

Archived Content

Information identified as archived on the Web is for reference, research or record-keeping purposes. It has not been altered or updated after the date of archiving. Web pages that are archived on the Web are not subject to the Government of Canada Web Standards.

As per the [Communications Policy of the Government of Canada](#), you can request alternate formats on the "[Contact Us](#)" page.

Information archivée dans le Web

Information archivée dans le Web à des fins de consultation, de recherche ou de tenue de documents. Cette dernière n'a aucunement été modifiée ni mise à jour depuis sa date de mise en archive. Les pages archivées dans le Web ne sont pas assujetties aux normes qui s'appliquent aux sites Web du gouvernement du Canada.

Conformément à la [Politique de communication du gouvernement du Canada](#), vous pouvez demander de recevoir cette information dans tout autre format de rechange à la page « [Contactez-nous](#) ».

CANADIAN FORCES COLLEGE / COLLÈGE DES FORCES CANADIENNES
CSC 35 / CCEM 35

EXERCISE/EXERCICE NEW HORIZONS

**THE OFFICIAL LANGUAGES PROGRAM TRANSFORMATION MODEL AND
TWO-TIER SECOND LANGUAGE TRAINING**

By /par LCdr/capf S.P. Curran

This paper was written by a student attending the Canadian Forces College in fulfillment of one of the requirements of the Course of Studies. The paper is a scholastic document, and thus contains facts and opinions that the author alone considered appropriate and correct for the subject. It does not necessarily reflect the policy or the opinion of any agency, including the Government of Canada and the Canadian Department of National Defence. This paper may not be released, quoted or copied except with the express permission of the Canadian Department of National Defence.

La présente étude a été rédigée par un stagiaire du Collège des Forces canadiennes pour satisfaire à l'une des exigences du cours. L'étude est un document qui se rapporte au cours et contient donc des faits et des opinions que seul l'auteur considère appropriés et convenables au sujet. Elle ne reflète pas nécessairement la politique ou l'opinion d'un organisme quelconque, y compris le gouvernement du Canada et le ministère de la Défense nationale du Canada. Il est défendu de diffuser, de citer ou de reproduire cette étude sans la permission expresse.

Abstract

The Department of National Defence has been widely criticized for the inefficiencies of its Official Languages Program and for its historic failure to fully comply with the Official Languages Act (OLA). The Official Languages Program Transformation Model (OLPTM) will address specific systemic shortfalls of the National Defence Official Languages Program in a bid to meet the legal compliance requirements of the Act. The OLPTM will move the Canadian Forces away from the Universal Bilingualism model of the 1990s towards the functional approach of employing the right people, with the right skill, in the right job. The OLPTM will seek to focus Second Language Training on specifically targeted Military Occupations assessed as requiring the skill to deliver the functional capability mandated by the Act at the Unit level.

This paper will examine the historic origins and institutionalization of bilingualism and biculturalism in the Canadian Forces (CF) and the factors leading up to the implementation of the Official Languages Program Transformation Model. By describing how key supporting Human Resource processes and policies have been overlooked during the implementation, it will demonstrate how the OLPTM has created a two-tier system with respect to the provision of Second Language Training that could prove damaging to affected members' careers. The paper will discuss the disadvantages of the system and the disparity that will be created for the affected military members. Finally, it will consider four corrective courses of action to remedy the disparity and propose a recommended solution.

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
Background.....	2
Quebec in the CF.....	3
The Official Languages Act.....	4
Discussion.....	6
Performance.....	7
The Function Approach.....	9
The Problem.....	12
Proposed Corrective Measures.....	16
Conclusion.....	18
Bibliography.....	19

“...I firmly believe that the language skills of the CF will be one of the traits that puts us on the map as we build an integrated Team Canada that defends this great country at home and abroad.”¹

- General Rick Hillier, Chief of the Defence Staff (CDS)

Introduction

The English and French bilingual and bicultural nature of the Canadian Forces (CF) has been a distinctive and enduring characteristic of our military since 1763. Bilingualism and biculturalism are at the very root of our identity and have been a source of strength and struggle from the beginning. In spite of this rich heritage, it was not until the 1970s that the CF formally adopted institutional bilingualism as a core tenet of its personnel policy. Under the leadership of General Victor Allard (Chief of the Defence Staff 1966 – 1969) the Canadian Forces set out to establish a military culture that would enable Francophones to serve their country in their own language. Key among General Allard’s objectives were; the provision of bilingual services (both internally and externally), proportional representation in the forces reflective of the national linguistic demographic (28% Francophone in 1968), creation of an environment in which all military personnel could seek to achieve common goals, and to provide for second language training.²

¹Department of National Defence, *Official Languages Program Transformation Model* (Ottawa: Director of Official Languages, 2006); available from http://hr.ottawa-hull.mil.ca/Dol/Engraph/TransModel_TOC_e.asp; Internet; accessed 27 February 2009, 1/41.

²Jean Pariseau and Serge Bernier. *French Canadians and Bilingualism in the Canadian Armed Forces*, Volume II: 1969 – 1987 Official languages: National Defence’s response to the Federal Policy. (Ottawa: Canada Communications Group, 1996), 1-53.

The CF has been working over the past 40 years to achieve General Allard's objectives. Beginning with the adoption of the Official Languages Act in 1969, the Department of National Defence has been working to meet its obligations regarding the use of French and English as Canada's two recognized official languages. The National Defence Official Languages Program Transformation Model (OLPTM) is the latest in a long series of policies and direction intended to make the Department compliant with the spirit and intent of the Official Languages Act. This paper will provide a brief history of the events leading up to the implementation of the OLPTM and will describe its "short term" (2007 – 2012) objectives. Next, it will attempt to explain how implementation of certain of the OLPTM's provisions have created a two-tiered system with respect to the provision of language training opportunities for Canadian Forces members. Further, the paper will explain the potential resulting negative career implications for the affected members, particularly for the Officer corps. By examining the results of the 2008 Annual Military Occupation Review (AMOR), the paper will demonstrate the extent to which the tiering will occur for Officers. Finally, possible corrective measures will be proposed to mitigate the problems and the resulting implications on members' careers.

Background

French Canada has a proud and distinguished history of service in (if not the establishment of) the Canadian Military. That history has continuously included a struggle for both linguistic and representational equality within the CF.

The surrender of Montreal in 1760 by European French forces to the British marked the beginning of the dominance of British military customs and traditions in Canada. The Pontiac uprising in 1763 saw the establishment of five companies of French Canadian militiamen by General Murray (Governor of Quebec) to repel the attack and hence the beginning of our bilingual and bicultural military heritage. The presence of French language and culture was tolerated within the French militia units but the language and culture of military leadership was singularly English. This fact remained through the war of 1812, the South African conflict, both world wars and the Korean War. It was not until the late 1950's with inquiries into the state of the conditions of service for Francophone Canadians that plans for the integration of Francophones into the CF began to take shape.³

Quebec in the CF

The modern movement towards French linguistic and cultural equality in Canada began with the “quiet revolution”⁴ in the early 1960's in Quebec and with the establishment of the Royal Commission on Biculturalism and Bilingualism in May of 1963. The Laurendeau-Dunton Commission (or the Royal Commission on B&B as it became known) was established under Prime Minister Pearson to report on the state of

³Jean Pariseau and Serge Bernier. *French Canadians and Bilingualism in the Canadian Armed Forces*, Volume I: 1763-1969: The Fear of a Parallel Army. (Ottawa: Canadian Government Publishing Centre, 1986), 29-41.

⁴Jean Pariseau and Serge Bernier. *French Canadians and Bilingualism in the Canadian Armed Forces*, Volume I: 1763-1969: The Fear of a Parallel Army. (Ottawa: Canadian Government Publishing Centre, 1986), 179-205.

biculturalism and bilingualism in Canada. Its mandate was “[to] recommend steps to ensure that the country would develop according to the principle that its two founding peoples were equal, while taking into account the contribution of other ethnic groups to our cultural enrichment.”⁵ The appointment of General Jean Victor Allard as Chief of the Defence staff (CDS) in 1966 and Leo Cadieux as the Minister of National Defence in 1967 marked a turning point that would permanently change the language, composition and structure of the Canadian Forces. Allard stated that his agreement to lead the implementation of Hellyer’s (Minister of National Defence 1963 - 1967) planned CF Unification was in exchange for an agreement that an “investigation into the situation of Francophones in the Forces would be carried out.”⁶ It was Allard’s intent to ensure that the “French fact” would be firmly included “into the framework of the new Forces.”⁷

The Official Languages Act

Since its adoption in 1969, the Official Languages Act (OLA) has continued to refine its objectives and strengthen its mandate with respect to the language of work in Canadian federal institutions and throughout the Public Service of Canada. 1982 saw the OLA formally integrated into the Constitution Act, and in 1988 a “new” Official Languages Act introduced a national regional system of linguistic designation for the federal service. The passing of Bill S-3 in 2005 re-invigorated and further strengthened

⁵*Ibid.*, 184

⁶*Ibid.*, 205

⁷*Ibid.*

the OLA by mandating that every federal institution had the duty to ensure positive measures were taken for its implementation and it granted the Governor in Council power to make regulations prescribing the manner in which those duties were to be carried out.⁸

For the Canadian Forces this has meant significant changes in organizational structure, operations, training and attitudes over the years as we attempted to keep pace with the changes in the original Act. As might be expected, 1970 saw the biggest series of change with the release of CDS Directive P3/70 entitled “Bilingualism Policy for the Canadian Armed Forces.”⁹ First and foremost the policy formalized and expanded the French Language Unit (FLU) structure that had begun with the formation of the Royal 22e regiment in 1914. Implementation of the “Unit model” would designate CF units as French language, English language and Bilingual with the intent of promoting the availability of bilingual services and to better reflect the linguistic and cultural values in proportion with the national linguistic demographic.¹⁰ Adoption of bilingualism into the Canadian forces would also mean “introducing language skill as part of the military personnel file of every member of the Canadian Forces, increasing the number of

⁸Canadian Heritage: History of Bilingualism in Canada <http://www.pch.gc.ca/pgm/lo-ol/bllng/hist-eng.cfm>; Internet; accessed 19 March 2009.

⁹Jean Pariseau and Serge Bernier. *French Canadians and Bilingualism in the Canadian Armed Forces*, Volume II: 1969 – 1987 Official languages: National Defence’s response to the Federal Policy. (Ottawa: Canada Communications Group, 1996), 7-8.

¹⁰Department of National Defence, CF Unit Language Designation: Principles and Procedures (Ottawa: NDHQ/DOL, Aug 2007);

Francophones, promoting more Francophones, and setting requirements for language skill in senior officers.”¹¹

Introduction of the regional system of linguistic designation in 1988 saw the CF move away from the Unit Model of the 1970’s to adopt a “Universal Approach” to bilingualism “[that] envisaged a CF in which all personnel were bilingual”¹². The goals of the Universal Approach were to comply with the spirit and intent of the OLA in providing bilingual services and respecting the linguistic rights of its members while simultaneously meeting the CF’s unique operational mandate that demanded a highly mobile work force. Finally, because of the symbolic nature of the CF and what it represented both nationally and internationally the Universal Approach intended that the CF should linguistically reflect the Canadian population as a whole.

Discussion

Taking the approach that its important to know where you’ve been before striking out on a new path, the next section will discuss the CF’s performance over the past forty years in its bid to becoming compliant with the Official Languages Act. A brief discussion of the CF’s performance is important because it will speak to the rationale for

¹¹Graham Fraser. *Sorry I Don’t Speak French: Confronting the Canadian crisis that won’t go away* (Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 2006), 216.

¹²Department of National Defence, *Official Languages Program Transformation Model: Executive Summary* (Ottawa: Director of Official Languages, 2006); available from http://hr.ottawa-hull.mil.ca/Dol/Engraph/TransModel_TOC_e.asp; Internet; accessed 27 February 2009, i.

the recent transformation to the “Functional Approach” and it will also provide the basis for the discussion of merit and promotion to follow later in the paper.

The CF’s performance in meeting its OLA mandate is reported in two ways. The first is through the Official Languages Annual Review report that is published by the Department of National Defence in response to a yearly call from the Public Service Human Resource Management Agency. The reports are intended to provide an annual performance “snapshot” for the Office of the Commissioner of Official Languages (OCOL) and Senior management in National Defence. The second method of performance monitoring is provided by departmental audits conducted by the Office of the Commissioner of Official Languages and by the Office of the Auditor General of Canada.

Performance

After twenty years of official bilingualism in the Canadian Forces, the 1990 Report of the Office of the Auditor General of Canada (OAG) observed that “[t]he official language training program needs improvement.”¹³ The report focused on three main areas; policies and plans, the second language training program, and bilingual ability and the promotion process. Under the first main area the report observed that the CF lacked clear policies with respect to the number of positions designated as bilingual

¹³Office of the Auditor General of Canada, 1990 Report of the Auditor General of Canada, Chapters 20-23; available from <file:///Volumes/NO%20NAME/new%20horizons/OAG%201990%20Report%20of%20the%20Auditor%20General%20of%20Canada.webarchive>; Internet; accessed 5 April 2009.

and measurable goals towards achieving those numbers. It specifically observed that the CF policy of the “bilingual Officer corps” lacked objective requirement in its establishment and lacked documented operational need. Under the Second Language Training (SLT) heading, the report observed “the Military Second Language Training Program (MSLTP) has a number of economy and efficiency difficulties”¹⁴ and specifically highlighted that it would take forty years (using the 1990 production rates) for the CF to eliminate the (then) bilingual Anglophone shortfall at an estimated cost of \$50M per year. Under the third main area the report observed that the Treasury Board had provided insufficient advice and direction with respect to how language skill should be integrated into the merit process. It was also observed under this section that “promotion policies, including the policy of a bilingual officer corps... have greatly increased the demand for language training, although there is no assurance that individuals trained will be needed in bilingual positions in the foreseeable future.”¹⁵

The 2001 report by the Office of the Commissioner of Official Languages noted that the office had completed a formal review of complaints by two officers concerning the CF’s bilingual Officer Corps policy and had determined that “the Canadian Forces must ensure that its English-speaking and French-speaking members must have equal opportunity for advancement.”¹⁶ Further the OCOL directed that “in evaluating members for promotion, the promotion marks to be awarded for bilingualism should vary with

¹⁴*Ibid.*, 22.41- 22.46.

¹⁵*Ibid.*, 22.50.

¹⁶Office Of the Commissioner of Official Languages, Annual Report 2001 – 2002, *The texture of Canada* (Ottawa: Commissioner of Official Languages, October 2002); http://www.ocol-clo.gc.ca/html/ar_ra_2001_02_e.php; Internet; accessed 14 April 2009, 73.

rank.”¹⁷

More recently, an audit on the “Language of Work” (Part V of the Official Languages Act) in National Defence Headquarters conducted between 2004 and 2005 by OCOL observed that when it came to the use of French in the workplace, leadership and organizational culture “left something to be desired”¹⁸ and that DND and the CF had a very long way to go. The report was consistent with all previous OCOL audits reporting on the CF’s performance. In a 2007 appearance before the House of Commons Standing Committee on Official Languages, Graham Fraser the current Official Languages Commissioner, reported that all of his predecessors had expressed their concerns with respect to the CF’s progress in complying with the OLA and that he felt no differently. Mr. Fraser concluded his statement by saying that the CF’s recent change to the “functional approach” represented yet another admission of failure by the Canadian Forces to achieve compliance with the OLA forty years after its passing into law.¹⁹

The Functional Approach

The Official Languages Program Transformation Model was presented to the

¹⁷*Ibid.*, 74.

¹⁸Office of the Commissioner of Official Languages, Audit of the Language of Work at National Defence Headquarters February 2006; available from http://www.ocol-clo.gc.ca/html/dnd_mdn_022006_e.php; Internet; accessed 29 March 2009, 30.

¹⁹House of Commons, Standing Committee on official Languages, Speech by Graham Fraser, Commissioner of Official Languages 1 March 2007; available from http://www.ocol-clo.gc.ca/html/speeches_discours_01032007_e.php; Internet; accessed 29 March 2009.

Parliamentary Standing Committee on Official Languages in February 2007²⁰ and implemented in DND and the CF on 1 April 2007.²¹ Beyond addressing observations of the OAG and/or the ever present criticisms of the OCOL, the Official Languages Program Transformation Model has three aims; the provision of linguistically qualified personnel in the right place and at the right time, the revitalization and enhancement of Official Languages awareness and training within DND and the CF, and the establishment of rigorous and objective measurement and monitoring of DND and CF performance. The OLPTM moves the CF away from universal bilingualism towards a functional approach to compliance with the OLA. It will address key parts of the OLA, employing both military and civilian personnel at the “Unit” level to satisfy OLA requirements and will hold Unit Commanding Officers accountable for seeing that the requirements are met. “Language requirements [will] no longer be assigned to military positions, but rather to the functions that must be provided.”²² In general the approach is appealing because it systematically focuses on the areas of the OLA in which the CF has previously been assessed as lacking. Using the “Defence Team” methodology of employing both civilian and military personnel to satisfy functional requirements it also

²⁰House of Commons, Standing Committee on Official Languages, *Minutes of the 39th Parliament, 1st session proceedings and evidence*, Tuesday, February 27, 2007; available from <http://www2.parl.gc.ca/HousePublications/Publication.aspx?DocId=2750254&Language=E&Mode=1&Parl=39&Ses=1>; Internet; accessed 29 March 2009.

²¹Department of National Defence, *Official Languages, National Defence Annual Review 2007 – 2008*; available from <http://www.cmp-cpm.forces.gc.ca/ps/hri-irh/oln-lob/2007/index-eng.asp>; Internet; accessed 27 February 2008.

²²Department of National Defence, The Maple Leaf, *Right Person, Right Place, Right Time*, Vol 11, No. 16, (30 April 2008); available from <file:///Volumes/NO%20NAME/new%20horizons/Right%20person,%20right%20place,%20right%20time%20%7C%20The%20Maple%20Leaf%20-%20Vol.%2011,%20No.%2016%20%7C%20National%20Defence%20and%20the%20Canadian%20Force.s.webarchive>; Internet; accessed 16 March 2009.

seeks to align our National Defence Act responsibilities with respect to the mobility of CF personnel with our OLA responsibilities.

In addition to implementing strategies for complying with specific parts of the OLA, the plan identifies key processes and policy realignment that must be put in place to ensure the OLPTM achieves the “desired end-state.” The implementation plan recognizes that “[i]t is not possible to transform the Official Languages Program in isolation, as it directly touches on a multitude of other human resource-related policies and programs required to support CF operations.”²³ Implementation of the functional approach will require analysis and realignment of; employment and posting policies of personnel, compliance performance measurement metrics, and second language training and testing (which occupations require training and to what level).

The OLPTM also plans to conduct an “end-to-end review of CF Human Resources Policies and Processes”²⁴ to address seven areas of CF Personnel Policy deemed critical for the functional approach to be fully implemented. Prominent among the HR policies is integration of Second Language Training (SLT) into selected Occupation Specifications, revision of the CF merit board second language scores, and the review of CF personnel selection, employment and posting policies. The implementation plan states; “[i]t is critical that the number of points awarded for

²³Department of National Defence, *Official Languages Program Transformation Model* (Ottawa: Director of Official Languages, 2006); available from http://hr.ottawa-hull.mil.ca/Dol/Engraph/TransModel_TOC_e.asp; Internet; accessed 27 February 2009, 14/41.

²⁴*Ibid.*, 17/41.

bilingualism be allocated so as not to place at a disadvantage those military members who have not been given the opportunity to become bilingual...”²⁵

The end-to-end review plan is ambitious and complicated and will rely on the support of other programs like the Military Occupation Structure Analysis, Redesign and Tailoring (MOSART) Program. MOSART will be responsible for planning and implementing the resulting occupation structure realignments.

The OLPTM will be implemented in two phases; phase one (which began in April 2007) will address short-term “Priority 1” objectives that are achievable within the 2007 to 2012 timeframe, and Priority 2 objectives will be addressed once priority 1 activities are in place. The objectives are defined by 16 activities that correspond with specific parts of the OLA (Parts III through Part VII) and are assigned priority based on time-achievability. For instance, Priority 1-Activity 1 relates to Part III of the OLA (Administration of Justice) and it seeks to “ensure that the CF Military Justice System continues to comply with the requirements of the Official Languages Act.”²⁶

²⁵*Ibid.*, 18/41.

²⁶Department of National Defence, *Official Languages Program Transformation Model: Appendices 1 & 2 to Annex D* (Ottawa: Director of Official Languages, 2006); available from http://hr.ottawa-hull.mil.ca/Dol/Engraph/TransModel_TOC_e.asp; Internet; accessed 27 February 2009.

The Problem

The problem is that the OLPTM has been only partially implemented and that many of the key, supporting activities seem to have been forgotten. For example, while the OLPTM has moved ahead and modified second language training delivery, it has not addressed the merit system that awards points for second language skill and it has not included Official Language requirements into CF occupation specifications. In fact, the MOSART program that was supposed to implement the occupation realignment activities necessary for achieving the “desired end-states” of the OLPTM was cancelled on the same day the OLPTM was implemented – 1 April 2007.²⁷ As well, communication of the plan, its intent and implications on personnel and careers has been sparse – at best. Chief of Military Personnel (CMP) who has lead on many of the key HR resource realignments has been completely silent on the topic at Annual Occupation briefings.

To better comply with the Official Languages Act and provide the improved operational efficiencies noted by the OAG in 1990, since 1 April 2007 the OLPTM has been delivering Second Language training only to specific occupations and functions that have been assessed to require the skill as part of their occupation profile (how and when this was done is unclear since MOSART was cancelled). Also, in accordance with Priority 1 Activities 8 through 12 of the OLPTM, second language training to senior officers and or those posed to become senior officers is proceeding ahead to comply with

²⁷Department of National Defence, *The MOSART project transitions to steady-state*, The Maple Leaf, Vol 11, No. 16, (18 April 2007); available from http://www.forces.gc.ca/site/Commun/ml-fe/vol_10/vol10_10/1010_full.pdf; Internet; accessed 16 March 2009, 7.

Part V of the OLA. Additionally, officer candidates attending the Royal Military College continue to receive second language training and will continue to be required to achieve a language proficiency score of (BBB) prior to successful graduation. This unfortunately leaves a large cadre of Officers who will enroll in the CF as Direct Entry Officers (DEO), Regular Officer Training Plan candidates from civilian universities (ROTP CiviU), Continuing Education Officer Training Plan candidates (CEOTP), Officers Commissioned from the ranks (CFR) and Reserve Officers who Component Transfer to the regular force who will not receive comparable language training opportunities and who will potentially be disadvantaged as a result. The OLPTM has created a two-tier system with respect to the provision of language training for a large portion of the officer corps but has failed to realign key supporting HR policies, and as a result could negatively impacted their ability to progress in their careers and to fully meet their responsibilities as leaders, supervisors and managers.

To examine the extent of the problem posed by the two-tier Second Language Training model, the results of the 2008/2009 Occupation Status List for all Naval occupations will be presented to demonstrate the present and forecasted health of the occupations with respect to manning. The OSL results feed into the Annual Military Occupation Review (AMOR), which is the process used to determine recruiting and retention forecasts leading up to production of the CF Strategic Intake plan (SIP).²⁸ The OSL compares the “Preferred Manning Level” (PML), which is the aggregate of jobs or positions that must be filled by a particular occupation, with the “Trained Effective

²⁸Department of National Defence, CF Mil Pers Instr 01/08 – *Annual Military Occupation Review* (Ottawa: 2008), 5/9.

Strength” (TES), which is an estimate of the number of fully trained individuals available to fill the positions. The AMOR results are used to produce near, medium and long-term recruitment and retention forecasts.²⁹ The process also produces a Long Range Planning Model (LRPM) which is the breakdown of total planned recruitment by intake source (DEO versus ROTP versus CFR etc.) that must be selected to satisfy the near, medium, and long-term personnel demand horizons.

Table 1 below presents an excerpt of the 08/09 Occupation Status List showing the state of Naval occupations as of March 2008. The large delta between PML and TES (“the RED occupations”) is presently consistent with the average “health” of all occupations across the CF.³⁰

²⁹*Ibid.*

³⁰The health of all CF Occupations is shown in the 2008 / 2009 Occupation Status available from http://hr.ottawa-hull.mil.ca/dgmp/dpgr/downloads/parra_psr_bpd/occ_status_0809_v1_b.xls

Table 1: Occupation Status for Naval Occupations (2008/2009)³¹

Occupation Status List FY 08/09 (Based on Spring 2008 PSR)					
OCCUPATION/M/TIER	Forecast TES for Mar 09 as of 31 Mar 08/ Pr'vision NPD pour mar 09 en date de 31 mar 087	PML for Mar 09 as of 31 Mar 08/ EQA for mar 09 en date de 31 mar 08	Forecast % TES vs TEE	Status for Mar 2009/Stat en mars 2009	REMARKS
MARS/MAR SS	853	961	88.8%	red/rouge	11.2% below PML, PML has increased, long term
MS ENG/GSM	223	249	89.6%	red/rouge	10.4% below PML, steady, long term recovery
NAV ENG/O GM	61	66	92.4%	amber/ambre	Small occ, declining and feeder occs are red
NCS ENG/GSCN	203	269	75.5%	red/rouge	24.5% below PML, very slow recovery
BOSN/MAN	472	517	91.3%	amber/ambre	8.7% below PML, recovering
CL DVR/DPD	114	126	90.5%	amber/ambre	Small occ, 9.5% below PML, mostly CT/OT-in occ,
E TECH/LECTROTEC I	269	318	84.6%	red/rouge	15.4% below PML. Terminal occ fed from MAR EL. Decl
H TECH/TECH COQUE	331	349	94.8%	amber/ambre	5.2% below PML, TES declining
MAR EL/L MAR	112	122	91.8%	amber/ambre	Small occ, feeder to E Tech
MAR ENG ART/MM C MAR	245	342	71.6%	red/rouge	Combined occ Red, 11.7% below PML, declining. Mar
MAR ENG MECH/M C MAR	229	297	77.1%	red/rouge	Eng Mech feeder for Mar Eng Tech. Cert 3 issues at P02
MAR ENG TECH/TECH M C N	418	371	112.7%	green/vert	Mar Eng Art
NAV COMM/COMM NAV	628	740	84.9%	red/rouge	15.1% below PML. Medium term recovery
NCI OP/OP EICM	399	422	94.5%	amber/ambre	5.5% below PML.
NE TECH (SONAR)/LECTRO	132	200	66.0%	red/rouge	34% below PML, not recovering
NE TECH (C)/LECTRON (C)	202	242	83.5%	red/rouge	16.5% below PML, not recovering
NE TECH (M)/LECTRON (S)	65	82	79.3%	red/rouge	20.7% below PML. A terminal occ/feeders, not recovering
NE TECH (RADAR)/LECTRON	238	333	71.5%	red/rouge	28.5% below PML, not recovering
NES OP/OP DEM	347	369	94.0%	amber/ambre	6% below PML
NW TECH/TECH AN	374	434	86.2%	red/rouge	13.8% below PML, medium term recovery
SONAR OP/OP SONAR	384	452	85.0%	red/rouge	15% below PML, medium term recovery/declining
STWD/STWD	271	311	87.1%	red/rouge	
CMS Total/Total Marine	6570	7572	86.8%	14 RED	

Table 2: Naval Technical Officer - Long Range Planning Model (2008 – 2016)³²

	08/09	09/10	10/11	11/12	12/13	13/14	14/15	15/16	16/17
New ROTP SIP	40	40	40	24	24	24	24	24	24
New DEO SIP	43	43	32	25	24	24	24	24	24
New UTPNCM SIP	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
New CFR SIP	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
Total	95	95	84	61	60	60	60	60	60

Table 2 shows the Long Range Planning Model for the Naval Technical Officer (NTO) occupations. A single occupation grouping is displayed for demonstration purposes only, since each of the 109 CF occupations would generate its own long range recruiting

³¹Department of National Defence, Occupation Status Report 2008 – 2009 (Ottawa: Director General Military Personnel, 2008); available from http://hr.ottawa-hull.mil.ca/dgmp/dpgr/downloads/parra_psr_bpd/occ_status_0809_v1_b.xls; DWAN; accessed 27 February 2008.

³²*Ibid.*

model. Table 2 indicates the intake required to bring the NTO occupation back to health (i.e., PML = TES) over a 9 year planning horizon. The model shows that on average, 60% of the planned NTO intake over the next 9 years will come from sources other than the Royal Military College. Given the present consistency in health across the vast majority of CF occupations, especially in the officer corps, if the present recruiting trend continues (and there is no reason to expect that it will not given the present CF attrition rates and the plan to expand the CF to 70,000 personnel),³³ then the OLPTM Second Language Training plan will produce a very large population of officers over a short time, who will not be offered SLT. Under the present HR construct this group will be severely disadvantaged with respect to second language skill assigned merit points, leadership responsibilities and opportunities in one of Canada's two official languages.

Possible Corrective Measures

Four viable courses of action (COA) will be proposed to mitigate or correct the tiering effect that the functional approach of the OLPTM will create. Each COA will be presented with a corresponding implementation plan, and pros and cons of each will be discussed.

³³Department of National Defence, *CF Personnel Management Report – September 2008* (Ottawa: Chief Military Personnel, 2008); available from http://hr.ottawa-hull.mil.ca/dgmp/dmpsc/downloads/cf_pers_mgt_report/eng; DWAN; accessed 27 February 2009, slide 3.

COA 1: SLT upon completion of Basic Military Officer Qualification: this option would be a return to the Bilingual Officer Corps approach (pre-2007), where a 33-week SLT block course is delivered immediately following Basic Officer Military Qualification (BOMQ). The objective would be to deliver SLT to all new junior officers during Development Period 1 (DP1) that would bring the officer to the BBB or BCB intermediate level. The advantages of this approach are that the training is delivered early in the officer's career and can be built upon in subsequent occupation training and initial leadership positions. It would not interfere with initial occupation qualification (IOQ) training and in fact, could be re-enforced if some of the IOQ training was delivered in the second language. The approach would bring all junior officers to a common initial second language skill level. The key to the long-term success of this approach is to implement programmed re-qualification annually or semi-annually (the current 5 year qualification is too long and results in significant skills fade). The disadvantage of this approach is there is risk of subsequent occupation training failure and or release for other reasons, and therefore loss of investment as noted by OAG in the 1990 audit.³⁴

COA 2: Insertion of SLT at specific points in DP1 and DP2: this option would incorporate SLT blocks into specific locations of the IOQ training program for all officers. It would be delivered in 2 or 3, 10-to-15 week sessions, again resulting in a 33-week total program length and producing the BBB or BCB intermediate skill level. The advantages are that the training is spread out so the risk of lost investment is mitigated,

³⁴Office of the Auditor General of Canada, 1990 Report of the Auditor General of Canada, Chapters 20-23; available from <file:///Volumes/NO%20NAME/new%20horizons/OAG%201990%20Report%20of%20the%20Auditor%20General%20of%20Canada.webarchive>; Internet; accessed 5 April 2009.

all officers would have the same initial language qualification upon completion, and the training is delivered early in the officer's career. The disadvantages are that, because IOQ training varies so widely in length and intensity from one occupation to the next, it would be difficult to coordinate common SLT across all of the CF. Also, since it would be necessary to run so many different SLT programs, it would be prohibitively expensive as compared with the economies of scale of COA 1.

COA 3: Removal of merit points for Second Language Skill (SLS): this option would be to properly implement the OLPTM approach. SLT would be delivered only to those occupations or functions assessed as requiring the skill and it would be treated as an occupational qualification much like basic navigation is for the MARS officer or initial fixed wing qualification is for pilots. Merit points would be Occupation Qualification based. While this would solve the merit issue, it would result in many fewer officers acquiring second language training or skill. Progression for these Officers into senior ranks would be hampered since SLS is required by Senior Officers in accordance with part V of the OLA. Also, the unilingual officer would be geographically limited to unilingual regions or unilingual positions in bilingual regions at best. Their abilities to lead, mentor, manage and council their subordinates would be limited and the inherent national symbolic nature that bilingual capability brings Officers in the Canadian Forces would be diminished.

COA 4: Continuous learning approach with graduated merit system based on rank: this option is a blending of COA 1, 2 and 3. SLT would be delivered to all officers on

completion of BOMQ to achieve an initial qualification level. The initial training would be confirmed and improved upon throughout the officer's IOQ training and initial employment period (DP1 and DP2). Officers employed in occupations or functions assessed as requiring a second language skill would be given more training to achieve a greater competency. Re-assessment and further training would be annual or semiannual and training would be shorter in duration, courses would be higher in frequency and given over a longer period. Second language skill based merit points would be graduated based on rank and increasing in value as rank and requirement progressed.

Conclusion

“My Vision for the Canadian Forces (CF) is of an integrated Team Canada. This team will draw strength from its ability to conduct operations in English and in French.”

General Rick Hillier.

This paper presented a brief history of bilingualism and biculturalism in the Canadian Forces. It described how under the leadership of General Victor Allard the “French fact” was incorporated into the framework of the CF during Unification. It explained how the CF has moved away from universal bilingualism to the functional approach of the Official Languages Program Transformation Model (OLPTM).

The paper attempted to explain how this move has created a two-tier system of language training in the CF. It described how the present partial implementation of the Model's key supporting objectives has exacerbated the issue of merit points awarded for

second language skill in spite of the observations by the Office of the Auditor General of Canada and the Office of the Commissioner of Official Languages. Instead of being the source of strength General Hillier had hoped it would be the OLPTM will deplete our strength to conduct operations in both official languages. As shown using the 2008 AMOR results, the functional approach will continue to weaken language ability and widen the chasm between those who receive training and those who do not.

The paper concluded by presenting four possible courses of action to correct the tiered second language training effect and the associated supporting human resource policy shortfalls. COA 4 is the recommended course of action since it preserves and promotes second language training throughout all officers' careers and it reasonably addresses the Human Resource issues of training equality and merit. The functional approach proposed by the OLPTM can probably ensure "technical" compliance with the OLA but it will do so at the cost of the spirit and the intent of the Act. Perhaps the misalignment of the National Defence Act with the Official languages Act discussed here, and the criticisms of the OAG and OCOL are just the cost of doing business. Commissioner Fraser noted that "[o]ther national organizations in Canadian life have not had to deal with the language implications of such a primal reality as the military faces. Nor have they been as successful."³⁵ The CF would be shortsighted if it permitted our past successes in the promotion of bilingualism and second language training to recede just so that we could "technically" comply with the OLA.

³⁵Graham Fraser. *Sorry I Don't Speak French: Confronting the Canadian crisis that won't go away*, (Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 2006), 220.

Bibliography

- Canada. Department of National Defence, CF Mil Pers Instr 01/08 – *Annual Military Occupation Review*. Ottawa: 2008.
- Canada. Department of National Defence, *CF Personnel Management Report – September 2008*. Ottawa: Chief Military Personnel; 2008 available from http://hr.ottawa-hull.mil.ca/dgmp/dmpsc/downloads/cf_pers_mgt_report/eng; DWAN; accessed 27 February 2009.
- Canada. Department of National Defence, *Occupation Status Report 2008 – 2009*. Ottawa: Director General Military Personnel, 2008; available from http://hr.ottawa-hull.mil.ca/dgmp/dpgr/downloads/parra_psr_bpd/occ_status_0809_v1_b.xls; DWAN; accessed 27 February 2008.
- Canada. Department of National Defence, *Official Languages Program Transformation Model*. Ottawa: Director of Official Languages, 2006; available from http://hr.ottawa-hull.mil.ca/Dol/Engraph/TransModel_TOC_e.asp; Internet; accessed 27 February 2009, 14/41.
- Canada. Department of National Defence, *Official Languages Program Transformation Model: Appendices 1 & 2 to Annex D*. Ottawa: Director of Official Languages, 2006; available from http://hr.ottawa-hull.mil.ca/Dol/Engraph/TransModel_TOC_e.asp; Internet; accessed 27 February 2009.
- Canada. Department of National Defence, *Official Languages, National Defence Annual Review 2007 – 2008*; available from <http://www.cmp-cpm.forces.gc.ca/ps/hri-irh/oln-lob/2007/index-eng.asp>; Internet; accessed 27 February 2008.
- Canada. Department of National Defence, *The Maple Leaf, Right Person, Right Place, Right Time*, Vol 11, No. 16 (30 April 2008); available from <file:///Volumes/NO%20NAME/new%20horizons/Right%20person,%20right%20place,%20right%20time%20%7C%20The%20Maple%20Leaf%20-%20Vol.%2011,%20No.%2016%20%7C%20National%20Defence%20and%20the%20Canadian%20Forces.webarchive>; Internet; accessed 16 March 2009.
- Canada. Department of National Defence, *The MOSART project transitions to steady-state*, *The Maple Leaf*, Vol 11, No. 16, (18 April 2007); available from http://www.forces.gc.ca/site/Commun/ml-fe/vol_10/vol10_10/1010_full.pdf; Internet; accessed 16 March 2009, 7.
- Canada. House of Commons, Standing Committee on official Languages, Speech by Graham Fraser, Commissioner of Official Languages 1 March 2007; available

- from http://www.ocol-clo.gc.ca/html/speeches_discours_01032007_e.php;
Internet; accessed 29 March 2009.
- Canada. House of Commons, Standing Committee on Official Languages, *Minutes of the 39th Parliament, 1st session proceedings and evidence*, Tuesday, February 27, 2007; available from <http://www2.parl.gc.ca/HousePublications/Publication.aspx?DocId=2750254&Language=E&Mode=1&Parl=39&Ses=1>; Internet; accessed 29 March 2009.
- Canada. Office of the Auditor General of Canada, *1990 Report of the Auditor General of Canada*, Chapters 20-23; available from <file:///Volumes/NO%20NAME/new%20horizons/OAG%201990%20Report%20of%20the%20Auditor%20General%20of%20Canada.webarchive>; Internet; accessed 5 April 2009.
- Canada. Office of the Commissioner of Official Languages, *Audit of the Language of Work at National Defence Headquarters February 2006*; available from http://www.ocol-clo.gc.ca/html/dnd_mdn_022006_e.php; Internet; accessed 29 March 2009, 30.
- Canada. Office Of the Commissioner of Official Languages, *Annual Report 2001 – 2002: The texture of Canada* (Ottawa: Commissioner of Official Languages, October 2002); http://www.ocol-clo.gc.ca/html/ar_ra_2001_02_e.php; Internet; accessed 14 April 2009.
- Canada. Canadian Heritage: *History of Bilingualism in Canada*; <http://www.pch.gc.ca/pgm/lo-ol/bllng/hist-eng.cfm>; Internet; accessed 19 March 2009.
- Canada. Department of National Defence, *CF Unit Language Designation: Principles and Procedures*. Ottawa: NDHQ/DOL, Aug 2007.
- Fraser, Graham. *Sorry I Don't Speak French: Confronting the Canadian crisis that won't go away*. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 2006.
- Pariseau, Jean and Bernier, Serge. *French Canadians and Bilingualism in the Canadian Armed Forces, Volume I: 1763-1969: The Fear of a Parallel Army*. Ottawa: Canadian Government Publishing Centre, 1986.
- Pariseau, Jean and Bernier, Serge. *French Canadians and Bilingualism in the Canadian Armed Forces, Volume II: 1969 – 1987 Official languages: National Defence's response to the Federal Policy*. Ottawa: Canada Communications Group, 1996.