested in and committed to the CELBAN test. I think it's the first time I've heard candidates say testing was an enjoyable experience - that this is a good test!*

All of this feedback confirmed positive aspects of the process, and also allowed for an opportunity for revisions to be made to the process. In addition, information gathered will assist in forming recommendations regarding the future implementation of CELBAN.

The following personnel have successfully completed CELBAN administration training at the three CELBAN Administrative Sites that participated in this project:

SITE	ADMINISTRATOR/S	INVIGILATOR/S	SPEAKING ASSESSORS
<b>Vancouver</b> Assessment Centre Vancouver Community College King Edward Campus Contact Person: <i>Mary Waddington</i>	<i>Jane Sheil</i> <i>Susan Vellutini</i>	<i>Susan Vellutini</i> <i>Patricia Mahler</i>	<i>John Kostoff</i> <i>Kerry Shepherd</i>
<b>Toronto</b> Language Studies and Access Programs George Brown College Casa Loma Campus Contact Person: <i>Joan Reynolds</i>	<i>Denise Richard</i>	<i>Denise Richard</i> <i>TBA</i>	<i>Liza Chacko</i> <i>Karen Crawford</i> <i>Hill</i> <i>Nancy Phillips</i>
<b>Edmonton</b> Assessment Centre Grant MacEwan College Contact Person/ Coordinator: <i>Gerri Nakonechny</i> Alberta College Campus Contact Person/ Coordinator: <i>Greg Sowak</i>	<i>Greg Sowak</i>	<i>Judy Sandstrom</i> <i>Ursula Hindle</i>	<i>Silvia Bégin</i> <i>Nancy Aubin</i> <i>Pam McCreedy</i>

### Statistical Analysis of Inter-rater Reliability: Speaking and Writing

The most important attribute of any measurement device is its consistency. This consistency is referred to as reliability. Previous findings have shown (see Phase I and II) the CELBAN to be a reliable test. Another aspect of reliability, termed inter-rater reliability, becomes important when there are two or more raters or administrators of a test. We want to know how much consistency or agreement in scoring exists between raters. Phase III, *Implementation of CELBAN*, involved the training of “new” assessors. A natural question that arises as a result of this training is, “How much agreement is there between the scoring of trainers and the scoring of trainees?”

Inter-rater reliability is measured by correlation. Correlation (denoted with a small “r”) is the measure of association or the strength of a relationship that exists between two variables. In terms of inter-rater reliability the two variables are the scores of two raters on similar participants. r-Values can only range from -1 to +1. The closer the value to either endpoint (i.e., -1 or +1) the stronger the correlation or relationship between two variables. Clarification with some examples may be useful: an r-value of +0.90 is a stronger relationship than an r-value of +0.80; an r-value of -0.8 is stronger than an r-value of +0.7; an r-value of -0.6 and +0.6 are



considered to be of equal strength. What then does the minus sign stand for in correlation? The plus and minus signs in correlation denote the direction of the relationship. A positive value signifies that both variables are increasing in the same direction, i.e., as one variable increases so too does the other variable. A negative value signifies that when one variable is increasing the other variable is decreasing.

In terms of inter-rater reliability, it is expected that training, practice, and monitoring of trainees should produce high positive correlation values (above 0.85) between all raters. The average inter-rater reliability between all raters (trainers and trainees) was **0.906 for the speaking component and 0.940 for the writing component**. These high values suggest that with the proper training of “new” assessors, CELBAN inter-rater reliability is excellent.

### **3.0 Ongoing Licensing Agreements With Administrative Sites**

An interim licensing agreement was part of the contract for each of the three sites during this pilot project.

The licensing agreement included responsibility for:

- maintaining the security of all CELBAN test materials and results
- maintaining confidentiality of all information related to candidates
- administering the CELBAN (including the invigilation of CELBAN Listening, Writing, and Reading, and carrying out CELBAN Speaking)
- scoring the CELBAN Speaking
- providing feedback regarding strengths and weaknesses in speaking
- recruiting candidates and marketing CELBAN
- determining the cost of fulfilling the obligations listed in the contract
- identifying in-kind contributions

### **4.0 Challenges In Setting Up Administrative Sites**

#### Site Selection

Some confusion resulted from lack of clarity regarding the roles of the CCLB and the CELAS Centre. CCLB took responsibility to select sites and provide information. However, not all information was always passed on. As a result, site team members did not always understand what was required of them. In some cases, the CELAS Centre found that key information had not been shared with sites.

At one site, no actual assessment site had been identified, and so trainers arrived ready to begin training sessions, only to find that they were also responsible for deciding on an assessment site. This resulted in complications, and ultimately meant that after the second training session, the site had to be changed. Had this decision been made before trainers arrived, the whole process could have proceeded more efficiently.

In other cases, sites were not informed of the requirements until the last minute. As a result, a great many last minute arrangements had to be made. In another

case, criteria developed for team members were not shared with the administrative site before trainers arrived.

The fact that a site was selected in Edmonton without a formal site selection process created the perception that all institutions were not given equal opportunity to apply for status as CELBAN assessment sites. In the opinion of some stakeholders, the process lacked transparency.

### Registration Procedures<sup>5</sup>

At first, it seemed that in-person registration by candidates at each site would be the most feasible. However, it became clear that a requirement for in-person registration was problematic for two reasons. First, it might be difficult for candidates to travel to the location in order to register in person. Second, in discussing registration procedures at each site, it became clear that each infrastructure required a unique registration process. As a result, the process would not be consistent from one site to another. The CanTEST Project Office at the University of Ottawa provided feedback regarding registration procedures. In addition, research was done regarding registration procedures followed by other tests. In order to provide a consistent and convenient process for all candidates, it was determined that mail-in or fax registration was the preferred method for CELBAN. There was consensus on the need for both primary photo ID and secondary ID.

### Training Of Administrative Site Personnel

Administrative personnel at two of the three sites did not accurately understand the actual terms of the RFP as reflected in the contract. As a result, it was difficult for site staff to make necessary plans and arrangements. This complicated the training process, as trainers had to inform personnel that their expectations were incorrect.

One specific challenge was that speaking assessor trainees were not initially aware that they needed to be available for all of the training sessions. In one case, an inadequate amount of time was spent in training, and, as a result, the trainee was not able to meet the requirements of certification.

## **5.0 Lessons Learned Regarding Setting Up Administrative Sites**

### Site Selection

It is important that the process of site selection be transparent, with all prospective sites being given the opportunity to reply to an RFQ.

### Registration

Based on the experience gained during this project, it was found that if initial registration takes place at the testing sites, the procedures will not be uniform. Each administrative site infrastructure is unique. At the same time, there is a need for uniformity in initial registration of candidates. Based on this information, it was

---

<sup>5</sup> For more details on registration see CELBAN website (TBA).

determined that initial registration was best carried out through the CELAS Centre, by mail-in or fax.

Because official registration procedures have not yet been piloted through the CELAS Centre, it is important that the procedures that have been established be reviewed after the first administration of the official CELBAN is undertaken. Lessons learned during this process will provide information for revisions to these procedures as indicated.

### Training Of Administrative Site Personnel

First, each of the two formats of training (one five day training period or two 2.5 day training periods) presented advantages and disadvantages. An advantage of one five day period, was that there was more continuity, and trainees could apply immediately what they had learned. An advantage of two 2.5 day training periods was that sites had time to make scheduling and logistical arrangements between the two training periods. The cost of airfare for one trip vs. two trips is definitely another consideration.

Second, the feedback received during training of staff at the three CELBAN administrative sites provided invaluable information to the trainers in developing an efficient and effective process for the establishment of future sites.

Third, confusion resulting from lack of clarity regarding duties and responsibilities of each party involved needs to be addressed. All participants would have benefited from a clear understanding of what is expected of them well in advance of the training period.

Fourth, speaker assessor training was enhanced when trainees participated (either indirectly through observation or directly through assessing) in a minimum of 15 of CELBAN speaking assessments.

## **1 Ongoing Feedback from Stakeholders**

Feedback from stakeholders was gathered in three ways. First, a National Advisory Committee was established. Second, focus groups met at three locations. Third, feedback was collected from CELBAN candidates (internationally educated nurses) in the form of a survey.

### **3.1 National Advisory Committee (NAC)**

At the beginning of the project the NAC was established, as it had been in Phases I and II. It was comprised of nursing stakeholders across the country. The NAC members for Phase III were:

#### British Columbia

- Gordon MacDonald, Executive Director, College of Licensed Practical Nurses of British Columbia
- Carolyn Sams, Nursing Consultant, Strategic Leadership Group

- Carla Taylor, Registered Nurses Association of Nurses of British Columbia

#### Alberta

- Laura Schneider, Manager of Health Programs, Alberta Learning, Government of Alberta
- Roberta Parker, Workforce Planning Branch, Alberta Health and Wellness, Government of Alberta
- Maya Charlebois, Administrative Director for Healthy Communities, Calgary Regional Health Authority

#### Saskatchewan

- Bulah Ghosh, Past President, Immigrant Services, Cypress Hills Regional College
- Debbie Carey, Acute Care Co-ordinator, Meadow Lake Hospital

#### Manitoba

- Debbie Stewart, Labour Relations, Manitoba Nurses Union
- Verna Holgate, Executive Director, College of Licensed Practical Nurses of Manitoba

#### Ontario

- Ana Maria Revilla, Co-ordinator and Outreach Co-ordinator, CARE for Nurses
- Ellen Nemetz, Provincial Planner, Provincial Health Services Planning Unit, Ontario Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care
- Lisa Little, Canadian Nurses Association
- Gail Gaffney, ESL Professor, Language Institute at Algonquin College,
- Carmen Hust, Foreign Trained Nurse Project, Lead, School of Health and Community Studies, Algonquin College
- Cathy Wilson, ESL Instructor, Algonquin College

#### Newfoundland

- Paul Fisher, Executive Director/Registrar, Council of Licensed Practical Nurses of Newfoundland

The NAC provided feedback at various stages of the project. Interim reports, as well as drafts of policies and procedures were sent to the NAC. Issues raised included:

- What would the process be for sending the test report to institutions (i.e. regulatory bodies) as requested by the candidate?
- What would the format of these reports look like? How would it be handled if the candidate required further copies of the test report?

NAC input provided direction during the development and revisions of the policies and procedures.

### 3.2 Focus Groups

Focus groups were held in Vancouver, Toronto and Edmonton. These meetings were facilitated by the test developers. An effort was made to include representatives of a wide range of stakeholders in each of these focus groups. The following individuals participated in the focus groups at each centre.

#### Vancouver

- Johanna Nethercott, Registration Officer, Registered Nurses Association of British Columbia (RNABC)
- Carla Taylor, RNABC
- Donna Smart, Nursing Services, Healthmatch BC
- Debbie Barnes, International School of Nursing and Health
- Wes Schroeder, Owner/Manager, Western ESL Services Testing and Referral Centre
- Rob Boldt, Manager of Program Design and Evaluation, Multiculturalism Branch, BC Ministry of Community, Aboriginal and Women's Services; also CCLB Nursing Committee Member
- Mary Ruth Martell, ESL Instructor, Camosun College
- Kathy Fukuyama, Department Head, Practical Nursing Department, Vancouver Community College (VCC)
- Marge Hawkins, VCC
- Amanda Frayling, Camosun College
- Margaret Osborne, Lecturer, School of Nursing, UBC School of Nursing
- Cathy Griffin, CLPNBC
- Jane Sheil, Site Administrator, Assessment Centre, VCC
- Facilitated by Epp and Lewis, CELBAN Test Developers, LTC, RRC

#### Toronto

- Joanne Young Evans, Executive Director, RPNAO
- Peggy Frederikse, Senior Program & Policy Consultant, Access to Professions and Trades Unit, Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities; also CCLB Nursing Committee Member
- Nancy Phillips, ESL Instructor, Centennial College
- Diane Allen, Policy Analyst, CNO
- Ellen Nemetz, Provincial Health Services Planning Unit, Ontario Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care
- Sheila Brown, Ontario Hospital Association
- Ana Maria Revilla, Counselor and Outreach Coordinator, Care for Nurses
- Sylvia Scott, International Nurses Interest Group, RNAO
- Facilitated by Epp and Lewis, CELBAN Test Developers, LTC, RRC

#### Edmonton

- Debbie Elliott, Regional Clinical Program Coordinator, Capital Health Authority
- Terry Gushuliak, Assistant Registrar, Continuing Competence, AARP

- Laura Schneider, Manager, Health Programs, Alberta Learning, Government of Alberta
- Maya Charlebois, Administrative Director for Healthy Communities, Calgary Regional Authority
- Gerry Nakonechny, Dean, Health and Community Studies, Grant MacEwan College
- Greg Sowak, Associate Coordinator, ESL, Alberta College
- Jean Wilson, Team Leader, Practical Nursing Program, Norquest College
- Donna Anderson, Curriculum Developer, Norquest College
- Anna De Luca, Coordinator, ESL, English Language Training Division, Norquest College
- Heather Plaizier, Assessor, LARCC (Catholic Social Services)
- Shannon Boyer, Assessor, LARCC (Catholic Social Services)
- Natalia, internationally educated nurse
- Videlyn, internationally educated nurse
- Facilitated by Epp and Lewis, CELBAN Test Developers, LTC, RRC

In all focus groups conducted during Phase III: *Implementation of CELBAN*, discussion was lively and generally positive about CELBAN. The following issues were addressed at most, if not all, focus groups. The comments in text boxes which follow the explanation of issues outline the method by which the CELAS Centre will address the issue.

#### Validity Period for Results

The original policy stated: *The validity period for CELBAN test results is 2 years.* This time-frame for this policy was modeled after the academic tests which are currently accepted by nursing licensing bodies. (i.e. TOEFL, MELAB, TOEIC, CAEL, etc.)

On closer examination of the policy statements, it was determined that validity refers more to the retention of test score data, than to a measure of the candidate's English language proficiency level at a later date.

For example:

TOEFL: *"If you took the TOEFL test more than two years ago, you will have to take the test again to have the scores sent to you, an institution, or an agency."*

MELAB: *"No results can be issued for tests taken more than two years in the past."*

CAEL: *"Test results are valid for one full year."*

The policy regarding validity period for CELBAN test results will read as follows:  
*CELBAN test results cannot be issued for tests taken more than two years in the past.*

## Title for CELBAN Central Administrative Office

The name and acronym, CELBAN National Administrative Centre (CNAC), was originally suggested. However, it was pointed out that this acronym is currently used by the Nursing profession – Canadian Nursing Advisory Committee.

Based on this feedback, a search of various possibilities was made for a title. The title chosen is the Canadian English Language Assessment Services (CELAS) Centre.

## Eligibility Requirements for Registration

Concerns were raised regarding the language requirement for registration for CELBAN. There was a strong preference to avoid stating a requirement for specific CLBA or CLBPT score, as obtaining a score may be a barrier for some candidates. A *recommendation* seemed more appropriate. It was also suggested that language descriptors be included to indicate the language proficiency levels required for success on the CELBAN.

The eligibility policy statement now reads as follows:  
It is important that applicants keep in mind the required Canadian Language Benchmarks (CLB) levels that have been determined for the nursing profession in Canada. These scores are: Speaking CLB 8; Listening CLB 9; Reading CLB 8; Writing CLB 7. Also with the development of an on-line self-assessment tool now underway, it is recommended that candidates access this tool if they are interested in writing the CELBAN in the future.

## Comparison to Other Tests

Each group raised the ongoing question of how CELBAN compares with other tests currently being accepted by the licensing bodies.

In response to this issue, a position paper<sup>6</sup> was written in May, 2004 and was sent to all provincial nursing licensing bodies with a cover letter from the CCLB. A request was made for a response from licensing bodies regarding approval of CELBAN by July 31, 2004.

## Support Materials

Requests for support materials were made. Support materials include preparatory materials, practice tests, an on-line self-assessment tool, as well as promotional and informational brochures.

---

<sup>6</sup> The position paper, *An Analysis Comparing CELBAN with other English Language Tests including TOEFL*, is available from CCLB upon request; excerpts of this report are included in this report on pages 36-38.

The development of an on-line self-assessment tool is now underway, with targeted completion by March 2005. This self-assessment will also be available for off-line self-assessment. The self-assessment tool will provide preparatory material. Its purpose is to provide information about the format and content of the CELBAN, and an opportunity for candidates to practice test items.

### Affordable Cost for CELBAN

All stakeholders have raised the issue that CELBAN be affordable for candidates. A chart was developed comparing all tests currently used by nursing regulators to assess the English language proficiency for internationally educated nurses (see Appendix A). A commitment has been made to keep the cost of CELBAN below the cost of TOEFL.

During this project, CELBAN costs were identified by both the CELAS Centre and the administration sites. Based on an analysis of these costs, it has been determined that the fee for CELBAN (per candidate) should be comparable to that of other English language proficiency tests. An analysis of costing is included in the *Three Year Business Plan*. The fee needs to be finalized with confirmation from CCLB and funders. Discussions will need to take place regarding funding for ongoing research and development of CELBAN, including second and third versions, and other development projects.

### Accessibility of CELBAN

Location of sites, and frequency of test dates were raised as accessibility issues. The sites selected during the pilot administration period (January – May, 2004) were locations where large numbers of internationally educated nurses were available and warranted the establishment a site. Criteria for site selection were established. The frequency of test dates will be staggered across Canada among the sites, and, as more sites are established, the frequency of test dates will increase to meet supply and demand.

CELBAN cannot be delivered if the costs of the test are not recoverable. At locations where there is low demand, it may not be feasible to open a CELBAN administration site.

One option, identified in the second year of the *Three Year Business Plan*, is to explore the feasibility of an itinerant CELBAN administration team. Such a team could travel to locations where it is not cost effective to establish an official CELBAN administration site.

Another option, identified in the third year of the *Three Year Business Plan*, is to explore the possibility of delivery of the CELBAN speaking assessment through live video streaming. This would facilitate the delivery of the CELBAN in remote locations, and possibly overseas. With live video streaming, only an administrator/invigilator is needed on location.



### Development of Other Versions

There is currently only one version of the CELBAN. It is a high-stakes test, and as such it is imperative that a second version be developed as soon as possible to ensure security and to maintain the integrity of the test.

It is projected that a second version will be developed and piloted by summer of 2005, as identified in the first year of the business plan. A third version is projected to follow in the second year of the business plan.

Funding is required for the development of subsequent versions of CELBAN. Obtaining the necessary funding is a challenge. CELBAN's widespread acceptance by professional bodies will strengthen proposals to funders. CELBAN has already gained acceptance by a number of professional nursing bodies, with strong indication of acceptance by a growing number of nursing licensing bodies. Official endorsement by the nursing licensing bodies is critical for the implementation of CELBAN. It is hoped that CELBAN will become a nationally recognized test for internationally educated nurses both inside and outside of Canada.

### Bridging Concerns

A need for bridging programs was identified and all stakeholders see the importance of providing these programs in an affordable and accessible way. CELBAN provides feedback to inform the need for remediation.

As part of the path to nursing licensure, new access to licensure guidelines are being considered; new legislation might include new alternatives such as the need for diagnosis of need and identification of remediation resources.

CELBAN already has built-in feedback which provides information to the candidate regarding his/her strengths and weaknesses in the productive skills of speaking and writing. Identification of remediation resources (a listing of programs per province with costs, and subsidies available if any) needs to be available to internationally educated nurses who have unsuccessfully completed the CELBAN.

### Availability Overseas

A review of using the CELBAN overseas is included in the third year of the business plan. It is imperative that a high-stakes test such as CELBAN be reliably and securely established nationally before being exposed to an international market as an official test. Based on feedback from other testing centres, overseas testing provides unique challenges, especially in terms of test security. Two criteria must be met before overseas delivery can be offered. First, a protocol for security of the test must be developed for the unique setting of a CELBAN site outside Canada. Also, it is not advisable to deliver the CELBAN overseas until at least two versions have been developed and implemented. At present (June 2004), only one version is available.

With the development of the on-line self-assessment tool recently begun, candidates overseas will have access to helpful information regarding CELBAN. This is a necessary first step in the process of establishing potential overseas test sites.

If there is a need at one particular overseas location, it is possible for an itinerant team of CELBAN assessors/invigilators to visit, and deliver the test. The costs will need to be recoverable. Such a trip could also include a needs assessment and piloting. In addition, a feasibility study of the location could be carried out in terms of establishing process and procedures for setting up overseas administration centres. Demand, facilities, availability of staff, and cultural issues would all need to be considered.

### Publicity

A formal marketing plan needs to be in place to ensure that information regarding CELBAN is widely distributed. Some suggestions included:

- a plan for marketing through test sites that have been established
- brochures with wide distribution, as part of outreach into ethno-cultural communities (by means of immigrant-serving agencies), educational institutions, government offices, etc.
- CELBAN website (well-linked)
- a national nursing initiative which includes Psych nurses/LPN/RN regulators is currently underway to clearly explain entry to practice information for IE nurses; a portal or link to the CELBAN website would be valuable
- links to other websites (i.e., immigration, CELBAN On-line Self-assessment portal, educational institutions, etc.)

Focus groups have suggested that the one brochure currently available could be redesigned into two brochures with two separate target audiences: 1) internationally educated nurses; and 2) educators/administrators, nursing regulators, etc. A special note was made that less attention in the brochure should be paid to acute care; also current proper procedure does not permit masks to be worn around the neck, so pictures depicting that practice should not be included. Nursing personnel should be consulted to verify the accuracy of content.

### Role/Purpose of CELBAN

The purpose of CELBAN has been clearly articulated: CELBAN is a language proficiency assessment tool designed to assess the English language proficiency skills of internationally educated nurses whose native language is not English. All the literature and promotional materials will clearly articulate this purpose.

### CELBAN: A Model For Other Professions

CELBAN is clearly regarded as a model for other professions. Test developers used best practices in test development, including *pre*-test development research which included a feasibility study, and a full analysis of the language demands of the profession to determine threshold CLB levels recommended for entry to practice.

The possibility of other professions following this model is greatly enhanced by the development of the “How-To” manual entitled *Developing an Occupation-Specific Language Assessment Tool using the Canadian Language Benchmarks: A Guide for Trades and Professions*<sup>7</sup>.

## 1.0 Internationally Educated Nurses

Information regarding the candidates who took the CELBAN as part of this project was gathered in two ways:

1. Candidates were asked to provide information, by completing a Candidate Information Form, as part of the registration process.
1. Candidates were asked to provide feedback in the form of a survey after the test was completed.

The following data provides information regarding the candidates themselves:

<b>Location</b> (# of Candidates)	Vancouver: 25	Toronto: 21	Edmonton: 17
<b>Gender</b> (# of Candidates)	Female: 59	Male: 4	
<b>Age Range</b> (# of Candidates)	20-25: 5	31-35: 19	41-45: 10
	26-30: 8	36-40: 11	46 or + : 9
<b>Highest Degree Completed</b> (# of Candidates)	RN: 47	LPN: 1	Other: 4
<b>Work Experience in Canada</b> (%)	paid health related: 54%	volunteer health related: 14%	
	paid non-health related: 27%	volunteer non-health related: 8%	

<sup>7</sup> Available from the CCLB website ([www.language.ca](http://www.language.ca))

**Country of Origin**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Korea	1	1.6	1.6	1.6
	Philippines	20	31.7	31.7	33.3
	Russia	3	4.8	4.8	38.1
	China	14	22.2	22.2	60.3
	Poland	2	3.2	3.2	63.5
	India	4	6.3	6.3	69.8
	Iran	1	1.6	1.6	71.4
	Hong Kong	1	1.6	1.6	73.0
	Romania	1	1.6	1.6	74.6
	Kazakhstan	2	3.2	3.2	77.8
	Egypt	1	1.6	1.6	79.4
	Bosnia	1	1.6	1.6	81.0
	Finland	1	1.6	1.6	82.5
	Vietnam	1	1.6	1.6	84.1
	Congo	1	1.6	1.6	85.7
	Colombia	3	4.8	4.8	90.5
	Ukraine	2	3.2	3.2	93.7
	Bangladesh	1	1.6	1.6	95.2
	Bulgaria	1	1.6	1.6	96.8
	Nigeria	1	1.6	1.6	98.4
	Peru	1	1.6	1.6	100.0
	Total	63	100.0	100.0	

### First Language

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Korean	1	1.6	1.6	1.6
	Filipino	8	12.7	12.7	14.3
	Russian	6	9.5	9.5	23.8
	Tagalog	11	17.5	17.5	41.3
	Mandarin	5	7.9	7.9	49.2
	Polish	2	3.2	3.2	52.4
	Pampango	1	1.6	1.6	54.0
	Gujarati	2	3.2	3.2	57.1
	Persian	1	1.6	1.6	58.7
	Chinese	10	15.9	15.9	74.6
	Romanian	1	1.6	1.6	76.2
	Arabic	1	1.6	1.6	77.8
	Serbo-Croatian	1	1.6	1.6	79.4
	Finnish	1	1.6	1.6	81.0
	Vietnamese	1	1.6	1.6	82.5
	French	1	1.6	1.6	84.1
	Spanish	4	6.3	6.3	90.5
	Malayalam	1	1.6	1.6	92.1
	Kannada	1	1.6	1.6	93.7
	Ukrainian	1	1.6	1.6	95.2
	Bangali	1	1.6	1.6	96.8
	Bulgarian	1	1.6	1.6	98.4
	Ibo	1	1.6	1.6	100.0
	Total	63	100.0	100.0	

**Time in Canada (in months)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid %	Cumulative Percent
Valid	2	1	1.6	1.6	1.6
	4	1	1.6	1.6	3.2
	5	2	3.2	3.2	6.3
	6	1	1.6	1.6	7.9
	8	1	1.6	1.6	9.5
	9	1	1.6	1.6	11.1
	11	3	4.8	4.8	15.9
	12	2	3.2	3.2	19.0
	14	2	3.2	3.2	22.2
	16	1	1.6	1.6	23.8
	19	2	3.2	3.2	27.0
	20	1	1.6	1.6	28.6
	21	3	4.8	4.8	33.3
	22	1	1.6	1.6	34.9
	24	1	1.6	1.6	36.5
	25	2	3.2	3.2	39.7
	26	2	3.2	3.2	42.9
	29	1	1.6	1.6	44.4
	32	2	3.2	3.2	47.6
	33	2	3.2	3.2	50.8
	34	2	3.2	3.2	54.0
	35	1	1.6	1.6	55.6
	36	4	6.3	6.3	61.9
	38	1	1.6	1.6	63.5
	40	1	1.6	1.6	65.1
	41	1	1.6	1.6	66.7
	44	1	1.6	1.6	68.3
	47	1	1.6	1.6	69.8
	48	1	1.6	1.6	71.4
	49	1	1.6	1.6	73.0
	52	3	4.8	4.8	77.8
	55	1	1.6	1.6	79.4
	56	1	1.6	1.6	81.0
	58	1	1.6	1.6	82.5
	67	1	1.6	1.6	84.1
	71	1	1.6	1.6	85.7
	76	1	1.6	1.6	87.3
	78	1	1.6	1.6	88.9
	96	1	1.6	1.6	90.5
	112	1	1.6	1.6	92.1
	124	1	1.6	1.6	93.7
	154	1	1.6	1.6	95.2
	308	1	1.6	1.6	96.8
	332	1	1.6	1.6	98.4
	359	1	1.6	1.6	100.0
Total		63	100.0	100.0	

**Country of Nursing Education**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid %	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Korea	1	1.6	1.6	1.6
	Philippines	20	31.7	31.7	33.3
	Russia	2	3.2	3.2	36.5
	China	13	20.6	20.6	57.1
	Moldora	2	3.2	3.2	60.3
	Poland	2	3.2	3.2	63.5
	India	4	6.3	6.3	69.8
	Iran	1	1.6	1.6	71.4
	Hong Kong	1	1.6	1.6	73.0
	England	1	1.6	1.6	74.6
	Romania	1	1.6	1.6	76.2
	Kazakistan	2	3.2	3.2	79.4
	Egypt	1	1.6	1.6	81.0
	Bosnia	1	1.6	1.6	82.5
	Finland	1	1.6	1.6	84.1
	Vietnam	1	1.6	1.6	85.7
	Belgium	1	1.6	1.6	87.3
	Ukraine	2	3.2	3.2	90.5
	Colombia	2	3.2	3.2	93.7
	Bangladesh	1	1.6	1.6	95.2
	Bulgaria	1	1.6	1.6	96.8
	Nigeria	1	1.6	1.6	98.4
	Peru	1	1.6	1.6	100.0
	Total	63	100.0	100.0	

### Language of Nursing Education

		Frequency	Percent	Valid %	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Korean	1	1.6	1.6	1.6
	Russian	8	12.7	13.1	14.8
	Tagalog	1	1.6	1.6	16.4
	Mandarin	3	4.8	4.9	21.3
	English	24	38.1	39.3	60.7
	Polish	2	3.2	3.3	63.9
	Persian	1	1.6	1.6	65.6
	Chinese	11	17.5	18.0	83.6
	Romania	1	1.6	1.6	85.2
	Serbo-Croatian	1	1.6	1.6	86.9
	Finnish	1	1.6	1.6	88.5
	Vietnamese	1	1.6	1.6	90.2
	French	1	1.6	1.6	91.8
	Spanish	3	4.8	4.9	96.7
	Gujarati	1	1.6	1.6	98.4
	Bulgarian	1	1.6	1.6	100.0
	Total	61	96.8	100.0	
	Missing	System	2	3.2	
Total		63	100.0		

The statistics above indicate that candidates represented a wide range of backgrounds.

During the present project, Phase III, 50 candidates also provided feedback to statements that compared the CELBAN with other English language assessment tools currently recognized by nursing licensing bodies in Canada. These results have been analyzed as follows:

Statement	strongly disagree	disagree	not sure	agree	strongly agree
The CELBAN <b>more accurately</b> assess my English abilities.	7.7%	4.1%	11.5%	36.7%	38.8%
The CELBAN is a <b>more relevant</b> test of the English skills needed for nursing in Canada.	7.7%	4.1%	12.2%	28.6%	46.9%
It is beneficial to me that upon receiving my CELBAN test results (scores), I will also be receiving <b>feedback on my strengths and weaknesses</b> in both Speaking and Writing.	8.3%	2.1%	0%	26%	63%



These statistics indicate strong face validity from the perspective of candidates when they compare CELBAN to other English language assessment tools.

Candidates were also given an opportunity to share their comments. A few candidates expressed frustration with the challenges of the time constraints of the test. However, the following typical remarks included by candidates on their survey indicate a very positive overall response:

- *I enjoyed the test and I think that the CELBAN is the best test for Nursing.*
- *I think CELBAN is more appropriate to use for people who want to go back into Nursing.*
- *Thanks!*
- *Thank you very much. I'd rather take CELBAN than CAEL.*
- *It is very helpful for health professionals.*
- *This test is more useful to nurses like me because it is the actual situation where we need to speak and use English.*
- *This test really measures the ability of nurses to communicate in an actual work scenario; it will also help us to be aware and improve our weaknesses as far as English communication for nurses is concerned.*
- *CELBAN is far better than other English proficiency tests because it's related to the nursing profession.*
- *I think CELBAN is more appropriate for nurses than IELTS or TOEFL/TSE.*
- *I would like to take this test in the future as an official test for nurses.*

#### Feedback regarding cost

The following chart indicates the costs of language test/s incurred to date by candidates in their effort to meet the requirements for nursing licensure in Canada.

**How much money have you spent to take the current test required in your province to enter the nursing profession in Canada?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid %	Cumulative Percent
Valid	\$85	2	3.8	8.7	8.7
	\$150	2	3.8	8.7	17.4
	\$160	1	1.9	4.3	21.7
	\$165	1	1.9	4.3	26.1
	\$170	1	1.9	4.3	30.4
	\$173	1	1.9	4.3	34.8
	\$195	1	1.9	4.3	39.1
	\$200	2	3.8	8.7	47.8
	\$208	1	1.9	4.3	52.2
	\$224	1	1.9	4.3	56.5
	\$225	1	1.9	4.3	60.9
	\$240	1	1.9	4.3	65.2
	\$250	1	1.9	4.3	69.6
	\$300	3	5.8	13.0	82.6
	\$360	1	1.9	4.3	87.0
	\$500	1	1.9	4.3	91.3
	\$900	1	1.9	4.3	95.7
	\$1,000	1	1.9	4.3	100.0
	Total	23	44.2	100.0	
Missing	System	29	55.8		
Total		52	100.0		

Based on these figures, seven of the participants have already spent \$300 to \$1000 taking English proficiency tests. It should be noted that of the candidates that responded, only five indicated that they have met all of the English language requirements (including speaking requirements). We can conclude that most candidates will have paid more than they have indicated by the time they meet the language proficiency requirements.

**Maximum suggested price for CELBAN**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	\$225-\$275	29	55.8	63.0	63.0
	\$276-\$325	2	3.8	4.3	67.4
	\$326-\$375	1	1.9	2.2	69.6
	below \$225	13	25.0	28.3	97.8
	others	1	1.9	2.2	100.0
	Total	46	88.5	100.0	
Missing	System	6	11.5		
Total		52	100.0		

Over half of the candidates who responded (63 %) indicated that the price they would be willing to pay for an official CELBAN was \$225 - \$275.

## Feedback regarding frequency

How many times per year would you like to see the CELBAN offered?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	twice a year	7	13.5	14.0	14.0
	three times a year	3	5.8	6.0	20.0
	four times a year	22	42.3	44.0	64.0
	monthly	9	17.3	18.0	82.0
	others	9	17.3	18.0	100.0
Total		50	96.2	100.0	
Missing	System	2	3.8		
Total		52	100.0		

This feedback indicates that there is a range of opinions regarding how often the CELBAN should be offered, but the largest group (42%) chose four times a year. The decision regarding how often the CELBAN will be offered in each location will be dependent on demand and cost effectiveness.

## 1 Role of Consultants

During the project, consultants provided valuable input regarding the implementation of CELBAN. Tom Harrigan, of Red River College/University of Manitoba, provided direction regarding collection of data, as well as statistical analysis of data gathered through testing and surveys.

Margaret Des Brisay and Amelia Hope, of the CanTEST Project Office, University of Ottawa, provided direction regarding policies and procedures, based on their experience with CanTEST.

## 4 Comparison of Candidates' Scores on CELBAN and Scores on Other Tests<sup>8</sup>

Since the CELBAN has now been developed, one issue that has been raised is the need for some comparison with other English tests presently recognized by nursing licensing bodies. The following contrastive analysis addresses this issue.

While the direct comparison of scores is informative in a general way, there are several weaknesses inherent in using this approach exclusively. First, the purpose of a test is central to its development. The tests presently recognized to assess English language proficiency of internationally educated nurses in Canada (TOEFL, IELTS, MELAB, CAEL, etc.) have been developed with the primary objective of assessing language readiness for an academic setting. The CELBAN, however, has been developed to assess language proficiency in the nursing context. Second, the tasks and content of these tests are determined by the purpose. The tests presently recognized to assess the English language proficiency of internationally educated nurses in Canada reflect the language needed in an academic setting. However, the tasks and content of the CELBAN reflect the language demands of the nursing profession. Third, if formats of tests are dissimilar, that leads to poorer correlations and raises the issue of whether or not comparisons should be made. Based on these three concerns, a direct comparison of scores may not be as informative as might be expected at face value.

Consider the following scenarios:

1. Candidate One follows a lecture on a topic such as astronomy very well. (This topic could likely appear on the Listening Section of the TOEFL.) However, the same candidate has difficulty following a discussion between a physician and a nurse regarding patient treatment (a topic likely to appear on the Listening Section of the CELBAN).

---

<sup>8</sup> This section is an excerpt from the position paper, *An Analysis Comparing CELBAN with other English Language Tests including TOEFL* (available from CCLB at [www.language.ca](http://www.language.ca))

1. Candidate Two does very well following the physician/nurse interaction, but not so well following the astronomy lecture.

How should a comparison of these candidates' scores be interpreted? By simply comparing Candidate One's TOEFL and CELBAN scores, one might assume that, because the TOEFL score is higher, the TOEFL must be an easier test. On the other hand, by comparing Candidate Two's scores, one might assume that because the CELBAN score is higher, the CELBAN must be an easier test.

Are these assumptions accurate? Not necessarily. It is more appropriate to conclude that Candidate One will do better in an academic setting, while Candidate Two will do better in a nursing setting. We cannot assume that the CELBAN is an easier or more difficult test just by doing a direct comparison of scores. Direct comparisons give some general information which can be used to compare tests, but this information can be misleading if it is considered the only indicator.

We must consider the purpose of the test, the content of the test, and the background knowledge of the candidates. Ultimately, it is important that an assessment tool measure the ability of the candidate to meet the language demands that are reflected in the context of her/his subsequent work or study.

During the present project, candidates were asked to indicate if they had taken other language tests for nursing licensure, and what their scores were on these tests. Based on this data, the following chart was developed.

#### Analysis Of The Following Chart

In 6 out of 7 cases, candidates who met the required CLB levels on all four components of CELBAN, also met the requirements that had been established for other tests. In 9 cases, candidates met at least some of the requirements that had been established for other tests, but did not meet the requirements in all 4 components of CELBAN. In 14 cases, the candidates who did not meet the requirements of CELBAN, also did not meet requirements of other tests. These results indicate that the CELBAN is certainly as rigorous as other tests being used to meet the licensing requirements of the nursing profession in Canada.

It is important to note that if a candidate is unsuccessful on the Speaking section of CELBAN, but successful on the three other sections (i.e. Listening, Writing, Reading), then only the Speaking section must be re-tested. If the candidate is unsuccessful on one of the three sections, Listening, Writing, or Reading, all three sections must be re-tested, as they are administered together in a group format. If, on the retest, a candidate scores lower on the second attempt, the higher score from the first attempt will be counted.

**SURVEY RESULTS FROM CELBAN CANDIDATES FEB. – APRIL/04**

	CELBAN				TOEFL Computer	TOEFL Paper	TSE	CAEL	MELAB	TOEIC	IELTS	DATE
	S	L	R	W								
candidate 1	6	6	5	5	200							?
candidate 2	7	9	7	6	207							?
candidate 3	7	8	7	6							6	?
candidate 4	9	8	8	6			40			785		Jan 04
candidate 5	7	5	6	5	200							Dec 03
candidate 6	8	6	9	6	260							Dec 02
candidate 7	7	10	9	8							7	Oct 03
candidate 8	7	7	6	5		553				750		Aug 03 Jan 04
candidate 9	8	10	8	7	260		45					Dec 03 Nov 03
candidate 10	8	9	8	7							6.5	Jan 04
candidate 11	8	9	8	8	215		50					Aug 02 Dec 02
candidate 12	8	9	8	6	217							Jan 04
candidate 13	7	10	9	8					78			Oct ?
candidate 14	6	8	6	6					62			Mar ?
candidate 15	8	9	6	7				60				Jan 03
candidate 16	8	8	6	6	183			30				Mar 04
candidate 17	8	10	9	7				70				Jun 02
candidate 18	7	8	10	7				60				Jul 03
candidate 19	9	10	9	8	240							Jan 02
candidate 20	5	9	5	6						470		Jan 03
candidate 21	7	5	7	7				40				Jan 03
candidate 22	5	7	8	6						665		Sep 03
candidate 23	7	6	8	6		537						Oct 03
candidate 24	7	7	8	6	246		45	50				Jan 03 Jan 04 Jan 04
candidate 25	7	5	6	5						620		Sep 03
candidate 26	9	8	10	7			50					Jan 03
candidate 27	7	6	8	7	227							Oct 03
candidate 28	6	8	9	6	235							Dec 03
candidate 29	7	7	7	5					70			Jan 04
candidate 30	8	9	8	7					77			Feb 04
candidate 31	7	6	5	6		470						Jun 02
<b>SCORES REQUIRED</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>213</b>	<b>550</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>800</b>	<b>6.5 (S)7</b>	

**\* NOTE: Shaded areas indicate that candidate has achieved the score required by the licensing bodies.**

### **3 Potential Future Projects/Areas Of Research**

In the *Three Year Business Plan*, the following topics are addressed to provide direction for the implementation of CELBAN:

- development of a CELBAN Website (in process)
- development of On-line/offline CELBAN Self-Assessment (in process)
- development of CELBAN versions 2 and 3
- ongoing analysis of data regarding candidates taking CELBAN (e.g., tracking, demographics)
- ongoing statistical analysis of test reliability data
- feasibility study regarding overseas delivery
- feasibility study of development of on-line video speaking assessment for remote and/or international delivery a pilot study of itinerant delivery of CELBAN to remote and/or overseas sites
- a pilot study of itinerant delivery of CELBAN to remote and/or overseas sites

The following topics indicate further issues that should be addressed in relationship to the CELBAN:

- feasibility study of tracking of internationally educated nurses who have successfully completed the CELBAN
- analysis of changes of language demands in the nursing profession in Canada (e.g., use of technology)
- application of this model to other professions

## 5 *Three Year Business Plan*<sup>9</sup>

A draft of the *Guiding Principles*, provided by the CCLB with input from the CELAS Centre, has directed the revisions to the final version of the *Three Year Business Plan* for the Implementation of CELBAN and Ongoing Development Projects related to CELBAN. The *Guiding Principles* is an appendix to the *Three Year Business Plan*, a separate document, not included in this report.

### Responsibilities of the Key Players

The following responsibilities highlight the key players and their primary roles and responsibilities in the management and administration CELBAN, as well as ongoing research and development.

The **CELBAN Test Administration Sites** will be required to comply with the requirements and provide all documentation requested in the licensing agreement. The responsibilities will include recruitment of candidates, identification of potential assessors and invigilators to be trained, and completion of all tasks related to the administration of the CELBAN following procedural guidelines.

The **CELAS Centre** will report to the CCLB, and will be required to establish licensing agreements with CELBAN Test sites, store all CELBAN materials, maintain a central CELBAN computer database and advise the CCLB on policies and protocols for CELBAN. The CELAS Centre will follow the *Guiding Principles* outlined by CCLB for the administration, and ongoing development of CELBAN, as well as all marketing and communication regarding CELBAN.

The **CCLB** as the owner of CELBAN will establish and maintain policies related to test use and administration, administer matters related to copyright and trademark, monitor CELAS Centre in their capacity as the national administrative body, and establish a National Advisory Committee of stakeholders for CELBAN. The CCLB will follow the *Guiding Principles* for securing funding for CELAS Centre projects and core administration services, and continue to advocate with regulatory bodies in pursuit of approval of CELBAN.

---

<sup>9</sup> The Three Year Business plan is a separate document. All rights belong to the CCLB.



## **5 Computer Data Base**

The CELBAN Project Team met regularly with RRC Computer Services to develop a computer database which could be used to compile data related to the administration of and data collection for CELBAN. The system has been set up to collect all relevant data collected as reflected on the registration form. It is also designed to enter scores and feedback. Through this computerized system, reports for candidates and also transcripts can be produced. The confidentiality of all information will be strictly maintained; only personnel with passwords will be allowed access to the site.

The process of entering Phase III data into this database has begun to test that the system is functioning smoothly, and ensure that it will be ready as soon as official administration of CELBAN commences.

## **6 Recommendations**

Based on the experience of the piloting, and an analysis of the challenges and lessons learned during this project, the following best practices are recommended:

### Site Selection

- A Request for Letters of Qualification (RFQ) should be widely distributed to potential sites at each location as part of the CELBAN administration site selection process.
- The CELAS Centre, in consultation with the CCLB, should take responsibility for sending out RFQs.
- The CELAS Centre, in consultation with the CCLB, should take responsibility for site selection.
- All RFQs should clearly indicate the expectations and responsibilities of each party involved.
- Future potential pilot test sites must be provided with the information regarding criteria for sites and staff (i.e. site administrator, invigilators, assessors) as early as possible. Once the pilot sites are selected, early and ongoing direct communication between trainers and site administrator is crucial to eliminate confusion and misunderstanding.
- A licensing agreement signed by both parties should clearly articulate the responsibilities of each player.

### Registration

- Mail-in/fax registration through the CELAS Centre will provide the most clear and consistent process for candidates when they register. This recommendation is a result of input from administrative sites, stakeholders, and research.
- The official registration policies and procedures should be reviewed after the first official administration of CELBAN, and revised as indicated.

### Training of Site Personnel

- Feedback from all trainees should be analyzed to provide direction for improvement to the training process.
- Contracts need to be made well in advance, in order to provide adequate time for site administrators and coordinators to make arrangements. Issues that must be addressed include:
  - ⇒ the amount of time required of each participant during training
  - ⇒ the minimum number of trainees required (one site administrator, two invigilators, three speaking assessors)
  - ⇒ the roles and responsibilities of each position
  - ⇒ the qualifications required for each position
  - ⇒ the need for commitment to the full training process
- During the CELBAN speaking assessor training, trainees should participate (either indirectly through observation, or directly through assessing) in a minimum of **15** CELBAN speaking assessments.
- Time needs to be allocated for the final development of training materials. (The piloting has already been done.) Revisions need to include: better quality audio tapes or videos for speaking assessor training, revision of speaking assessor training manual to make it more user friendly, and revisions to clarify instructions given by invigilators and speaking assessors.

## **7 Policies and Procedures**

CELBAN policies and procedures have been developed based on input from consultants, research, and information gathered during the piloting process. Some of these policies and procedures have been referred to throughout this report. A comprehensive CELBAN Policies and Procedures document has been compiled as a separate document and is available from CCLB ([www.language.ca](http://www.language.ca)).

## **8 Appendix A**

**Appendix A:****Comparative Analysis of English Proficiency Tests**

<b>Test Name</b>	<b>Duration of Test</b>	<b>Test Cost</b>	<b>Limitations</b>
TOEFL & TSE	4hrs + 45min	\$173 + \$167= \$340	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not nursing content</li> <li>• No feedback provided re: strengths and weaknesses</li> <li>• Must schedule two test times and often in two separate tests assessment locations</li> <li>• Paper and Computer Based options for TOEFL but not in every country</li> <li>• Speaking assessment is tape-mediated</li> </ul>
IELTS	2hrs 40min	\$245	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not nursing content</li> <li>• No feedback provided re: strengths and weaknesses</li> </ul>
MELAB	2.5-3.5 hrs	\$107 + \$53(sp) =\$160	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not nursing content</li> <li>• No feedback provided re: strengths and weaknesses</li> <li>• Not currently used for Health Care Worker certification but can be used in Canada for admission to nursing schools</li> </ul>
TOEIC	2.5hrs	\$85.66	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not nursing content</li> <li>• No feedback provided re: strengths and weaknesses</li> <li>• Assesses Listening and Reading only</li> <li>• A writing assessment can also be done at an additional charge of \$30 in some provinces</li> </ul>
CAEL	2hrs 15min	\$110 (\$85 in Ottawa)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not nursing content</li> <li>• No feedback provided re: strengths and weaknesses</li> <li>• Speaking assessment is tape-mediated</li> </ul>
<b>CELBAN</b>	<i>3 hrs</i>	<b>TBA</b>	<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Advantages of CELBAN</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Nursing content (based on in-depth analysis of the language demands of the nursing profession in Canada)</i></li> <li>• <i>Feedback provided re: strengths and weaknesses (speaking and writing)</i></li> <li>• <i>All four skill areas assessed</i></li> <li>• <i>Face-to-face speaking assessment w/ 2 trained assessors</i></li> </ul>

