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Project Overview & Policy Summary
Project Overview

• Study Purpose: To investigate the efficacy and impact of changes to the FLPB policy for SOF operators on individual proficiency and organizational capability.

• Skill-based pay (SBP) programs typically vary on three main dimensions:
  • Eligibility criteria: requirements to be eligible
  • Verification process: formal verification with an exam or assessment
  • Payout type and amount: bonus or permanent change in base pay

• SOF FLPB study focuses on two policy changes (interventions):
  • Lowering eligibility criteria for FLPB payment from ILR 2/2 to ILR 1/1
  • Use of an OPI score as an explicitly accepted verification test for FLPB payment
## Summary of DoD FLPB Policy (Time of Study; DoD, 2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Eligibility Criteria:      | • Active and reserve forces are eligible  
                            • Language category and proficiency level influence eligibility and payment                                                       |
| Verification Process:      | • DLPT is the preferred verification test, but OPI is accepted if no DLPT is available  
                            • Annual recertification is required  
                            • Some form of waiver is available for deployment  
                            • Recoupment can occur if certification is lost and payment is not stopped                                                          |
| Payout Type and Amount:    | • Annual lump sum or monthly installment options  
                            • $12,000 pay ceiling for a single year  
                            • No more than $500/month for a single language or $1,000/month for multiple languages                                    |

DoD, 2013
Timing of Eligibility and Verification Changes for SOF

- NSW: Verification with OPI - 2/06
- AFSOC: Verification with OPI - 6/06
- MARSOC: Eligibility at 1/1 - 6/06
- NSW: Eligibility at 1/1 - 3/07
- AFSOC: Eligibility at 1/1 - 11/09
- MARSOC: Verification with OPI - 1/10
- ARSOC: Verification with OPI - 5/11
- ARSOC: Eligibility at 1/1 - 5/11

Study Start Date: 1/98
Study End Date: 3/15
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Army Policy Timeline (1998-2011)

- **2004**: USA/FSWCS changed graduation requirement from ILR 0+/0+ to ILR 1/1 on the DLPT.
- **2009**: USA/FSWCS began using the OPI as graduation metric.
- **2010**: USSOCOM initiated discussions to implement changes to FLPB program; specifically, payment at ILR level 1/1 for ARSOF. Memo was sent re pilot program for changes to FLPB.
- **5/2011**: E: SOF assigned to ARSOF are eligible for FLPB at ILR 1/1. Once USSOCOM funding is expended, the Army will not pay at ILR 1/1. Those who complete a foreign language basic course with a graduation standard of ILR 2/2 are not eligible.
- **E**: FLPB at ILR 1/1 is restricted to Soldier’s designated CLANG/PLANG and/or one language supporting deployment. Soldiers must be within nine months of deploying in a language supporting a deployment.
- **E**: Army limits languages designated as CLANG/PLANG and for certain languages will only pay for one dominant language (e.g., Spanish). Languages supporting deployment are not limited.
- **E**: Soldiers can only receive FLPB for one dialect per language, except Arabic, which will be treated as two languages (i.e., AD, AE, DG, AP are one language; all other dialects are another language).
- **V**: Can qualify with DLPT or two-skill OPI. FLPB will not be paid if no test exists for the language.
- **P**: FLPB will be paid monthly for a maximum of two languages. FLPB will be $100/month for the first language and the second will depend on which payment list the language falls under. Total FLPB will not exceed $200/month. Languages not listed receive Payment C.
- **P**: Eligibility begins on test date and ends 12 months, less one day, from the test date or at the end of the pilot. FLPB will be prorated for the month entitlement starts and for Soldiers with valid, current test scores taken before the implementation of the pilot.
- **6/2011**: Selected SOF assigned to ARSOF, with ILR 1/1 or above and below 2/2 in any language covered by the pilot, can be paid FLPB at the 1/1 rate. This includes one dominant language.
- **P**: Pay at ILR 1/1 or above and below 2/2 is $100/month.
Army Policy Timeline (2012-2015)

1998

- E: FLBP payment at ILR 1/1 for ARSOF is listed in Army Regulation 11-6.
- E: Soldiers who completed a basic language course with a graduation standard of ILR 2/2 are not eligible for FLBP below 2/2 for that language.
- P: Below ILR 2/2, FLBP cannot exceed $100/month for a single language and $200/month for a combination of languages.
- P: ILR 2/2 and above, FLBP may not exceed $400/month for a single language and $3,000/month for any combination of languages.
- T: Soldiers with ILR 5/0+/5 and below are not eligible for USAF/KSWCS AST until they meet the 1/1 Regimental proficiency standard. This does not apply to PME.

2012

- E: CMF 1B with ILR 1/1 and above are eligible for FLBP with qualifying DLPT or OPI scores. CMF 1B with ILR 2/2 and above are eligible for FLBP with qualifying DLPT score.
- E: Extension of pilot to pay FLBP at ILR 1/1 for SOF assigned to ARSOF for an additional 18 months (i.e., until 31 OCT 13).
- T: SFGs are required to have 80% of its members tested within 12 months and proficient at ILR 1/1.
- T: NCO and Officer Evaluation Reports require entry of Soldiers’ last language score and test date.
- T: Soldiers with ILR 0/0+ and below and no current DLPT or OPI in their CLANG are not eligible for USAF/KSWCS AST.
- T: Soldiers with ILR 1/1 and above are eligible for USAF/KSWCS AST, to submit a WO Candidate School packet, and to attend LET, Immersion, or a University/College language training program.

2013

- V: SFGs, 95th CBde, 4th and 8th MIAG must maintain 80% of CMF 18, 37, 38 tested within 12 months and proficient at ILR 1/1 or above on the DLPT or OPI.
- V: All 35P must be tested and current at ILR 2/2 or above on the DLPT and ILR 1+ or above on the OPI. They are required to take the OPI annually.
- V: For LET, CMF 18, 37, and 38 must have ILR 2/2 on the OPI and ILR 1 on DLPT-R in their CLANG. Test dates must be within 120 days of the LET.
- V: CMF 18, 37, and 38 without ILR 1+/1+ on the OPI in their CLANG are not eligible for ASI schools. This does not apply to PME.
- V: CMF 18, 37, and 38 assigned to SFODs must achieve at minimum ILR level 2/2 on the DLPT and OPI. There are various requirements for particular SFODs.
- T: First USAF/KSWCS cohort to graduate with an ILR 1+/1+ on the OPI as the graduation standard began.

2014

- V: SFGs must maintain 80% of CMF 18, 37, 38 tested within 12 months and proficient at ILR 1/1. All CMF 35P must be at ILR 2/2.
- V: Soldiers unable to test within 12 months due to extended TDY must test within 180 days of returning.
- V: CMF 18 must achieve ILR 1/1 on the DLPT or OPI in their CLANG. 35P must achieve ILR 2/2 on the DLPT. CMF 18, 37, 38, 35P are required to take the DLPT or OPI annually.
- V: Each ODA member must be at ILR 1/1. Different SFODs have various ILR level and testing requirements.
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Study 1: Individual Level Results for SF
Study 1: Methods

• We restricted the sample to individuals with test scores both pre- and post-intervention
  • 1 JUN 07 – 31 MAR 15

• Used Hierarchical Linear Modeling (HLM; multilevel modeling)
  • Piecewise methodology was used to compare the results pre- and post-intervention

• Focused on 5 criteria:
  • Listening proficiency levels over time
  • Reading proficiency levels over time
  • Speaking proficiency levels over time
  • Qualifying for FLPB over time
  • Level of FLPB over time
### SF Summary for Piecewise Individual Change Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Listening Proficiency</th>
<th>Reading Proficiency</th>
<th>Speaking Proficiency</th>
<th>FLPB Qualifying (Yes/No)</th>
<th>FLPB Qualifying Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How much variability resides between/within individuals? (ICG)</td>
<td>77% / 23%</td>
<td>82% / 18%</td>
<td>50% / 50%</td>
<td>36% / 64%</td>
<td>61% / 39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(T2.1, Null)</td>
<td>(T2.3, Null)</td>
<td>(T2.5, Null)</td>
<td>(T2.7, Null)</td>
<td>(T2.9, Null)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there linear change pre-intervention on average? (y_{pa})</td>
<td>YES, -</td>
<td>YES, -</td>
<td>YES, -</td>
<td>YES, -</td>
<td>YES, -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(T2.1, P1)</td>
<td>(T2.3, P1)</td>
<td>(T2.5, P1)</td>
<td>(T2.7, P1)</td>
<td>(T2.9, P1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there linear change post-intervention on average? (y_{pa})</td>
<td>YES, +</td>
<td>YES, +</td>
<td>YES, +</td>
<td>YES, +</td>
<td>YES, +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(T2.1, P1)</td>
<td>(T2.3, P1)</td>
<td>(T2.5, P1)</td>
<td>(T2.7, P1)</td>
<td>(T2.9, P1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there individual differences in linear change during the pre-intervention time period? (t_{pa})</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO*</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(T2.1, P2)</td>
<td>(T2.3, P2)</td>
<td>(T2.5, P2)</td>
<td>(T2.7, P2)</td>
<td>(T2.9, P2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there individual differences in linear change during the post-intervention time period? (t_{pa})</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO*</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(T2.1, P2)</td>
<td>(T2.3, P2)</td>
<td>(T2.5, P2)</td>
<td>(T2.7, P2)</td>
<td>(T2.9, P2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there differential linear change post-intervention on average? (y_{pa})</td>
<td>YES, +</td>
<td>YES, +</td>
<td>YES, +</td>
<td>YES, +</td>
<td>YES, +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(T2.1, P3)</td>
<td>(T2.3, P3)</td>
<td>(T2.5, P3)</td>
<td>(T2.7, P3)</td>
<td>(T2.9, P3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there individual differences in differential linear change post-intervention? (t_{pa})</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO*</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(T2.1, P4)</td>
<td>(T2.3, P4)</td>
<td>(T2.5, P4)</td>
<td>(T2.7, P4)</td>
<td>(T2.9, P4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are individual differences in linear change pre-intervention explained by cognitive ability? (v_{ca})</td>
<td>YES, -</td>
<td>YES, -</td>
<td>YES, +</td>
<td>YES, -</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(T2.2, P4)</td>
<td>(T2.4, P4)</td>
<td>(T2.6, P4)</td>
<td>(T2.8, P4)</td>
<td>(T2.10, P4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are individual differences in linear change pre-intervention explained by language difficulty? (v_{ld})</td>
<td>YES, -</td>
<td>YES, -</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES, -</td>
<td>YES, -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(T2.2, P4)</td>
<td>(T2.4, P4)</td>
<td>(T2.6, P4)</td>
<td>(T2.8, P4)</td>
<td>(T2.10, P4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are individual differences in linear change post-intervention explained by cognitive ability? (v_{ca})</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES, +</td>
<td>YES, +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(T2.2, P4)</td>
<td>(T2.4, P4)</td>
<td>(T2.6, P4)</td>
<td>(T2.8, P4)</td>
<td>(T2.10, P4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are individual differences in linear change post-intervention explained by language difficulty? (v_{ld})</td>
<td>YES, +</td>
<td>YES, -</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES, +</td>
<td>YES, +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(T2.2, P4)</td>
<td>(T2.4, P4)</td>
<td>(T2.6, P4)</td>
<td>(T2.8, P4)</td>
<td>(T2.10, P4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: T# = table number; P# = piecewise model number; *a Tests of random slopes in HGLMs for discrete outcomes may be unreliable.
SF: Change in Listening Proficiency Pre-/Post-Intervention
SF: Change in Reading Proficiency Pre-/Post-Intervention
SF: Change in Speaking Proficiency Pre-/Post-Intervention
SF: Change in Log-Odds of FLPB Qualifying
SF: Change in FLPB Qualifying Level Pre-/Post-Intervention
Study 1: SF Summary

• In general, pre-intervention, there was a decrease over time in proficiency and FLPB qualifying

• Post-intervention, individuals who tested on multiple occasions tended to:
  • Improve their proficiency
  • Increase the odds of FLPB qualification
  • Increase qualifying levels over time

• For most outcome variables, there were significant individual differences in rates of linear change pre- & post-intervention

• Across outcome variables, average rates of change were significantly more positive post-intervention
Study 1: SF Summary (continued)

• Individual differences pre-intervention:
  • Higher cognitive ability tended to be associated with less positive trends in listening, reading, & odds of FLPB qualifying
  • Greater language difficulty had a significant negative relationship with listening, reading, odds of FLPB qualifying, & qualifying level

• Individual differences post-intervention:
  • Greater language difficulty had a positive relationship with listening, but negative with reading
  • Greater language difficulty had a positive relationship with odds of FLPB qualifying & qualifying level

• Language difficulty had no association with rates of change in speaking pre- or post-intervention
Study 2: Group Level Results for SF

Army
24,258

ARSOC
24,182

SF
15,828

CA
1,880

PSYOP/MISO
2,597

Other
3,877

Navy
2,118

NSW
2,118

SEAL
1,314

SWCC
380

Other
424

Air Force
1,330

AFSOC
1,286

Marines
650

MARSOC
650
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Study 2: Methods

- Captured as much testing data as possible from 1998 - March 2015

- Employed several types of time series analysis, before deciding on regression discontinuity time series analysis
  - We chose bimonthly (every two months) as our interval

- Organized data into 6 organizational criteria:
  - Objective 1: Participation in testing (percentage participation per time interval)
  - Objective 2: Average age of test scores (days between tests)
  - Objective 3: Average Proficiency (per time interval per skill)
  - Objective 4: Percentage of test takers at ILR level per time interval
  - Objective 5: Percentage “qualified” at each FLPB level per time interval
  - Objective 6: Percentage of persons qualifying for money per time interval
Percentage of Speaking Test Participation for SF
Percentage of Listening Test Participation for SF

![Graph showing the percentage of listening test participation over time. The graph includes data points for each bi-monthly interval from January 1998 to March 2015. The graph shows a trend line indicating an increase in participation post-intervention.]
Percentage of Reading Test Participation for SF
Average Number of Days between Speaking Tests for SF

![Graph showing the average number of days between speaking tests over time. The graph includes data points for pre-intervention and post-intervention periods, as well as a trend line.](image-url)
Average Number of Days between Listening Tests for SF
Average Number of Days between Reading Tests for SF

![Graph showing the average number of days between reading tests for SF. The graph illustrates a trend with data points indicating pre-intervention, post-intervention, and a trend line.](Image)
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Average Speaking Proficiency for SF

![Graph showing average speaking proficiency over time with pre-intervention, post-intervention, and trend line markers.](image)
Average Listening Proficiency for SF
Average Reading Proficiency for SF

The graph illustrates the change in average reading proficiency over time in a bi-monthly interval format. The x-axis represents the time periods from January/February 1998 to March/April 2015. The y-axis shows the average reading proficiency levels, categorized into ILR 1 and ILR 1+. The data points are marked as follows:

- **Pre-intervention**: Blue circles
- **Post-intervention**: Black circles
- **Trend Line**: Gray line

The graph shows a decline in proficiency levels from pre-intervention to post-intervention, followed by an upward trend towards the end of the period.
Percentage of Scores at ILR 0+ for SF

Speaking

Listening

Reading
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Percentage of Scores at ILR 1 for SF

**Speaking**

![Graph of Speaking Scores at ILR 1]

**Listening**

![Graph of Listening Scores at ILR 1]

**Reading**

![Graph of Reading Scores at ILR 1]
Percentage of Scores at ILR 1+ for SF

Speaking

Listening

Reading
Percentage of Scores at ILR 2 for SF

Speaking

Listening

Reading
Percentage of Scores at ILR 2+ and higher for SF

Speaking

Listening

Reading
Percentages of Not Qualified for FLPB in SF

No Minimum Requirements

0/0, 0+/0, 0+/0+, 0+/1
Percentages of “Qualified” for FLPB by Qualification Level for SF

1/1

1+/1+

2/2 and Higher
Percentage of SF “Qualifying” for Money
Use of OPI at SWCS & FLPB Policy Change

Participation in Speaking Test - SWCS OPI Start

Participation in Speaking Test - FLPB Policy Change
Use of OPI at SWCS & FLPB Policy Change

Average Speaking Proficiency - SWCS OPI Start

Average Speaking Proficiency - FLPB Policy Change
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Study 3: Stakeholder Perspectives
### Methods: Survey Timeline and Response

- **2016**
  - **Survey Link Distributed** Mar 16
  - **Survey Officially Closed** Mar 28

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>03/16</th>
<th>03/18</th>
<th>03/20</th>
<th>03/22</th>
<th>03/24</th>
<th>03/26</th>
<th>03/28</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- 301 respondents clicked on the survey link.
- 206 retained after data cleaning.
  - 150 SOF Operators or SOF assigned to another duty
  - 56 Unit Commanders/Leaders
Survey Participants

ARSOC 162
- SF 121
- CA 7
- MISO 3
- Other\(^1\) 31

MARSOC 19
- AFSOC 14

SEAL 5
- SWCC 1
- Other 1

\(^1\)These survey respondents indicated that they were assigned to a deployed SO Unit or element (provisional or task force; e.g., JSOTF), JSOC, TSO, USSOCOM or Other and did not answer questions related to a specific job code.
Research questions:

1) How has participation in DLPT/OPI changed over time?
2) What factors facilitate/interfere with DLPT/OPI?
Across the studies, more than 80% of respondents took the DLPT and indicated having a requirement to take the DLPT.
SF Survey Results: Experiences with Testing (Historical Comparison)

In 2004 & 2009, less than 50% of respondents took the OPI.

In 2016, 88% took the OPI

In 2016, 66% indicated having a requirement to take the OPI
Nearly all reported most recent test within last 5 years

SF have more experience with DLPT than OPI

67% score ILR 1/1 or higher on DLPT

93% score ILR 1/1 or higher on two-skill OPI
2016 SF Survey Results: Maintenance of DLPT

**Facilitated Maintenance/Improvement of DLPT (N=104)**

- Deployment where language used: 13.46%
- Personal travel where language used: 7.69%
- Language self-study: 60.58%
- Formal language training: 49.04%
- Informal conversations with native speakers: 15.38%

**Interfered with Maintenance of DLPT (N=104)**

- Deployment where language not used: 73.08%
- No time for self-study: 65.38%
- No access to self-study: 5.77%
- Lack opportunity for formal training: 55.77%
- No opportunity to interact with native speakers: 59.62%
2016 SF Survey Results: Maintenance of OPI

Facilitated Maintenance/Improvement of OPI (N=100)

- Deployment where language used: 11.00%
- Personal travel where language used: 6.00%
- Language self-study: 56.00%
- Formal language training: 61.00%
- Informal conversations with native speakers: 21.00%

Interfered with Maintenance of OPI (N=100)

- Deployment where language not used: 69.00%
- No time for self-study: 55.00%
- No access to self-study: 8.00%
- Lack opportunity for formal training: 45.00%
- No opportunity to interact with native speakers: 51.00%
SF Survey Results: Testing Language Capability

Research questions:

1) How has receipt of FLPB changed over time?

2) Are FLPB procedures perceived to be fair/motivating?
SF Survey Results: Experiences with FLPB (Historical Comparison)

71% of SF operators indicated they currently receive FLPB

Percentage of SF operators currently receiving FLPB increased from 14% in 2009 to 71% in 2016, consistent with the policy changes.
2016 SF Survey Results: Experiences with FLPB

FLPB Compared to Other Incentive Pay (N=110)

- FLPB is less motivating: 41.8%
- FLPB is equally motivating: 40.0%
- FLPB is more motivating: 18.2%
Operators indicated the top 3 policy features that make FLPB motivating:

- Allowing the OPI (Verification Process)
- Lowering threshold to 1/1 (Eligibility Criteria)
- Pay for “plus” levels (Payout type and Amount)
Respondents were moderately satisfied with the FLPB program.

53% of respondents reported either receiving late payment or no payment.

**Satisfaction with FLPB (N=73)**

- Overall satisfaction: 2.81
- Amount per month: 2.88
- Proficiency level to qualify for FLPB: 3.04
- Scheduling a DLPT or OPI: 3.82
- FLPB application process: 2.78

**FLPB Issues Experienced (N=73)**

- FLPB amount incorrect: 8.22%
- FLP payment late or did not arrive: 53.42%
- Recoupment (had to pay back): 9.59%
- Delinquency (recent test could not be scheduled): 16.44%
- Other: 5.48%
Increasing the pay for “plus” levels was the most recommended area for change to FLPB.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What to Change to make FLPB more Motivating (N=101)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of proficiency to qualify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test used to qualify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay for multiple languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of pay at different levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More pay for “plus” levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of pay depending on language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of payment (monthly or lump sum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper limits on payment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual testing requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waivers associated with deployment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary & Conclusions
Summary

- Use of the OPI and lowering FLPB qualifying level to 1/1 were effective policy changes for SF overall (Study 1 and 2)
- Switching from OPI to DLPT to qualify for ILR 2/2 pay may be establishing a ceiling for speaking proficiency (Study 1 and 2)
- The policy changes were two of the most important motivating features of FLPB for operators (Study 3)
- Still perceived misalignment between FLPB amount and effort required
  - Language proficiency requires more time & effort compared to some other incentive pay (Study 3)
- Delayed FLPB payment or not receiving payment are prevalent issues (Study 3)
- Heavy administrative burden to collect FLPB (Study 3)
Act on Insights™ to Improve Outcomes

The ALPS Ibex™ software platform incorporates our evidence-based learning effectiveness model and data analytics to help organizations gain and act on relevant, data-driven insights to improve the learning process and outcomes.
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