



Test Analysis Report

International Board Certified Lactation Consultant® (IBCLC®) Certification Examination

2017 April Administrations

Prepared for the:

International Board of Lactation Consultant Examiners® (IBLCE®)

Prepared by:

**Lawrence J. Fabrey, PhD
Senior Vice President, Psychometrics Division**

and

**Lily Chuang, MS
Associate Psychometrician**

Copyright © 2017. International Board of Lactation Consultant Examiners® (IBLCE®). PROPRIETARY. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying or recording, or any information retrieval system, without permission in writing from IBLCE.

**Test Analysis Report
International Board of Lactation Consultant Examiners® (IBLCE®)
International Board Certified Lactation Consultant® (IBCLC®)
Certification Examination
2017 April Administrations**

Overview

The IBCLC certification examination 2017 April test form was administered in 455 locations across 40 countries and territories in English (British). A total of 1,493 candidates sat for the examination in April 2017. All candidates tested through computer-based test (CBT).

Test Construction

The IBCLC certification examination is based on a detailed content outline that was derived from a practice analysis completed in 2014 by the Board, in conjunction with its Examination Committee members and a Representative Panel of Experts (RPE). On the basis of this study, the Board arranged the examination content according to content areas and chronological periods. The detailed content outline appears in its entirety on the IBLCE website (www.iblce.org).

The examination is scored as a single integrated test. However, it has two multiple-choice item formats: text-based and image-based multiple-choice. The images usually present a photograph depicting an aspect of breastfeeding, or breast anatomy or pathology that the candidates must resolve. These test items have a particularly high degree of clinical relevance. Of the 175 items comprising the test, 85 reference images.

Following standard operating procedures, the 2017 April form was developed by an Examination Committee that prepared, reviewed, edited, and selected test items. The Committee includes broad geographic and practice setting representation of subject matter experts.

A preliminary item analysis was conducted after test administrations using all candidate score data ($n = 1,493$). Psychometrics staff at PSI Services (PSI) reviewed the preliminary item analysis with members of the Examination Committee to confirm the appropriateness of potentially problematic items (i.e., those with slightly irregular statistics or adverse candidate comments). Appropriate item scoring changes were made as needed.

Test Scoring

These statistics are computed for the first-time candidate population of 988 candidates, based on the combined text-based and image-based portions. The statistics are presented for the overall test rather than for the two subtests because the examination was designed and intended to be one comprehensive, integrated test.

The distribution of raw scores for first-time candidates ($n = 988$) had a slight negative skew (see *Figure 1*). Reliability (KR20) of scores from first-time candidate responses to the 175-item test was 0.86, the standard error of measurement (SEM) was 4.92, the conditional SEM at the cut score was 5.50, and single administration decision consistency index estimates were 0.90¹ and 0.92². The mean test score was 137.36 with a standard deviation of 13.15.




Figure 1. Distribution of Raw Scores for First-Time Candidates

¹Subkoviak, M. (1976). Estimating reliability from a single administration of a criterion-referenced test. *Journal of Educational Measurement*, 13(4), 7-10.

²Livingston, S. A., & Lewis, C. (1995). Estimating the consistency and accuracy of classifications based on test scores. *Journal of Educational Measurement*, 32, 179-197.

The performance for each content area based on all candidates is shown in Table 1. Candidates received scores in these seven major content areas, along with guidance on how to interpret these scores for either retesting (for unsuccessful candidates) or future professional development (for passing candidates).

**Table 1. Candidate Performance Summary for All Candidates
by Content Area
(n = 1,493, % passing =83.92)**

Content Area	n of Items	Mean
I. Development and Nutrition	26	20.06
II. Physiology and Endocrinology	24	18.60
III. Pathology	31	23.35
IV. Pharmacology and Toxicology	13	9.81
V. Psychology, Sociology, and Anthropology	21	16.73
VI. Techniques	25	19.88
VII. Clinical Skills	35	29.11
Total	175	137.55

Test Results

Established statistical procedures for test equating were conducted to adjust for differences in difficulty across test forms and to maintain the minimum competency standard pre-established by the IBLCE. After adjusting scoring for the item, the 2017 April form was equated to the 2016 April form using 44 equator items as identified at the exam development stage. The IBLCE approved and adopted a final cut score of 125 raw score units (out of 175) for the 2017 April test form.

Final results for the examination forms are shown in Tables 2 and 3, displaying means and pass/fail summary by certification status, eligibility pathway, respectively.

Table 2. Mean Score and Pass/Fail Summary by Certification Status

Certification Status	N	Mean	% Passing
Initial Certification	988	137.36	85.02
Recertification by Exam at 5 Years	8	145.50	100.00
Recertification by Exam at 10 Years	179	144.97	96.09
Recertification by Exam at 15 Years	21	141.81	95.24
Recertification by Exam at 20 Years	88	147.72	100.00
Recertification by Exam at 25 Years	5	150.20	100.00
Recertification by Exam at 30 Years	6	151.17	100.00
Repeater	162	123.04	50.62
Lapsed	36	137.72	88.89
Total	1,493	137.55	83.92

Table 3. Mean Score and Pass/Fail Summary by Eligibility Pathway

Pathway	N	Mean	% Passing
Pathway 1*	1,069	135.42	80.64
Pathway 2**	24	132.17	75.00
Pathway 3***	41	141.00	90.24

*Pathway 1: Health professionals and non-health professionals earning clinical hours in an appropriate setting

**Pathway 2: Accredited Academic Programs

***Pathway 3: Mentorship for clinical hours with an IBCLC