

1 and 2 June 2016 Board of Visitors Meeting
of the
Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center
Monterey, California

1 – 2 June 2016 Contents

TAB A-	Administrative Details
TAB B-	Meeting Agenda
TAB C-	Minutes
TAB D-	Subcommittee Members/Mission/Meeting Purpose
TAB E-	Observers and Guests
TAB F-	Handouts
TAB G-	Actions Forwarded to the AEA

TAB A - Administrative Details FEDERAL REGISTER ANNOUNCEMENT

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Army

Army Education Advisory Subcommittee Meeting Notice

AGENCY: Department of the Army, DoD.

ACTION: Notice of open Subcommittee meeting.

SUMMARY: The Department of the Army is publishing this notice to announce the following Federal advisory committee meeting of the Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center Board of Visitors, a subcommittee of the Army Education Advisory Committee. This meeting is open to the public.

DATES: The Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center (DLIFLC) Board of Visitors Subcommittee will meet from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on June 1 and 2, 2016.

ADDRESSES: Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center, Building 326, Weckerling Center, Presidio of Monterey, CA 93944.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Detlev Kesten, the Alternate Designated Federal Officer for the subcommittee, in writing at Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center, ATFL-APAS-AA, Bldg. 634, Presidio of Monterey, CA 93944, by e-mail at detlev.kestev@dliflc.edu, or by telephone at (831) 242-6670.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The subcommittee meeting is being held under the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act of 1972 (5 U.S.C., Appendix, as amended), the Government in the Sunshine Act of 1976 (5 U.S.C. 552b, as amended), and 41 CFR 102-3.150.

Purpose of the Meeting: The purpose of the meeting is to provide the subcommittee with briefings and information focusing on the Institute's plan for its students to achieve higher proficiency scores on the Defense Language Proficiency Test (DLPT). The subcommittee will also receive an update on the Institute's accreditation and will address administrative matters.

Proposed Agenda: June 1 - The subcommittee will receive briefings associated with DLIFLC's higher proficiency goals and the Institute's actions in supporting said goal. The subcommittee will be updated on the Institute's on going self-study to reaffirm its academic accreditation. The subcommittee will complete administrative procedures and appointment requirements. June 2 - The subcommittee will have time to discuss and compile observations pertaining to agenda items. General deliberations leading to provisional findings will be referred to the Army Education Advisory Committee for deliberation by the Committee under the open-meeting rules.

Public Accessibility to the Meeting: Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b, as amended, and 41 CFR 102–3.140 through 102–3.165, and subject to the availability of space, this meeting is open to the public. Seating is on a first to arrive basis. Attendees are requested to submit their name, affiliation, and daytime phone number seven business days prior to the meeting to Mr. Kesten, via electronic mail, the preferred mode of submission, at the address listed in the “FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT” section. Members of the public attending the subcommittee meetings will not be permitted to present questions from the floor or speak to any issue under consideration by the subcommittee. Because the meeting of the subcommittee will be held in a Federal Government facility on a military base, security screening is required. A photo ID is required to enter base. Please note that security and gate guards have the right to inspect vehicles and persons seeking to enter and exit the installation. Weckerling Center is fully handicap accessible. Wheelchair access is available on the right side of the main entrance of the building. For additional information about public access procedures, contact Mr. Kesten, the subcommittee’s Alternate Designated Federal Officer, at the email address or telephone number listed in the “FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT” section.

Written Comments or Statements: Pursuant to 41 CFR 102-3.105(j) and 102-3.140 and section 10(a)(3) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, the public or interested organizations may submit written comments or statements to the subcommittee, in response to the stated agenda of the open meeting or in regard to the subcommittee’s mission in general. Written comments or statements should be submitted to Mr. Kesten, the subcommittee Alternate Designated Federal Officer, via electronic mail, the preferred mode of submission, at the address listed in the “**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**” section. Each page of the comment or statement must include the author's name, title or affiliation, address, and daytime phone number. The Alternate Designated Federal Official will review all submitted written comments or statements and provide them to members of the subcommittee for their consideration. Written comments or statements being submitted in response to the agenda set forth in this notice must be received by the Alternate Designated Federal Official at least seven business days prior to the meeting to be considered by the subcommittee. Written comments or statements received after this date may not be provided to the subcommittee until its next meeting.

Pursuant to 41 CFR 102-3.140d, the Committee is not obligated to allow a member of the public to speak or otherwise address the Committee during the meeting. Members of the public will be permitted to make verbal comments during the Committee meeting only at the time and in the manner described below. If a member of the public is interested in making a verbal comment at the open meeting, that individual must submit a request, with a brief statement of the subject matter to be addressed by the comment, at least seven business days in advance to the subcommittee’s Alternate Designated Federal Official, via electronic mail, the preferred mode of submission, at the address listed in the “FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT” section. The Alternate Designated Federal Official will log each request, in the order received, and in consultation with the Subcommittee Chair, determine whether the subject matter of each comment is relevant to the Subcommittee’s mission and/or the topics to be addressed in this public meeting. A 15-minute period near the end of the meeting will be available for verbal public comments. Members of the public who have requested to make a verbal comment and whose comments have been deemed

relevant under the process described above, will be allotted no more than three minutes during the period, and will be invited to speak in the order in which their requests were received by the Alternate Designated Federal Official.

Brenda S. Bowen, Army Federal Register Liaison Officer.
[FR Doc. [2016-10001](#) Filed 4-28-16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5001-03-P

TAB B - Meeting Agenda

**Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center
Board of Visitors (BoV) Meeting
1 – 2 June 2016**

Wednesday, 1 June 2016

- 7:30 am Leave Portola Plaza lobby for the Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center
- Escort: Mr. Detlev Kesten, ADFO
- 7:55 am Arrive Weckerling Center, Presidio of Monterey, Bay View Room
- Park in Reserved Visitor Parking Space (4 parking spaces marked by pylon)
- Received by Dr. Betty Lou Leaver, DLIFLC Provost
- 8:00 am – 8:30 am Welcome Reception and Welcome Remarks, Bay View Room, Weckerling Center
- COL Phillip J. Deppert, DLIFLC Commandant
- Dr. Betty Lou Leaver, Provost, DLIFLC
- Attendees at (1) Below
- 8:30 am – 8:45 am Call to Order
- Dr. Richard Brecht, BoV Chair
- BoV FACA Compliance, Administrative Business, Welcome New Member
- Mr. Detlev Kesten, ADFO
- 8:45 am – 9:30 am Ethics Briefing, Bay View Room, Weckerling Center
- Presenter: Mr. Michael Bruun, Paralegal, SJA
- 9:30 am – 9:45 am Break
- 9:45 am – 10:30 am Introduction of Topic: Testing, Bay View Room, Weckerling Center
1. Introduction by COL Phillip J. Deppert, Commandant
2. Col Keith M. Logeman, Assistant Commandant, DLIFLC
3. Dr. Betty Lou Leaver, Provost
4. Mr. Kalman Weinfeld, Director, Language Proficiency Assessment (LPAD)
Attendees:
- Mr. Steve Collins, Chief of Staff
- Dr. Chung Yao Kao, Chief, Test Production
- Dr. Seamus Rogan, Lead Psychometrician
- Dr. Pradyumna Amatya, Assistant Director, LPAD
- Mr. Detlev Kesten, ADFO

- 10:30 am – 11:30 am Language Proficiency Assessment Overview, Bay View Room, Weckerling Center
- Mr. Kalman Weinfeld, Director
- 11:30 am – 12:30 pm Test Development Overview, Bay View Room, Weckerling Center
- Dr. Chung Yao Kao, Chief, Test Production
- 12:30 pm – 1:15 pm BoV Working Lunch, Bay View Room, Weckerling Center
- COL Phillip J. Deppert, Commandant
- Col Keith M. Logeman, Assistant Commandant
- Dr. Betty Lou Leaver, Provost
- Mr. Kalman Weinfeld, Director, LPAD
- Mr. Detlev Kesten, ADFO
- 1:15 pm – 2:15 pm OPI Overview, Bay View Room, Weckerling Center
- Dr. Pradyumna Amatya, Assistant Director, LPAD
- 2:15 pm – 3:15 pm Test Reliability Overview, Bay View Room, Weckerling Center
- Dr. Seamus Rogan, Lead Psychometrician
- 3:15 pm – 3:30 pm Move to Bldg 611, Testing Center
- 3:30 pm – 4:30 pm Tour of Testing Center & Mock DLPT
- Mr. Brent Eickholt, Chief, Test Management
- 4:30 pm Adjournment

Thursday, 2 June 2016

- 7:30 am BoV leaves Portola Plaza for Weckerling Center, Presidio of Monterey
- Escorted by Mr. Detlev Kesten, ADFO
- 8:00 am Call to Order, Bay View Room, Weckerling Center
- Dr. Richard Brecht, BoV Chair
- 8:00 am – 8:45 am Commandant's Priorities
- COL Phillip J. Deppert, DLIFLC Commandant
- Col Keith M. Logeman, DLIFLC Assistant Commandant
- Dr. Betty Lou Leaver, Provost
- Mr. Detlev Kesten, ADFO
- 8:45 am – 9:00 am Break & Official BoV picture
Location: Weckerling Center steps

9:00 am – 10:30 am	Commandant's Priorities (cont.)
10:30 am – 10:45 am	Break
10:45 am – 11:45 am	Commandant's Priorities (cont.)
11:45 pm – 12:30 pm	BoV working lunch (start outbrief compilation), Bay View Room, Weckerling Center - Attendees at (2) below
12:30 pm – 2:00 pm	BoV time to compile Outbrief, cont. Bay View Room, Weckerling Center
2:00 pm – 2:30 pm	BoV Outbrief to DLIFLC Commandant and Provost Bay View Room, Weckerling Center
2:30 pm – 2:45 pm	Break
2:45 pm – 3:00 pm	BoV Administration: Meeting Evaluation, Scheduling, Bay View Room, Weckerling Center - Mr. Detlev Kesten, ADFO
3:00 pm – 3:15 pm	BoV Outbrief to DLI Leadership, Staff & Faculty, Gold Room, Weckerling Center - Attendees at (3) below
3:15 pm – 3:30 pm	Closing Remarks by Col Keith M. Logeman, Assistant Commandant
3:30 pm	Adjournment
3:30 pm	Van departs for hotel - Escort: Mr. Detlev Kesten, ADFO

(1) Attendees for 1 June Welcome Reception

Dr. Richard Brecht, Member, Board of Visitors
 Amb. Ruth A. Davis, Retired, Member, Board of Visitors
 Dr. James Keagle, Col, Retired, Member, Board of Visitors
 Dr. Ervin Rokke, Lt Gen, Retired, Member, Board of Visitors
 Dr. Galal Walker, Member, Board of Visitors
 Dr. William Whobrey, Member, Board of Visitors
 Mr. Craig Wilson, Member, Board of Visitors
 COL Phillip J. Deppert, Commandant, DLIFLC
 Col Keith M. Logeman, Assistant Commandant, DLIFLC
 COL Paul W. Fellingner Jr, Garrison Commander, POM
 Mr. Steve Collins, Chief of Staff
 Dr. Betty Lou Leaver, Provost

Mr. Richard Chastain, DCSR
Mr. Brian Perry, DCSP
Ms. Terry Brutzman, DCSIT
Ms. Clare Bugary, DCSOPS
CSM Matildo Coppi, Installation CSM
SGM James V. Southern, Provost SGM
Mr. Detlev Kesten, Associate Provost for Academic Support & ADFO
Mr. Steve Koppany, Assistant Associate Provost, Academic Support
Dr. Hiam Kanbar, Acting Associate Provost, UGE
Dr. Parandeh Kia, Assistant Provost, UGE
Dr. Christine Campbell, Associate Provost, Continuing Education
Mr. Kalman Weinfeld, Director, Testing Division
Dr. Natalie Fryberger, Director, OSAE
Dr. Andrew Corin, OSAE
Dr. Rob Savukinas, OSAE
Mr. Sergei Entis, OSAE
Dr. Gerd Brendel, Chief, Test Review and Education Division
Dr. Chung Yao Kao, Chief, Test Production Division
Dr. Seumas Rogan, Chief, Test Design and Analysis Division
Dr. Pradyumna Amatya, Deputy Director of Language Proficiency Assessment Directorate
Mr. Brent Eickholt, Chief, Test Management Division
Dr. Rong Yuan, Dean, Resident Education
Dr. Hassane Bouhaja, Dean, Extension Programs
Dr. Ra'ed Qasem, Dean, Field Support
LTC Derrick Long, Commander, 229th BN
Lt Col Allison Galford, Commander, 17 TW
Lt Col James McCullough, Commander, 17 TW
CDR Andrew Newsome, Commander, CIDU
LtCol Rodrick McHaty, Commander, MCD
Mr. Sam Lipsky, NSA Representative to DLIFLC
Ms. Pamela Taylor, Director, Academic Affairs
Mr. Mike Vezilich, Dean, Distance Education
Capt Karmisha Reeb, Acting Dean, UEL
Dr. Deanna Tovar, Dean, UMB
Dr. Marina Cobb, Dean, UAB
Dr. Jeanette Edwards, Dean, UAA
Dr. Shen-Sheng Zhu, Dean, UMA
Dr. Hye-Yeon Lim, Dean, UCL
Dr. Viktoriya Shevchenko, Dean, UMC
Dr. Mica Hall, Dean, UPF
Dr. Mina Lee, Acting Director, Training & Analysis
Dr. Hyekyung Sung-Frear, Director, Student Learning Services
Ms. Grazyna Dudney, Director, Faculty Development Support
Ms. Masako Boureston, Director, Curriculum Development Support
Ms. Tammy Lowery, Acting Director, Library
Ms. Eileen Mehmedali, Director, Immersion Language Office
Dr. Mahera Harouny, President, Academic Senate, DLIFLC

Dr. Blaine Erickson, Secretary, Academic Senate, DLIFLC
Dr. Mohammad Meimandi, Vice-President, Academic Senate, DLIFLC
Mr. Reuf Borovac, President, AFGE Local 1263
Dr. Stephen Payne, DLIFLC Historian _
Ms. Natela A. Cutter, DLIFLC PAO Chief

(2) Attendees for 1 June - Working Lunch

Dr. Richard Brecht, Member, Board of Visitors
Amb. Ruth A. Davis, Retired, Member, Board of Visitors
Dr. James Keagle, Member, Board of Visitors
Dr. Ervin Rokke, Lt Gen, Retired, Member, Board of Visitors
Dr. Galal Walker, Member, Board of Visitors
Dr. William Whobrey, Member, Board of Visitors
Mr. Craig Wilson, Member, Board of Visitors
Mr. Kalman Weinfeld, Director, LPAD
Mr. Detlev Kesten, ADFO

(3) Attendees for 2 June BoV Outbrief to DLI Leadership, Staff & Faculty

Same as Attendee List (1)_
DLIFLC Faculty
DLIFLC Staff

TAB C - Minutes

**Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center
Board of Visitors (BoV)
Meeting Minutes**

Meeting Date: June 1 and June 2, 2016

Place: Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center, Monterey, CA 93944

Board of Visitors Members Present:

Dr. Richard Brecht, Member, Board of Visitors
Dr. James Keagle, Col, Retired, Member Board of Visitors
Dr. Ervin Rokke, Lt Gen, Retired, Member Board of Visitors
Dr. Galal Walker, Member, Board of Visitors
Dr. William Whobrey, Member, Board of Visitors
Mr. Craig Wilson, Member Board of Visitors

BoV Alternate Designated Federal Officer

Mr. Detlev Kesten, Associate Provost for Academic Support

June 1, 2016

Welcome Reception

COL Phillip Deppert, DLIFLC Commandant, and Dr. Betty Lou Leaver, DLIFLC Provost welcomed all in attendance. All individuals in attendance introduced themselves to the BoV.

Call to Order

Dr. Richard Brecht, DLIFLC Board of Visitors chairperson, called the meeting to order at 0837. Dr. Brecht welcomed returning members and DLIFLC for hosting the meeting. Announced that in attendance there were two outside observers, David Ellis from the National Foreign Language Center and Bill Rivers from the Joint National Committee on Languages. Dr. Brecht again greeted the BoV, Provost, Commandant and Assistant Commandant.

BoV FACA Compliance, Administrative Business, Welcome New Member

Mr. Kesten notified the BoV that new board member, Dr. William Whobrey, would be joining the meeting as soon as his schedule permitted, at which time he would provide formal introductions. Next, Mr. Kesten informed the board that two members would not be in attendance for personal reasons; these members hoped to be present at the next BoV meeting. Mr. Kesten then advanced the agenda to accommodate the arrival of the late parties and Mike Broom from the Paralegal office, who arrived to conduct the Ethics briefing. Next on the meeting agenda, COL Phillip Deppert provided his introduction of topics.

INTRODUCTION OF TOPIC: TESTING

1. Commandant Perspectives

COL Deppert, DLIFLC Commandant, presented the major areas of interest for the meeting. Prior to discussing these ideas, a stage setter was provided of things going on around DLIFLC. Firstly, a dialogue has been opened between DLI and OSD, asking the question: "Our BoV has provided feedback, presented its thoughts and you now have it. So, OSD, what do you do with it? Where does it sit?" COL Deppert noted that they are starting to work on that issue. Also, DLI leadership is starting to talk to new and potential board members.

COL Deppert then provided updates on what DLIFLC is doing across their three priorities to enhance the 2+/2+ requirement. He stated that new requirement work is being done, including the following efforts across all three priorities:

- Student development
- Faculty development
- Curriculum development

Student Development: COL Deppert reported that DLIFLC has opened dialogue with all of the services, posing the question "What processes can we put into place to better match candidate desires for a particular language with a particular service need?" First steps are being considered, from the time a candidate walks into the recruiting station. COL Deppert stated that this is being done to improve mismatch, which can in turn improve student motivation. Additionally, more is being done in terms of student resiliency; this is being done with better behavior and health screenings to test candidates. Additionally, when students arrive at DLIFLC, they receive pre-class preparatory training. COL Deppert mentioned that they have developed and harvested campus wide best practices from all four services' pre-course preparatory training and made it scalable for all services to implement without regard to how much time students have prior to official language course start dates.

Faculty Development: COL Deppert indicated many things are taking place to help prepare faculty to teach to the higher levels. This included Advanced Language Academies, the Harvard Course Exchange Reviews, and many other things. He explained that there is a chain and laundry list of things going on in terms of faculty development.

Curriculum Development: COL Deppert explained that all of the DLIFLC curriculum is in the process of being re-written to help reach the goal of 2+/2+, which he discussed as a huge undertaking. The Commandant explained the concept plan was developed a number of years ago for 2+/2+ but they are now working beyond the conceptual levels on the details. The details are being crafted in a way which makes them understandable and executable by every member. COL Deppert said at this time the plan for the entire DLIFLC should be complete. Also under that umbrella, each of the eight undergraduate schools are crafting their school level plans. With that, the developmental operational framework is a military framework, as it is organized to be easy to follow for the higher headquarters and the UGE schools. The goal is said to be completed by the end of this FY. So, at the start of FY17 there will be great momentum to reach that 2+/2+.

Next, COL Deppert presented another major discussion points: the institute will be undergoing a significant Military Leadership Transition over the summer. These represent the four senior leaders who will be leaving DLIFLC before July:

- CSM Coppi
- Lt Col McHaty (MCD)
- Lt Col Galford (USAF ,314th)
- Ltc Long (USA, 229th)

2. Leadership Perspective on Testing

COL Logeman introduced the topic of testing with the expressed hope gaining BoV insight into the testing part of the DLIFLC mission. He explained the area of testing as being very dynamic. According to COL Logeman, there are always areas for improvement, so getting outside perspective is important. COL Logeman explained the Testing Directorate would later brief on the various aspects of their work.

COL Deppert described the variety of DLIFLC customers and the wide range of needs. He explained that each customer presents different requirements for what their linguist should be able to do; accordingly this creates a lot of different feedback. For example, if one part of DLI customer base tries to get a change directed in how DLIFLC testing is done, it doesn't affect just that customer base alone, it affects everyone. Recently, one part of the customer base worked with DLNSEO (Defense Language National Security Education Office) to strongly recommend a change to the language categories. This was done without taking into account what that would do to everyone else in the community, to include FSI and others around the community. So, the move to reclassified language categories is in abeyance until OSD level determines the next best move. COL Deppert expressed that this is why a level of common understanding must be on the table so everyone fully understands the scope, breadth and depth of what the Testing Directorate does at DLIFLC and who they actually serve out in the world.

Dr. Brecht stated, DLIFLC Testing system is unique because lives change depending on scores. This is why it is so incredibly important to consider every aspect of change and progress. Dr. Walker asked to have access to the report with the recommendations of reclassification. COL Deppert responds it was not a report but a one page memo which went to DLNSEO, to DLI and the Army. Dr. Rokke, questioned what was the essence of the memo?

COL Deppert expressed the position of DLI on the topic of reclassification: If one part of the customer base wants to make a change to the classifications, they must ensure that the other entire customer base affected by the change agrees.

UGE School Level Plans to Reach 2+/2+

- All eight UGE Schools
- All school leadership
- MDMP process for framework; identifying resources and gaps/seams

Ethics Training

Mr. Kesten introduced Captain Stewart who provided the mandatory ethics training to the BoV. Stewart began his presentation and presented the agenda, which was to address general ethics issues and how they tie in. He stated the intent of the presentation is not to get into the weeds of things, but to identify issues and work them out. Captain Stewart said the bottom line is core values. Stewart says when it comes to government employees, there are certain restrictions when it comes to political activities.

Captain Stewart stated the training was to provide a refresher and help members determine issues that may arise. Following his introduction, the following items were discussed: Rules, Principles of Ethical Conduct Executive Order 12674, Statutory Basis for SGE, Status, Counting Days as an SGE, Conflict of Interest, Representational Conflicts, Gifts from Outside Sources, Ethical Decision Making Considerations, Gifts from Outside Sources: Foreign Sources, Gifts between Employees, Contractors in the Workplace, Hatch Act- Political Activities and Use of Government Position. Captain Stewart addressed comments, questions and provided his contact information, should members ever need or as he suggested: "When in doubt, give us a call at (831)242-5082, the office of the Staff Judge Advocate (OSJA) Administrative Law Division." In conclusion, Mr. Kesten announced he would be submitting BoV member names to the OSJA office for their attendance of the Ethics briefing, as it fulfills the SGE ethics training requirement.

INTRODUCTION OF TOPIC: TESTING (cont'd)

3. Provost Perspective of Testing

Mr. Kesten moved the schedule along by reminding members that prior to our ethics training the group was in the middle of a discussion regarding reclassification. On that note, Dr. Walker wanted to clarify that the classifications were all in fact connected to the DLPT test. Dr. Leaver affirmed, the UG levels work towards the 2+; the advance levels, the graduates, work towards 3/3+. Dr. Leaver provided the historical perspective of DLPT, ILR, classifications and the DOD usages of language levels. Dr. Leaver states that in the 1950's embassies were saying that they did not know how to place people because they didn't know how good they were. Mainly, because they did not know if they could handle the job or not. So, this is where the ILR descriptors came from. COL Logeman mentioned that DLI has varied customers who all have varied requirements. In the cryptologic field the desire is 3/3; on the other, hand foreign services could be as low as 1 or 1+. COL Logeman asserted that what DLI has are various communities with different requirements.

Dr. Walker wanted clarification that DLPT was the framework in which DLI classified advanced levels. Dr. Brecht said Dr. Galal Walker is uniquely qualified, in standardized testing and languages, as he is an expert. Beyond this expertise, Walker sends people to China on internships because on the job is where the military has problems, because how else do you understand whether the language is sufficient. Saying that someone is a 3 or 3+ is not the same as saying the job is being done.

Dr. Leaver discussed, open architecture and transformative pedagogy. She asserted that DLIFLC is interested in people in Transformative pedagogy and at academic conferences no one is talking about those things with regard to language. Dr. Leaver discussed faculty development in regards to the Advanced Language Academies. Dr. Keagle asserted that

even with faculty development to prepare students for level 4, immersion is optimum. He then mentioned that great military minds have created a number of simulated immersive combat experiences: “Why the same thing can’t be done for in-country immersion experiences, think Hollywood for language learning?”

Regarding year in service immersion experiences, COL Deppert mentioned the Air Force has the most issues with their intelligence professionals, crypto linguists, returning after in country immersions and then returning to NSA. That having long term relationships in the host nation is what presents an issue. COL Deppert said this is a challenge but they are making progress on these issues. The bottom-line is now students stay at universities, which helps reduce the issue of long term connections.

COL Deppert interposed that there was a larger discussion at the heart of the conversation, which is extremely complex and to be had at another time. That being, as discussed, there are different portions of the DLI customer base, depending on career fields. So, as the institution continues to evolve overtime, the age old question returns: as DLIFLC evolves, how should they construct instruction? That is to say, does DLIFLC evolve and teach by career field (as opposed to general proficiency)? This issue has been talked about for decades. COL Deppert asked whether it is now the time to explore this question again as part of a reconstructive option.

Dr. Rokke questioned whether the Cyber constituency has emerged? And whether there is a sense of those requirements? COL Logeman replied they have emerged and they are developing their requirements and trade craft to meet the needs of customers. COL Deppert pointed towards machine translation, as CYBER analysis is able to leverage their tools a lot easier than the crypto linguist.

(Dr. Whobrey joins the BoV)

Mr. Kesten provided a formal statement of introduction of the new board member. Next, Dr. Whobrey graciously accepted the welcome. He stated he had been preparing his entire life to sit on this board. He was a student at DLI 40 years ago. After Dr. Whobrey finished his schooling he performed six years of active duty. He worked in military intelligence, 2nd Army division, 1st Army division and Germany most of the time. Next, he attended graduate school at Stanford University. Spent 20 plus years on the East Coast teaching at Yale, in German Studies. Now, finally Dr. Whobrey is teaching at Stanford University in Language Studies. He also served on a similar committee at Fort Leavenworth for six years. Finally, Dr. Whobrey expressed excitement to be on the BoV.

Mr. Kesten called for a break to allow BoV members to introduce themselves to Dr. Whobrey.

Break

Language Proficiency Assessment (LPAD)

Mr. Kalman Weinfeld, DLIFLC Director of Language Proficiency Assessment Directorate, provided an overview of the work they do and members of his team. Language Proficiency

Assessment Directorate (LPAD) does not work for the Provost since their product is used to graduate students and that separation is very important. Dr. Gerd Brendel discussed the DLPT and the related topics of test review and education. Next, Dr. Amatyia provided insight on OPI, followed by Dr. Rogan who reviewed topics of validity and reliability using psychometrics to provide deeper insight into the testing data.

Mr. Weinfeld informs that DLPT 5 is a Criterion Referenced test. The test has two formats, 'constructed response' and 'multiple choice'. Scores are reported in Lower range (0+ to 3), Very Low Range (0+ to 1+) and Upper Range (3+ to 4). There were 107 languages tested. He reported that 20% in-house examinee implementation, 80% through contractors. The tests at the DLI FLC are done by faculty as face-to-face test.

DLIFLC used to have faculty write the test, but now items are constructed and developed outside so there is no question of conflict of interest. The largest customer for the DLPT is the Army. Mr. Weinfeld then discussed DLPT priorities and issues. These include test maintenance, analysis and replacement. The next priorities are computer adaptive test validating and equating as well as scorer reliability in the lower ranges. Another topic is instrument choice for small-n populations. The question here is should we spend the money to develop tests when the tested population is very small. Finally, concerning field testing, we generally have a non-representative sample population for testing new items because the motivations for volunteers is very low in the lower ranges.

Dr. Brecht posed the question regarding testing: "How do you know if the proficiency score is not affected by content knowledge? Dr. Walker states "This is an issue that all testers face, which is why I am focusing on this concept of proficiency." Dr. Walker states that he uses OPI in his work, in which he has little faith but uses as a reference point. COL Deppert added that he understood what everyone was getting at: that conceptually true proficiency can only best be assessed in the field. The test vehicle can only be viewed as an indicator. He added it is only when someone gets on the job that true proficiency can be assessed. Dr. Brecht added that this is the reason, perhaps, that the DLPT has never been validated predicatively. There has never been an update in the field of performance against scores to validate this test. Mr. Wilson asserted, it seems like the DLPT needs a procedure that goes beyond the test that would ensure the taker has the functional capability required.

BoV Working Lunch

Dr. Brecht solicited feedback from the BoV members on topic areas covered in the day's briefings for potential recommendations. The BoV then had an unformatted discussion with DLIFLC Commandant, Assistant Commandant and Provost.

Test Development Overview

Dr. Chung Yao Kao, DLIFLC Test Production, provided an overview of the test design and analysis of the DLPT. Dr. Kao explained the DLPT design initiatives that include validity framework, item bank specification, and web-based field testing, and small in-standard setting studies, with internal consistency analysis using psychometric (CTT and IRT) of the DLPT item response characteristics. In terms of computer adaptive DLPT5, Dr. Kao

reported that challenges include staffing, psychometrics, field testing items, standard setting, and DLPT's for low volume languages.

OPI Overview

Dr. Pradyumna Amatya, DLIFLC Assistant Director, LPAD, offered an overview of the Oral Proficiency Interview test. The OPI is an interactive and adaptive test, involving real world task and topics which are developed during the test by two trained testers and are neither predetermined nor predictable. Dr. Amatya explained the OPI is based on a set of assessment criteria and its structure is standardized. Also, the OPI measures proficiency in that the test taker demonstrates the ability to handle real world task in a simulated way.

Dr. Amatya stated that there were 107 languages tested. Some test OPI testing is done through contractors: 20% in house examines, 80% through contractors. The test done at DLI is done by faculty as a face-to-face test. Issues for OPI: first is general proficiency. Currently, the languages tested through the OPI at DLI, using the scale Category from I - IV based on difficulty, range from Category I (including French and Spanish, to category II (including German and Indonesian.), to category III (including Hebrew, Hindi, Persian-Farsi, Russian, Tagalog and Urdu).

Second, Dr. Amatya presented the question of focus for OPI test: Can language learning be applied in the real world? She used the example of test questions in Arabic: A question asked in Arabic to talk about whether the student can make pasta isn't applicable culturally and does not have relevant content.

In terms of validity, there isn't a true two-skill test. Testing validity is an issue. The scoring algorithm consistency is another issue. OPI test base-levels, based on how you perform at the next level. There is a huge argument whether plus-levels exist. Some argue they do exist, while others say they don't. There is also the question of the consistency of the scores. We know that the true score and reported score are within the standard error of measurement. But they have inconsistencies, which causes issues.

There is need for lower level examinees to pass the test. It's a question of whether more tests need to be developed for lower levels or other measures. If someone says they're a level 2 that should be the same across the board and should be able to be tested for that. Dr. Amatya said recommendation or further discussion to this bigger issue need to be at a future meeting. Overall outlook suggestion: We can either continue as we are with a generalized one size fits all proficiency model, or we can adjust to meet the requirements in the field to give specialized training.

Just because our testing system has worked for decades, doesn't mean it still works and will work in the future. The suggestion for low value fits better into the one size fits all models. We can talk about developing something for a smaller number of domains, but it's hard to get traction in this way because it's going against the trend. People are afraid they're going to lose their rankings. Also, testing opportunities will proliferate, since everyone wants to have their own test. If DLI has to validate these tests, it becomes very difficult.

Test Design and Analysis

Dr. Seamus Rogan, DLIFLC lead psychometrician, provided a briefing on test reliability. He explains this as being consistency, reproducibility or repeatability of a test. In terms of test-retest reliability, operational assessment is confounded by recall/memory, overexposure of DLPT5 content and examinee training/field experience prior to follow-up test events. Dr. Rogan presented the ILR classifications which require single test event approximations or test-retest analyses.

Dr. Rogan explained that, with web-based field testing, one of the challenges test design has faced is trying getting people to participate. Dr. Rogan explained when they are doing field training of the examinees taking the test in a testing environment, it cannot compensate for the fact that the DLPT is a high stakes test in its natural application. Contrastingly, the field testing is voluntary, so therefore low stakes. They have not been able to make it truly reliable and high stakes field testing.

Dr. Brecht asked whether they were confident that DLIFLC can bring the students to the upper levels [2+ & 3]. Dr. Rogan answered that they are confident for the languages that have upper range test, but they still need to engage in maintenance, buy more items and develop further. Mr. Weinfeld added that in terms of testing the questions, it becomes a question of whether it is really worth development in this extensive way if there are only 8 examinees for a given language.

Move to Bldg 611, Testing Center

Tour of Testing Center & Mock DLPT

Mr. Brent Eickholt, DLIFLC Chief of Test Management, gave the BoV a tour of the testing center. The BoV was able to experience a mock DLPT.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30pm.

June 2, 2016

Call to Order

Dr. Brecht called meeting to order at 8:04am. Mr. Kesten offered greetings to the BoV and started the day recognizing that Dr. Whobrey took the oath of office yesterday afternoon and has been sworn in. Mr. Kesten then provided a brief overview of the day's schedule.

Commandant Priorities

COM Deppert stated that, as usual, he would like to start the second day by discussing his top priorities, which in terms of order may come in reverse order. He believed that the BoV would have gotten more out of meeting experience had yesterday's discussion taken place after the testing directorate briefing. The main point and the one big take away on which he is asking for BoV input is: Is now the right time for the institute to evolve to teaching by career field? Is now the right time to start that transition?

Mr. Wilson posed the question to COM Deppert. "Can you make that decision in an independent way? What sort of hierarchical input is need?" COM Deppert stated that he would never think of doing this independently. He is confident that no one would say "no". In order to best involve the community, step number one for him would be a decision briefing with Lt. General Michael D. Lundy, CAC Commander on the logistic of Fort Leavenworth. Then, to the Army director of training GE57. Then provide an informative brief once he has gotten through Lt. General Lundy. Then the next step would be the Defense Language Steering Committee, as an information brief and discussion. This would all be done so that the community would know what the DLIFLC was doing and why it was doing it. COL Deppert stated that the framework would stress that the senior leaders from the language authorities keep providing their requirements independently; accordingly this approach would be the new way that DLIFLC is proposing to address all the individual requirements. This would be a lengthy process.

Dr. Rokke said he would like to suggest the elephant in the room was that there are different stovepipes. As he reflected back, he did not remember that there was that much dialogue between the Sigint folks and the Imagery folks. He added he doesn't even think they knew each other. COL Deppert responded that he would require a lot of intelligence. Currently DLI is only at the one inch mark thinking forward. Dr. Whobrey posed the following questions for clarification simplicity sake: "What is the problem that we are faced with? What exactly are we trying to fix here from a language training standpoint?" COL Deppert responded that this was the right question. The big part of the conversation is that DLIFLC customers, the senior language authorities, represent different levels of requirements: they all demand a different level of language. The flip side is that if everyone walking out of here is 3/3, they can go on to do any job at any level. However, 3/3 is good for NSA, but when you talk to individual services, for instance the Army and Marines, they will tell you their linguist are fine with a 1+ or a 2. This particular solution (teaching and testing by career field: rdb) may just be something that can allow us to focus our faculty better. As faculty becomes more advance, they teach at the higher level. COM Deppert added that nothing is off the rails; he wanted to just say that DLIFLC is doing very well. DLI is in fact doing very well at meeting the target. What they are now focusing on is

evolving. Dr. Keagle said that NDU has a precedent of providing a big curriculum with tailored off shoots.

COL Deppert noted that, given their experience with the leadership, the OSD staff and the Defense Language Steering Committee last year, he understands that this is not going to be a one and done conversation. This will be a 12 month discussion at a minimum.

Next COL Deppert reviewed a presentation of slides to discuss his priorities further: DCPAS, which has been the major friction point. He has on his desk right now a new pay scales policy of March 24, 2016. He said he is to model and not mirror the current Air Force Academy constructs in pay scales.

Next, COL Deppert discussed the topics of recruitment and retention of leadership positions. The need for a systematic and shared governance way of recruitment of the next provost and higher levels of leadership. He discussed starting incentives, training and programs for chair, dean and leadership pathways. Dr. Whobrey said pay is not always the best incentive to promote, other options being perhaps time off, travel or recognition. Dr. Leaver said this is important. Dr. Campbell did a semester at the Air Force Academy, and she said it was one of the most informative opportunities. Dr. Leaver announced they are now working on faculty doing swaps with Flagship Language Program campuses. COL Deppert said they would like information or ideas regarding leadership incentives besides pay, which DLI should consider.

Finally, COL Deppert next priority was completing the family of 2+ plans (for each of the schools, rdb) to set conditions for FY17.

Official BoV picture

The DLIFLC BoV members assembled for a group photograph.

Break

Accreditation Update to BoV WASC/ACCJC

Dr. Stephen Payne provided an Accreditation Update for the BoV. DLIFLC accreditation was last reaffirmed in 2012. The self-study restart was sent in May 2016. In October 2015, DLIFLC published OPORD for the Institutional Self Report (ISER), formerly called a Self-Study. Dr. Payne mentioned that in December 2016 the Board of Visitors will receive an update. In March of 2018 the Accreditation evaluation Team will visit, and he will ask the BoV to also attend. They will provide the Board with an exit report with their recommendations.

Dr. Payne wanted to point out that after the last visit the commission recommended the BoV membership be continuously updated. Also, it is acknowledged that DLIFLC Board is different from transitional academic board of trustees, as it resides in a military community.

Mr. Wilson asked what activities should the BoV engage in between now and the next meeting. Dr. Payne asked if anyone on the BOV was interested in reading the initial drafts,

receiving updates, and commenting on the briefings. Also, the BoV could give their recommendations back with a little bit of guidance, as many BoV members have experience with accreditation or similar processes. He stressed the process is a lot of work for the team, as they have a full time job and limited experience. Dr. Brecht suggested if anyone was willing to receive, review and provide input, they should let him know and send a message to Dr. Payne. Instead, Dr. Payne said he will send the copy out to everyone. Dr. Rokke suggested that everyone who provides feedback cc Dr. Brecht.

Dr. Payne mentioned that in the accreditation report they requested a suggestion for futuristic institutional plans, which according to COL Deppert align with the evolution which was discussed previously in the meeting. Also, DLI has already reported a substantive change as it moves towards the 2+/2+ process. Dr. Payne mentioned that in 2012 ACCJC offered six recommendations: mission, institutional planning, off-site programs and services, aptitude assessment, decision-making and governance. In short Dr. Payne added that the recommendations from the previous visit of the accreditation committee have been met by the DLIFLC, which has continued to improve upon them.

UGE Student Sensing Session with BoV

BoV members met with a group of students to obtain feedback and to discuss student concerns. Closed session.

BoV Working Lunch (start outbrief compilation)

Dr. Brecht solicited feedback from the BoV members on topic areas covered in the previous day's briefings of 1 June 2016 for potential recommendations.

BoV time to compile Outbrief, cont.

Dr. Brecht led a group discussion with the BoV to outline provisional recommendations.

BoV Outbrief to DLIFLC CMDT, AC and Provost

The BoV presented its provisional observations to COL Deppert, Col Logeman and Dr. Leaver. This was a closed session. Dr. Brecht presented the BoV provisional observations based on information obtained over the past two days.

Break

BoV Administration: Meeting Evaluation, Scheduling

BoV Members completed the self-assessment of the June 2016 meeting. The BoV is scheduled to meet on December 7-8, 2016.

BOV Outbrief to DLI Leadership, Staff & Faculty

The BoV moved from the Bay View Room to the Gold Room of the Weckerling Center where Dr. Brecht presented the BoV's provisional observations to the DLIFLC faculty and staff. The final draft will be sent later. Below is a summary of the provisional outbrief:

Summary of Outbrief

1. The Board is aware of the sizeable investment required for the production of iterative language proficiency test (DLPT) and of the rigorous investment in

- Language Proficiency Assessment. These investment values might be revisited in context of their value to the overall mission. (Dr. Whobrey)
2. Post-Cold War events, including the addition of non-state actors with horrific intentions, new technologies and advanced communications, as well as an emerging Cyber domain have combined to yield a truly historic inflection point, a point of significant change for the security challenges facing the United States. Against this background, we applaud the leadership's increased emphasis on shared governance and professional development with regard to leadership techniques and the core values that will enable the Institute to meet the evolving communication and analysis requirements of the future. This effort to expand the institutional agility of the DLIFLC is essential for positioning it to achieve the fundamental mission of preparing graduates to serve effectively in an increasing complex and unpredictable world. (Dr. Rokke)
 3. The recruitment and selection of the new Provost should follow the tenets and process of selection of those in the Federal Senior Executive Service (SES), principally the convening of a senior panel of outside experts/interested parties to narrow qualified candidates for recommendation to the selecting official (Commandant). (Craig Wilson)
 4. The Board repeats its recommendation that the Commandant and Assistant Commandant term needs to be longer than two years and that this recommendation be specifically and personally made to the Commanding General, TRADOC. (Craig Wilson)
 5. The Board recognizes and applauds the Institution's progress toward achievement of the 2+/2+ proficiency goal but stresses the importance of sustaining resource support and limitation of externally imposed reorganizations and manpower reductions (i.e. subsequent to manpower reviews) as dysfunctional and disruptive to the accomplishment of the 2+/2+ goal. (Dr. Keagle)
 6. The DLI, with the help and input of its constituent community, has effectively defined distinct requirements for the respective human and signal intelligence communities. Moving forward, the Institute needs to prepare for new cyber-linguist curriculum requirements. Input should be sought from the appropriate subject-matter Defense and Service Cyber Centers. (Dr. Walker)

Closing Remarks

Col Logeman expressed his gratitude to the BoV for their insight and provisional recommendations.

Adjournment

Mr. Kesten adjourned the meeting at 4:25 pm

TAB D - Subcommittee Members/Mission/Meeting Purpose

Subcommittee/Board Members:

Dr. Richard Brecht
Dr. James Keagle, COL, Retired
Dr. Ervin Rokke, Lt Gen, Retired
Dr. Galal Walker
Dr. William Whobrey
Mr. Craig Wilson

Mission:

The Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center (DLI) is a Department of Defense School under the executive agency of the U.S. Army. The DLI Board of Visitors (BoV) is governed by the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) of 1972, as amended, and is a subcommittee of the Army Education Advisory Committee (AEAC).

The purpose of the DLI Board of Visitors (BoV) is to provide the Commandant, through the Army Education Advisory Committee, with advice on matters related to the Institute's mission, specifically: academic policies, staff and faculty development, student success indicators, curricula, educational methodology and objectives, program effectiveness, research, and academic administration.

Meeting Purpose:

The purpose of the meeting is to provide the subcommittee with briefings and information focusing on the Shared Governance practices across organizations and management to improve communication within Defense Language Foreign Language Institute. The subcommittee will also receive an update on the Institute's accreditation and will address administrative matters.

TAB E- Observers and Guests

Nicholas Bemish, the Director of Foreign Language Programs, Defense Intelligence Agency.

TAB F - Handouts

The BoV Members received documents. The titles below are in order of presentation.

1. Commandant opening remarks slide
2. DLIFLC Ethics Briefing
3. Academic accreditation update
4. LPAD division presentation (Testing updates)
5. Commandant Priority remarks

TAB G - BoV Provisional Recommendations Forwarded to the AEAC for Meeting
conducted on 1 and 2 June 2016:

BoV Provisional Recommendations: Meeting conducted on 1 and 2 June 2016:

1. The Board is aware of the sizeable investment required for the production of iterative language proficiency test (DLPT) and of the rigorous investment in Language Proficiency Assessment. These investment values might be revisited in context of their value to the overall mission. (Dr. Whobrey)
2. Post-Cold War events, including the addition of non-state actors with horrific intentions, new technologies and advanced communications, as well as an emerging Cyber domain have combined to yield a truly historic inflection point, a point of significant change for the security challenges facing the United States. Against this background, we applaud the leadership's increased emphasis on shared governance and professional development with regard to leadership techniques and the core values that will enable the Institute to meet the evolving communication and analysis requirements of the future. This effort to expand the institutional agility of the DLIFLC is essential for positioning it to achieve the fundamental mission of preparing graduates to serve effectively in an increasing complex and unpredictable world. (Dr. Rokke)
3. The recruitment and selection of the new Provost should follow the tenets and process of selection of those in the Federal Senior Executive Service (SES), principally the convening of a senior panel of outside experts/interested parties to narrow qualified candidates for recommendation to the selecting official (Commandant). (Craig Wilson)
4. The Board repeats its recommendation that the Commandant and Assistant Commandant term needs to be longer than two years and that this recommendation be specifically and personally made to the Commanding General, TRADOC. (Craig Wilson)
5. The Board recognizes and applauds the Institution's progress toward achievement of the 2+/2+ proficiency goal but stresses the importance of sustaining resource support and limitation of externally imposed reorganizations and manpower reductions (i.e. subsequent to manpower reviews) as dysfunctional and disruptive to the accomplishment of the 2+/2+ goal. (Dr. Keagle)
6. The DLI, with the help and input of its constituent community, has effectively defined distinct requirements for the respective human and signal intelligence communities. Moving forward, the Institute needs to prepare for new cyber-linguist curriculum requirements. Input should be sought from the appropriate subject-matter Defense and Service Cyber Centers. (Dr. Walker)

Detlev Kesten
Alternate Designated Officer, DLIFLC Board of Visitors
26 August 2016

I hereby certify this 2nd day of August 2016 that to the best of my knowledge, the foregoing minutes to be accurate and complete.

Dr. Richard Brecht (Chair)

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "R. Brecht", with a stylized flourish at the end.