

EVALUATION REPORT

**Defense Language Institute
Foreign Language Center
Monterey, California**

A confidential report prepared for
The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

This report represents the findings of the evaluation team that
visited the Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center
at the Presidio of Monterey from March 19-22, 2012

Douglas B. Houston, Ed.D.
Chair

**Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center
Visiting Team Roster
March 2012**

Dr. Douglas B. Houston (Chair)
Chancellor
Yuba CCD

Mr. James Preston
Dean of Educational Services
West Hills College

Dr. Kayleigh Carabajal
Dean of Academic Services
Lassen CCD

Dr. Leon Richards
Chancellor
Kapi'olani Community College

Dr. Erika Endrijonas
Executive VP Student Learning
Oxnard College

Ms. Cathy Richter (Team Assistant)
Executive Secretary to the Chancellor
Yuba CCD

Dr. Sharon Hart
President
Northern Marianas College

Mr. Peter White
Vice President of Student Services
San Diego City College

Ms. Kate Jaques
Dean of Humanities
American River College

Dr. Celina Sau Lin Ing
Professor, Computer Science
Sacramento City College

Mr. Joseph Keeler
VP of Administrative Services
Gavilan College

Dr. Gary Williams
Instructional Assessment Specialist
Crafton Hills College

SUMMARY OF EVALUATION REPORT

INSTITUTION: Defense Language Institute

DATES OF VISIT: March 19-22, 2012

TEAM CHAIR: Dr. Douglas B. Houston, Chancellor Yuba CCD

A twelve-member accreditation team visited the Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center from March 19-22, 2012, for the purposes of evaluating how well the institution is achieving its stated purposes, analyzing how well the college is meeting the Commission standards, providing recommendations for quality assurance and institutional improvement, and submitting recommendations to the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) regarding the status of the college.

In preparation for the visit, team members attended an all-day training session on February 7, 2012, conducted by the ACCJC and studied Commission materials prepared for visiting teams. Team members read the college's self evaluation report, including the recommendations from the 2006 visiting team, and assessed the various forms of evidence provided by the institution.

Prior to the visit team members completed written evaluations of the institution's self evaluation report and began identifying areas for further investigation. On the day before the formal beginning of the visit, the team members spent the afternoon discussing their views of the written materials and evidence provided by the institution as well as the Midterm Report completed by the institution on March 15, 2009 and other materials submitted to the Commission since its last comprehensive visit.

During the visit, the team met with approximately 150 institution faculty, staff, administrators, and students. Team members also met with the Provost, Commandant and members of the Board of Visitors. The team also attended two open meetings to allow for comments from faculty and staff and provided opportunity to hear confidentially from any DLIFLC stakeholder. The institution provided outstanding support to the team prior to and during the site visit. All members of the DLIFLC community were welcoming, hospitable and gracious.

The team found that the institution's self evaluation report was complete and included narrative responses on all ACCJC standards. However, the team was concerned with the generally insufficient focus on the accreditation standards in the self evaluation report. Although the institution provided substantial response on each standard, those responses generally fell short of fully describing the institution's practices in the context of accreditation standards. The team also noted several internal inconsistencies with the self evaluation report. The team suggests that the institution master the ACCJC *Guide to Evaluating* institutions. This is the guiding document for evaluating teams and provides great insight for institutions in preparation for accreditation reports and visits.

During the Site Visit, the team found ample supporting documentation and evidence to support its findings and is particularly concerned that the institution did not include some of this evidence in the evaluation report. The team encourages the institution to develop a more thorough understanding of the ACCJC *Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness* particularly with regard to institutional effectiveness in program review and planning and the assessment of student learning. The team determined that the institution is generally at a level of proficiency with respect to program review and planning and achieving proficiency in the assessment of student learning outcomes. That being said, DLIFLC is expected to be at a level of sustainable continuous quality improvement with respect to program review and planning and achieve proficiency in student learning outcomes assessment by Spring 2013. The team is confident that if DLIFLC masters this rubric it will have no difficulty in achieving expected levels of continuous quality improvement in its evaluation of institutional effectiveness.

The team wishes to express its deep appreciation to the Defense Language Institute, Foreign Language Center. Team members have developed an abiding respect for the institution, its faculty and staff, its mission, its abiding commitment to success and the critical role that it plays in our nation's defense. Although there were only two military veterans on the team, all team members left the visit with a profound pride and a renewed sense of patriotism because of the opportunity to work with DLIFLC command, academic and support staff, and students. This team hopes that its efforts will in some way contribute to the continued success of this outstanding academic institution.

Major Findings and Recommendations of the 2012 Visiting Team

Team Recommendations:

As a result of the March 2012 visit, the team made six recommendations:

Recommendation #1

Mission

To fully meet the standards, the team recommends that the institution evaluate and consider revisions to the mission statement in light of its degree-granting status (I.A).

Recommendation #2

Institutional Planning

To meet the standards and achieve a level of *Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement* in planning, the team recommends the institution evaluate its planning processes and systems evaluation mechanisms to ensure they are effective in improving instructional programs and services. (I.B.5, I.B.6, IV.A)

Recommendation #3

Off-site Programs and Services

To improve meeting the standards, the team recommends that the institution design, implement and assess a system of periodic evaluation of the instructional and support services

provided to students in DLIFLC programs at locations outside the Monterey campus (II.A.2; II.B.1; II.B.3.a, II.C.1.c).

Recommendation # 4

Aptitude Assessment

To fully meet the standards, the team recommends that the institution establish a schedule on which the DLAB is periodically reviewed and revised as necessary to ensure the accuracy of its placement scores and to minimize gender and racial/ethnic testing or cultural bias (Standard II.B.3.e).

Recommendation #5

Decision-Making

To meet the standards, the team recommends the institution document and evaluate the decision-making processes and systems including with regard to the role of faculty and staff in institutional decision-making (IV.A.2, IV.A.5).

Recommendation #6

Governance

To fully meet the eligibility requirements and the standards and ensure continued accreditation, the team recommends that the institution work with appropriate higher authorities to ensure timely appointment/reappointment of BOV membership (ER 3; IV.B & ACCJC Policy on Governing Boards for Military institutions).

Team Commendations:

During the visit, the team also recognized numerous noteworthy aspects of the institution:

Commendation #1

The team commends the institution for its nimble, action-oriented research agenda that supports the development of agile, targeted and innovative solutions for student learning.

Commendation #2

The team commends the institution for its use of the cross-functional, cross-departmental “Tiger Team” approach to identifying needs and problems and developing effective solutions.

Commendation #3

The team commends the institution for its comprehensive system of monitoring classroom learning to identify academic problems early and implementing interventions for student success.

Commendation #4

The team commends the institution for the frequency, depth and range of its assessments of student learning and of student satisfaction with support services, and for the variety of ways in which the assessments are used to improve classroom instruction, faculty development, and instructional support services.

Commendation #5

The team commends the institution for its cadre of talented, enthusiastic and diverse faculty and staff that are highly-dedicated to providing quality programs and services.

Commendation #6

The team commends the institution for strategically allocating resources to achieve its mission with high quality.

Commendation #7

The team commends the institution for its military command structure that consists of DLIFLC graduates and DLIFLC former instructors who are clearly passionate about student success.

Commendation #8

The team commends the institution for its individual and organizational ethos of accountability for mission achievement and quality improvement.

Commendation #9

The team commends the institution for the military and academic leadership of its Commandant, COL Danial Pick, and his commitment and dedication to the DLIFLC vision of "delivering the world's best culturally-based foreign language training and education-at the point of need." He is clearly an inspiration to the installation's military and civilian staff; moreover he is an inspiration to the DLIFLC faculty and their students.

ACCREDITATION EVALUATION REPORT FOR DEFENSE LANGUAGE INSTITUTE FOREIGN LANGUAGE CENTER

Introduction

The Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center (DLIFLC) is the world's largest foreign language education institution. It provides foreign language training and general education to approximately 3,500 students, the vast majority of whom are uniformed service members of our Nation's military. The institution has been in operation as a language training program for over seven decades; its national importance and its mission tempo have increased greatly since the events of September 11, 2001. DLIFLC resides at a U.S. Army installation, The Presidio of Monterey, and occupies approximately 400 acres of facilities that house a full complement of academic and support services.

DLIFLC traces its roots to the eve of America's entry into World War II, when the U.S. Army established a secret school at the Presidio of San Francisco to teach the Japanese language. Classes began November 1, 1941, with four instructors and 60 students in an abandoned airplane hangar at Crissy Field. Fifty-eight of the students were second-generation Japanese-Americans (Nisei) from the West Coast.

During the course of World War II, the Military Intelligence Service Language School (MISLS), as it came to be called, grew dramatically. When Japanese-Americans on the West Coast were moved into internment camps in 1942, the school moved to temporary quarters at Camp Savage, Minnesota. By 1944, the school had outgrown these facilities and moved to nearby Fort Snelling. More than 6,000 graduates served throughout the Pacific Theater during the war and the subsequent occupation of Japan. In 1946, after World War II, the MISLS was moved to the Presidio of Monterey. It added Russian, Chinese, Korean, Arabic and six other languages to its curriculum, and was renamed the Army Language School (ALS) in 1947. The size of the faculty, number of student classes, and number of languages taught increased throughout the Cold War years.

All of the military language programs were consolidated in 1963 into the Defense Foreign Language Program. A new headquarters, the Defense Language Institute (DLI), was established in Washington, D.C., and the Army Language School became the DLI West Coast Branch; the foreign language department at the Naval Intelligence School became the DLI East Coast Branch. The DLI also took over the English Language School at Lackland Air Force Base, Texas, which became the Defense Language Institute English Language Center (DLIELC).

In 1974, the Institute's headquarters and all resident language training were consolidated at the West Coast Branch and renamed the Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center (DLIFLC) (The Institute continues to operate a small contract foreign language training program in Washington, D.C.). With the advent of the All-Volunteer Forces and the opening of most specialties to women, the character of the student population underwent a gradual change. In 1973, the newly formed U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command

(TRADOC) assumed administrative control, and in 1976, all English language training operations were returned to the U.S. Air Force, which operates the DLIELC to this day.

DLIFLC was granted academic accreditation in 1979. Numerous academic changes were made during the period 1985 to 2000: more instructors were recruited; new instructional materials and tests were written; a comprehensive academic master plan was developed; teaching methodology became proficiency-oriented; and team teaching was implemented. The average staffing ratio was increased to two instructors per ten-student section. After 2001, with the need for higher proficiency, the staffing ratio was again increased 2:10 to 2:6 for languages determined to be more difficult to learn and from 2:10 to 2:8 for all other languages. In October 2001, the U.S. Congress gave the DLIFLC federal authority to grant an Associate of Arts in Foreign Language (AA/FL) degree. With the approval of the Accrediting Commission of Community and Junior Colleges of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges, the DLIFLC first began awarding associate degrees in May 2002 and has since granted over 6,100 degrees.

In recent years, the institution has taken on challenging new missions, including support for arms control treaty verification, the War on Drugs, Operation Desert Storm, Operation Restore Hope and Operation Noble Eagle. In response to the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, the DLIFLC created the Emerging Language Task Force to serve as the institution's quick-response language team on current and emerging needs for Operations Enduring Freedom and Iraqi Freedom, the Global War on Terror, and the ongoing operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. The DLIFLC continues to evolve and expand its language course offerings in the wake of the end of the Cold War and to support the Global War on Terror. The institution currently trains over 3,500 resident students in 24 languages and dialects yearly.

DLIFLC is a military organization and so many of the functions and operations that are routinely part of a public community or junior college are implemented in a manner not readily discerned by visiting teams. Funding and budgetary procedures are handled by external agencies; the institution is not required to comply with a number of the fiscal accounting mandates delineated in ACCJC's standards. Facility maintenance and repair are managed by a separate organization that is not part of nor does it report to the institution's leadership. The team devoted considerable attention to identify institutional practices and structures that either served as proxy for accreditation requirements or substantially met the spirit of accreditation standards if not the specific language.

That being said, the team found DLIFLC to be an outstanding academic institution, with enviable practices, that provides a high-quality educational experience for students. The institution remains an academic leader in the implementation of student learning outcomes and the team found an exemplary degree of accountability, both individual and organizational, for the institution's mission success of providing "culturally-based foreign language education, training, evaluation, research and sustainment for DoD personnel in order to ensure the success of the Defense Language Program and enhance the security of the nation." and its vision to deliver "the world's best culturally-based foreign language training and education – at the point of need."

Evaluation of Institutional Responses to Previous Recommendations

Team Recommendation #1 (2006)

Institutional Research and Evaluation: DLIFLC expand and integrate its institutional research and evaluations efforts. Comprehensive, integrated research will identify the degree to which various strategies (including recruitment, placement, instructional and student support services) contribute to the measurable improvements in student learning. (Standards I.B.1, I.B.3, I.B.4)

Over the past five years, the DLIFLC has devoted considerable effort and resources to expanding its evaluation and assessment capacities to improve its effectiveness. The institution has developed a number of initiatives and measures designed to better document student learning and achievement, boost student proficiency, reduce student attrition, and improve the overall quality of the education. It has continued these efforts to meet the ever-increasing demand for increased proficiency and the ever-shifting security priorities established by the Army and other branches of the Department of Defense.

The Proficiency Enhancement Program (PEP) is an example of a program implemented by DLIFLC to meet higher proficiency requirements identified by the National Security Agency (NSA) as well as other branches of the Armed Forces. The higher standards of this initiative have also required greater efforts to integrate institutional research and effectiveness measures at all levels and to update existing assessment instruments and protocols. The evidence and recommendations gleaned from these efforts are shared with programs and units throughout the institution to inform program and educational effectiveness. These efforts have resulted in improvements such as smaller class sizes, application of immersion/language field training exercises, enhanced faculty development, curricular improvements, and upgrades in facility and technology resources. The institution has provided ample evidence that these institutional research efforts have been integrated and sustained.

The team concludes that the college has satisfied this recommendation.

Team Recommendation #2 (2006)

Strategic Planning: Implementation of the long range strategic plan entitled FY 2006-2010 Command Plan. This longer range plan provides a clear road map that supports the expansion and direction of DLIFLC in its educational and military mission. (Standards I.B.4, I.B.6, III.2.B, III.C.1.c, III.D)

Since this recommendation, the DLIFLC has updated the 5-year Strategic/Command Plan annually to provide direction linking strategic planning to resource allocation in an environment of growth and evolving priorities. This Command Plan is complemented by an annual Campaign Plan that articulates more specific objectives, tasks and milestones to be completed yearly, in line with accomplishing the Command Plan. These plans are published and distributed to internal as well as external stakeholders to communicate key priorities and expectations. The institution uses a SharePoint document portal to encourage dialogue, feedback and communicate action plans progress. Numerous other plans are integrated and

supported under the 5-year Command Plan. For instance, the DLIFLC Human Resource Plan for all staff, excluding platform instructors, is based on the Army Manpower Management Program which mandates that positions be directly linked to its mission. Requirements for platform instructors are tied into the projected future student enrollments. Using these data, the institution projects a four-year forecast and reviews existing military and civilian personnel information/budget to ensure effective use of resources.

The self-study and related evidence for Standard IB demonstrates that DLIFLC has devoted considerable resources toward improving the quality of dialogue, integrated planning and resource allocation, evidence collection and evaluation tools and methodologies, and continually improves and refines these processes to ensure that evidence-based decision-making becomes part of the culture of DLIFLC well into the future.

The team concludes that the institution has satisfied this recommendation.

Team Recommendation #3 (2006)

Institutional Communication. A collaboratively developed faculty voice expanded through the Academic Advisory Council or other Council to promote effective communication within and between instructional units. [Standards IV.A.2, IV.A.2.a, IV.A.2b, IV.A.3]

The Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center (DLIFLC) responded to this recommendation in the institution's 2009 Midterm Report. The report highlighted the establishment of an Academic Senate (AS) as the primary representative body for faculty and practice of regular meetings between the AS leadership and the Commandant, Provost, and Board of Visitors.

In addition, several other Councils and ad hoc bodies were formed to promote effective communication including bi-weekly Deans Council meetings, bi-weekly Associate Deans meetings, monthly Teaching Improvement Certification programs, monthly Department Chair Council and the Academic Specialists' meetings. DLIFLC clearly recognizes the value of giving faculty a voice in matters related to the continuous improvement of the institution, and venues exist for this to occur. DLIFLC resolved the recommendation and ACCJC accepted the Midterm Report without reservation.

The team concludes that the institution has satisfied this recommendation.

ACCJC Recommendation - Eligibility Requirement 3. Governing Board (2006)

The Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center (DLIFLC) will need to update the Commission on the approval of its Board of Visitors by the Army Education Advisory Committee (AEAC) and how that group will delineate its duties and responsibilities (Standard IV).

In its March 15, 2007 Progress Report, and October 19, 2007 update *DLIFLC Board of Visitors (BOV)* and its March 15, 2009 Midterm Report, the DLIFLC detailed its progress and eventually the establishment of the Board of Visitors in December 2007. In a letter from ACCJC President, Dr. Barbara Beno, on January 31, 2008, to DLIFLC Commandant COL Sandusky, the ACCJC accepted the Midterm Report and accepted resolution of the Commission's recommendation regarding the DLIFLC Board of Visitors.

Furthermore, in June 2009, the ACCJC adopted ***Policy on Governing Boards for Military institutions*** detailing the Commission's expectations for the unique role of a Board of Visitors for a military academic institution. At the time DLIFLC published its self evaluation report, there had been substantial delays in the appointment and/or reappointment of Board of Visitors membership. Only one member of the Board of visitors was empaneled at the time the institution's self evaluation report was submitted to the Board for review. Fortunately, prior to the Site Visit the delay was resolved and all appointments had all been made. The team attended a meeting of the Board of Visitors during the site visit.

The team concludes that the institution has satisfied this recommendation. That being said, the team is concerned that the circumstances, leading to the delay in appointing members to the Board of Visitors, have not been resolved; it has recommended the institution work with its higher authorities to develop policies so that the membership of the Board of Visitors remains uninterrupted in the future. See ***Recommendation #6***.

Eligibility Requirements

- 1. Authority:** The evaluation team confirmed that Department of Defense Directive 5160.41 authorizes the Defense Language Program and that The Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center was authorized by Congress in 2001 to be a degree granting institution. The institution is accredited by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC).
- 2. Mission:** The evaluation team confirmed that The Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center's educational mission is clearly defined and was reaffirmed by the Board of Visitors in February 2011. The mission statement appropriately reflects the institution's mission and is published in the General Catalog, the Annual Program Review and on the institution's web site.
- 3. Governing Board:** The evaluation team confirmed that The Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center is a federal organization and operates within a military chain of command. Thus, it has no governing board similar to those of other two-year public and private institutions. Rather, DLIFLC has a Board of Visitors (BOV) with members nominated by the DLIFLC Commandant and approved by the Secretary of Defense. The BOV is an independent Federal Advisory Committee with no legal or fiduciary authorities. The purpose of the BOV is to advise the Army Education Advisory Committee (AEAC) by reporting its observations and recommendations on all matters related to the DLIFLC mission. The DLIFLC meets this Eligibility Requirement in accordance with ACCJC's *Policy on Governing Boards for Military Institutions*.
- 4. Chief Executive Officer:** The evaluation team confirmed that the Commandant serves as the DLIFLC's chief administrator. The Commandant is a U.S. Army Colonel appointed by the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness and chosen based on leadership and resource management ability, language training or education and service. The current Commandant assumed responsibility in 2010. Appointments are normally for three years. The duties and responsibilities of the Commandant are outlined in the Department of Defense Directive 5160.41E, October 21, 2005.
- 5. Administrative Capacity:** The evaluation team confirmed that DLIFLC has a sufficient number of administrators and staff who have the experience and qualifications to provide appropriate oversight to manage the institution's programs and services and to implement its mission.
- 6. Operational Status:** The evaluation team confirmed that the institution is operational, with approximately 3,500 students enrolled during the course of the current year. All students were enrolled in language courses and many were enrolled in a manner that would lead to an associate's degrees.
- 7. Degrees:** The evaluation team confirmed that many of the DLIFLC's educational offerings are programs that lead to degrees, and a significant proportion of its students are enrolled in them. The institution awarded 960 AA degrees in Fiscal Year 2011.

8. Educational Programs: The evaluation team confirmed that DLIFLC's principle degree programs are congruent with its mission, are based on recognized higher education fields of study, are of sufficient content and length and are conducted at levels of quality and rigor appropriate to the degrees offered. The degree requirements are listed in the General Catalog as well the DLIFLC's web site and outline a 63 unit (two-year) degree program.

9. Academic Credit: The evaluation team confirmed that credit for all coursework is awarded based on the Carnegie unit, the standard generally accepted in degree-granting institutions of higher education.

10. Student Learning and Achievement: The evaluation team confirmed that DLIFLC has developed Student Learning Outcomes for all programs and courses. The institution defines and publishes its educational goals for students in the General Catalog and on its web site and in each course syllabi. The institution's programs are outcome based and undergo rigorous assessments.

11. General Education: The evaluation team confirmed that general education courses have the required breadth to promote intellectual inquiry. The DLIFLC does not offer all the required general education courses necessary for an Associate of Arts degree. Students may transfer units taken from regionally accredited post-secondary institutions and units earned through other educational programs such as: Advanced Placement (AP), College Level Examination Program (CLEP), Defense Activity for Nontraditional Education Support (DANTES), and International Baccalaureate (IB), as well as some types of military training under the American Council on Education (ACE) Program of Non-collegiate Sponsored Instruction (PONSI). CLEP and DANTES examinations are available less than one mile from the campus; some general education courses are offered by adjacent institutions, such as Monterey Peninsula Community College and Brandman University.

12. Academic Freedom: The evaluation team confirmed that DLIFLC clearly expresses its commitment to ensuring academic freedom on its web site. The Statement on Academic Freedom is posted and disseminated via the Academic Senate. As a military institution, DLIFLC students are subject to the Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ) which defines good order and discipline under Article 134; this extends to classroom behavior.

13. Faculty: The evaluation team confirmed that DLIFLC had, at the time of the self evaluation report, 2,174 full-time faculty; this faculty serves approximately 3,500 students. The core faculty is sufficient in size and experience to support all of the institution's educational programs. Faculty responsibilities are outlined in the Civilian Employee Handbook and in contract between the Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center and the American Federation of Government Employees, Local 1263. The Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center has a clear statement of faculty responsibilities tied to its faculty evaluation system. The DA Form 7222-1 (Faculty Evaluation Support Form) explicitly contains several statements of faculty responsibilities to include development and review of curriculum and assessment of student learning.

14. Student Services: The evaluation team confirmed that DLIFLC, in collaboration with U.S. Army Garrison Presidio of Monterey, provides appropriate programs and services to students consistent with those student characteristics and with the mission of the institution. Services include: Education Center, Registrar, Wellness Center, Student Learning Center, Personnel Administration Center, Aiso and Chamberlin Libraries, Army Health Clinic, Dental Clinic, Army Community Service, Better Opportunities for Single Service Members, Morale Welfare and Recreation, Child Development Center, Porter Youth Center, Military Family Liaison, Hobson Student Activity Center, Combs and Bela's Dining Facilities, Legal Services, Tax Center, Inspector General, Equal Employment Opportunity Office, Religious Services, Ft. Ord Military Community and La Mesa Housing and Presidio of Monterey Police. Student services and development programs are listed in the General Catalog and on the institution's web site.

15. Admissions: The evaluation team confirmed that DLIFLC has adopted and adheres to admission policies consistent with its mission that specifies the qualifications of students appropriate for its programs. These are published in Army Training Requirements and Resources System and the General Catalog. The approximately 3,500 students represent a cross-section of all branches of the Armed Services. These service members are admitted to the basic language program based upon their performance on two examinations: the Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery and the Defense Language Aptitude Battery (DLAB).

16. Information and Learning Resources: The evaluation team confirmed that DLIFLC provides information and learning resources services through its many different divisions and departments but primarily through the Aiso and Chamberlin libraries which house over 115,000 items in 39 different foreign language collections. The libraries, as well as the classrooms, are equipped with wireless networks. The DLIFLC website provides students and the general public with access to robust foreign language learning materials. All resident students provided tablet PCs for use in their classroom and housing areas; all students and faculty have access to computers, email, and the internet.

17. Financial Resources: The evaluation team confirmed that DLIFLC is funded by Congressional appropriation to the Department of Defense based on its projected mission requirements. The institution monitors its funding base, financial resources and projected financial plan to address its financial stability for the foreseeable future. The institution does not maintain a reserve per se; unobligated balances expire at the end of a given fiscal year and are no longer available for new expenditures. This is all documented in the DLIFLC Annual Program Review.

18. Financial Accountability: The evaluation team confirmed that DLIFLC conducts a tri-annual review as part of the Joint Reconciliation Program with the Department of Defense (DoD) accounting organization. The DoD established and operates the Defense Finance and Accounting Service (DFAS) as an independent, external agency from the military departments and defense agencies. The tri-annual review is conducted by the institution's accounting officer, each fund-center manager and appropriate DFAS account representatives. The supporting DFAS office serves as the auditing agent external to the DLIFLC. These reviews are then certified as accurate and submitted for record to DFAS.

19. Institutional Planning and Evaluation: The evaluation team confirmed that DLIFLC has both an operational planning and evaluation process and a strategic/future planning and evaluation process. The Evaluations and Standards Division is tasked with educational research exclusively on foreign language education including research on student learning outcomes, attrition, and other areas. The Directorate of Academic Affairs produces the Annual Program Summary containing quantitative and qualitative data on all academic programs and directorates at the institution. The institution annually develops a formal five-year Campaign Plan that guides decision-making and resource allocation. Annual evaluative analyses are produced to monitor Campaign Plan progress. The Installation Garrison Command manages the Interactive Customer Evaluation system which collects data from students, faculty, and staff to improve its products and services.

20. Public Information: The evaluation team confirmed that DLIFLC provides public information consistent with a military instillation and its unique mission responsibilities. The mission statement is clearly articulated in the General Catalog, Annual Program Review and web site. The General Catalog and website also provide the public with current information on: course offerings, degrees offered and degree requirements, program length, available student services and contact information, to include email and phone numbers. General course information and enrollment requirements are located on Army Training Requirements and Resources System, a military training and education database.

21. Relations with the Accrediting Commission: The evaluation team confirmed that DLIFLC adheres to ACCJC eligibility requirements, accreditation standards and policies. The DLIFLC communicates any changes in its accredited status and has agreed to disclose all information required by the Commission in fulfilling its accrediting responsibilities.

STANDARD I

Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

A. Mission

General Observations:

The Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center's (DFIFLC) mission statement is central to institutional planning and decision-making processes. Its focus is on students learning a foreign language and in developing these linguists for the purpose of U.S. national security. Developed exclusively for the U.S. Armed Forces and its service members, the institution provides students with foreign language skills, often referred to as Final Learning Objectives (FLOs). These skills are then applied in the military environments where service members are assigned or deployed. Revised periodically, the mission was most recently approved by the Board of Visitors (BoV) in February of 2011. The mission statement clearly defines the institution's unique educational purposes, its intended student population, and its commitment to achieving student learning. Additionally, the mission and student learning are appropriately linked. Together, these drive all of the institution's programs and planning efforts.

The institution utilizes various technologies and resources to publish both the mission and the vision. These statements appear in appropriate institution materials and the DLIFLC website (<http://www.dhlc.edu/mission.html>). Additionally, the DLIFLC uses analyses of quantitative and qualitative data in an ongoing and systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, implementation, and reevaluation to verify and improve the effectiveness by which the mission is accomplished.

Findings and Evidence:

The Board of Visitors (BoV) was formed in 2007 and conducted its first meeting on December 12, 2007, which included the review of the mission statement. The BoV exists as a sub-committee of the Army Education Advisory Committee (AEAC) and serves as a non-governing body consistent with ACCJC's *Policy on Governing Boards for Military Institutions*. The purpose statement, as reported on July 16, 2010, states the function of the board is to provide advice on matters related to the institution's mission. Most recently in February of 2011, the BoV reviewed and approved additional changes to the mission statement which now reads as follows:

Mission Statement:

DLIFLC provides culturally-based foreign language education, training, evaluation, research and sustainment for DoD personnel in order to ensure the success of the Defense Language Program and enhance the security of the nation.

Since 2006, the Commandant and BoV reviewed and/or revised the mission statement six times. The current mission statement emphasizes the unique role of its "warrior linguist" student population whose education in foreign languages and culture prepares them to defend the United States and its allies. In emphasizing national security as the end-point for the

institution's activities, the mission statement underscores the broad base of the institution's stakeholders. These stakeholders include the Armed Forces and government agencies, such as the National Security Agency (NSA). These various entities, based on their current needs and requirements, help to shape the programs and projects of the institution, including the educational experience of military students (I.A.1, I.A.2).

Additionally, the institution's commitment to achieving student learning is impressive. It pursues its mission with the confidence and support of the Department of Defense, which is further underscored in its newly-revised Vision Statement (2011), shown below:

Vision Statement:

Delivering the world's best culturally-based foreign language training and education - at the point of need.

The DLIFLC Deputy Chief of Staff is responsible for the coordination and publication of the mission statement. The newly revised mission statement is posted on the official DLIFLC website (<http://www.dliflc.edu/mission.html>), is included in the General Catalog, and is published in the Campaign Plan. The Mission and Vision Statements are printed inside graduation handouts and shared with visitors and students' families. The team noted that while the mission statement is not visibly displayed around the institution, interviews with key constituent groups (e.g., faculty, deans, etc.) reflect that the mission statement is well understood and reviewed by all key constituents for input prior to BoV review and recommendation (I.A.2.).

The mission statement is key, serving as the road map on how the institution will proceed in its planning efforts. Additionally, the self evaluation noted the linkage between particular areas and the mission of the institution. In some cases, the descriptive summary, analysis, and planning agendas in the self evaluation evidenced a smooth integration between the mission statement and the institution's goals (I.A.4).

Conclusion:

The institution has a statement of mission that clearly defines its intended student population, and its commitment to achieving student learning outcomes. Moreover the student learning programs and services are fully aligned with purposes, character, and a unique student population. At the same time, the institution is now a degree-granting institution; this key component of the institution's mission is not reflected in its mission statement. The institution partially meets this standard (I.A.1).

DLIFLC is not governed by the traditional higher education governing board. Instead, it is the Board of Visitors (BoV) that provides advice on matters related to the mission statement. The most recent mission statement was adopted by the BoV in February of 2011. This new mission statement is appropriately published in key printed and electronic materials, but is not publically displayed. The institution meets this standard (I.A.2).

The institution regularly reviews its mission statement. This is completed by the Commandant, with input from key constituent groups, and then provided to the BoV for

review and support. Over the last six years, the mission statement has been changed to reflect the needs of the stakeholders; yet the institution's focus on the fundamental task of developing linguists for the purposes of national security has remained constant. DLIFLC has involved key internal constituents in the development of the mission statement. The institution meets this standard (1.A.3).

The mission statement is central to the planning efforts at the institution. The Campaign Plan 2010-2014 demonstrates sound strategic planning processes. Commandants have adapted the mission statement over time to accomplish the demands or requirements of national security. The institution meets this standard (I.A.4)

With one exception, the institution meets the requirements of Standard I.A.

Recommendation #1

Mission

To fully meet the standards, the team recommends that the institution evaluate and consider revisions to the mission statement in light of its degree-granting status (I.A.1).

STANDARD I

Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

B. Improving Institutional Effectiveness

General Observations:

The Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center (DLIFLC) is a unique institution with well-established practices that demonstrate commitment to excellence in all respects. The institution's military mission provides a basis for ensuring a common and sustained focus on high performance and on meeting the challenging and ever-changing needs of the United States Armed Forces and related Department of Defense Stakeholder agencies. The institution is adept at setting broad strategic goals that guide institutional action; the five-year Campaign Plan provides a primary framework that integrates goals and objectives with the core competencies.

An Annual Program Review published and disseminated among the institution's significant stakeholders reports achievements of the previous year, goals for the current year, and guidance from the Commandant and the institutional leadership for continued progress. A Commandant Brief on the progress of the Campaign Plan is conducted quarterly.

The Campaign Plan not only provides a framework for strategic planning, it is widely viewed as a key management tool and communication conduit from top to bottom and bottom to top. The current Campaign Plan was modeled after the Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC)'s Campaign Plan, when it was determined by the senior leadership (Command Group and Provost) that the previous five year plan did not sufficiently include overarching goals and themes. Once the framework was established, the Commandant delegated the task of crafting the Campaign Plan to the Associate Provosts, who solicit input from the deans and their staff.

The plan establishes Lines of Effort (LOE's) that further define the goals and objectives into plans of action and assign responsibility to various personnel within the institution. Progress on planned activities is tracked through the deployment of a SharePoint database, which provides a web-based environment for collecting and disseminating key information. A color-coded system within the application indicates whether key tasks are started, on track for completion, completed, or if there are factors or obstacles impacting completion of activities. This allows for key personnel to shift attention and resources to areas of need to solve problems and keep activities on track for completion.

The DLIFLC has established an impressive range of effectiveness measures and leverages a culture of evidence to guide decision-making at all levels; it supports continuous efforts to improve and maintain a high quality educational experience. The institution's ability to efficiently collect, organize and disseminate evidence to stakeholder groups in every area of the campus is outstanding, and there are ongoing efforts to continually fine-tune these processes.

Findings and Evidence:

The Annual Program Review process is well-established and drives institution-wide planning for improvement and informed decision-making. Dialogue occurs regularly, and in all areas the institution routinely uses data for guiding institutional action and ensuring that actions support the institutional mission. Particularly noteworthy is the institution's ability to identify problem areas early and rapidly respond to resolve problems quickly and efficiently. The institution routinely deploys "Tiger Teams" – a term to describe an ad hoc cross-functional, cross-departmental problem-solving group – to address a perceived or identified obstacle to progress. Tiger Teams are composed of stakeholders who are most impacted by the issue, and they are charged with developing and implementing the most effective solution to the problem. The Tiger Team approach includes evaluating a solution's effectiveness; post-action dialogue is a key part of the process.

The visiting team was able to verify numerous examples of ongoing, collegial, self-reflective dialogue. The institution has made considerable effort to ensure that various campus entities are engaged in a sustainable set of collaborative practices devoted to fulfilling the mission and strategic vision of DLIFLC. Chief among these practices is the comprehensive Annual Program Review (APR) that incorporates a comprehensive review of quality indicators for the institution and articulates the core competencies to all internal and external stakeholders. Feedback on student learning comes from a battery of assessment tools that begin with the Defense Language Aptitude Battery (DLAB) and culminate with the Defense Language Proficiency Test (DLPT) and the Oral Proficiency Test (OPT). The results are compiled, disseminated and utilized to improve and fine-tune the effectiveness and efficiency of educational programs. While the self evaluation narrative did not provide a clear picture of how those dialogues occur and indicated that the dialogues were not always well-documented, there was considerable evidence of numerous strategies, such as the 360-degree Program Evaluation, the Interim Student Questionnaire (ISQ) and End of Course Questionnaire (ESQ), attrition rates and SNAPSHOT summary analyses that are routinely collected and used to determine effectiveness of instructional programs. (I.B.1)

The DLIFLC has focused on ensuring that the comprehensive Strategic/Campaign Plan developed by senior leadership under direction of the Commandant, communicates the vision that empowers all stakeholders to achieve the goals that fulfill the mission of the institution. The institution updates the plan annually, which allows the institution to continually sharpen its focus on fulfilling the needs and directives of an evolving military mission and framework. Some of the goals that were identified in the Campaign Plan included:

- Streamlining hiring processes to hire new employees in 60 days or less.
- Improving processes to identify and satisfy physical space requirements.
- Increasing overall language proficiency of 2/2/1+ to 80% by the end of FY 2015, through identifying improvements in pedagogy, faculty training, and curriculum.
- Decreasing academic attrition to 7% in FY2012 through intervention strategies.
- Developing innovative new online training materials to boost and maintain proficiency.

The institution uses a SharePoint site to allow all staff and faculty to track progress on identified goals and objectives, and conversations with faculty and staff reinforced that use of this site was widespread. The Annual Program Review document reports institution wide

accomplishments and progress on prior year goals, and disseminates this information to all internal and external stakeholders. (I.B.2)

The DLIFLC is organized around key processes including the Campaign Plan, budget allocation process, and the Annual Program Review processes, all of which are supported by formal and informal evaluation and data collection processes. The four core competencies serve as overarching goals that guide development as well as the processes that track achievement of stated goals. These processes are supported by quantitative and qualitative data, and these practices are in use throughout the institution. The team found evidence of widespread use of data to make informed decisions at all levels, from resource allocation to instructional improvement. Examples include: the 360-degree evaluation process that encompassed nine language schools, reports and presentations delivered by the Evaluation and Standardization Directorate (ESD), the Center for the Advanced Study of Language (CASL) Projects and Updates, and periodic updates on the Campaign Plan delivered by the Commandant to internal as well as external stakeholders. Interviews with deans, associate provosts, staff, and faculty widely confirm that these goals and core competencies are embedded throughout the institution and that they drive collaborative dialogue and decision making. (I.B.3)

The DLIFLC has established channels of communication to ensure that all constituent groups have opportunities to provide input into the planning and resource allocation process. This has occurred in the context of an institution that has experienced rapid growth to meet increasing as well as changing requirements of the U.S. Armed Forces. The Commandant is charged with providing and maintaining a communication structure that engages all stakeholders in the planning process. The structure of input is organized around the hierarchy of the chain of command, where faculty work through department chairs and deans to send their planning needs and priorities up the chain to Associate Provosts who work with the Provost and Commandant to include this input into the overall institution-wide planning process. The Commandant and Provost meet periodically with faculty and departments, with the Academic Senate leadership and through “Town Hall” meetings to share information and solicit input. (I.B.4)

This top-down and bottom-up structure was instituted following a four-year period where the use of “Off-site” planning sessions were designed to promote a cross-functional team approach to participatory planning. These sessions generated a great deal of activity and synergy, and led to a greater feeling of inclusiveness on the part of some faculty. The team received a variety of perspectives from faculty who participated in the off-site sessions, providing evidence that ideas generated by the process were acted upon, such as the refinement of the “4+2” instructional model, and broader understandings of uses of emerging technology. While good ideas may have emerged from the off-sites, those charged with translating the ideas into actionable goals and objectives, such as the Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations (DCSOPS), found that they were not effective for good strategic planning. In 2010, it was decided that reverting to a structured, hierarchical chain-of-command provided better structure and direction to middle managers. While some faculty attributed this shift to a change in leadership style of a new Commandant, others shared with team members that the window for providing input into the planning process had been narrowed with this

change. Some other faculty related that the continuous, ongoing structure of instructional cycles afford little time to participate and provide input into the planning process under the current structure. (I.B.4)

The institution's self evaluation report lists a variety of learning assessments continuously administered in a systematic manner, the results of which are routinely communicated to all constituent groups within as well as outside the institution. This list includes six primary instruments: Defense Language Proficiency Test (DLPT), Oral Proficiency Interview (OPI), Final Learning Objectives (FLO), Interim Course Proficiency Tests (ICPT), Interim Student Questionnaire/End of Course Student Questionnaire, and the Language Skills Assessment (LSA). (I.B.5)

The DLPT and OPI are the Department of Defense standard language proficiency measurements students complete at the conclusion of their studies; the results are communicated to their service unit, who then use these results to make a "go/no-go" decision regarding the student's readiness for completing the required language mission in the field. Teaching faculty are purposefully detached from the development of the DLPT in order to preserve the integrity of the instrument's validity as a summative instrument, and to avoid teaching to the test. (I.B.5)

The test also serves as a primary indicator of the effectiveness of instruction. For instance, following the implementation of the fifth generation of the DLPT, the initial results indicated that student results in Arabic were far below expectations. The Training Improvement Certification Board (TICB), a group that is comprised of military service units and school representatives, and overseen by the Associate Provost/Dean of Students and the Provost, explored the contributing factors and focused on how to improve student results. A discussion of the detrimental impact of widespread DLAB Waivers ensued, which engaged the schools and the service units on a joint exploration of how to best address boosting performance by limiting waivers, among other strategies. This exemplifies how assessment results drive dialogue among appropriate constituencies toward identification of improvement strategies. (I.B.5)

Since the previous self evaluation in 2006, DLIFLC has expanded its capacity to engage internal stakeholders in decision-making dialog, increased its data collection and analytic report output, and extended its reach to individual schools, military units and support agencies to evaluate program effectiveness. The inclusion of effectiveness measures as part of the Campaign Plan, and the setting of benchmarks in boosting student proficiency as well as decreasing attrition, all point to a commitment to systematically reviewing the efficacy of their evaluation practices. The institution has established important partnerships, such as the one with the Center for the Advanced Study of Language (CASL) to provide independent technical review of initiatives such as the development of an updated Defense Language Aptitude Battery 2 (DLAB2), strategic planning efforts, and pedagogical approaches such as exploring how to improve students' use of out-of-class time in engaging homework, and self-directed study. (I.B.5)

The DLIFLC has established avenues for feedback and modification of their planning and

resource allocation model. The Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations (DCSOPS) leads this effort in collaboration with the Vice Provosts of the various directorates and staff agencies, such as Operations, Personnel and Resource Management. Evaluation and Standards conducts surveys to gauge faculty levels of satisfaction with their input into the resource allocation model. The results indicate that faculty want a greater opportunity to provide input into the planning and resource allocation priorities, and the visiting team received feedback from faculty during the visit that confirmed this. The institution continues to pursue ways to include these perspectives in their allocation model while maintaining that the Military mission and requirements drive the overarching priorities for DLIFLC. (I.B.6)

Initiatives such as the Proficiency Enhancement Program and the Student Attrition Reduction Initiative include provisions to identify and evaluate student support factors outside the classroom that contribute to student persistence and success. All of these activities indicate that the institution is committed to employing effective evaluation methods with a goal of improving instructional as well as student support services. (I.B.6)

Conclusions:

Using the ACCJC *Rubric for Evaluation of Institutional Effectiveness* the team determined that DLIFLC is at a level of *Proficiency* for both Program Review and Planning and has made progress on achieving *Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement* in both. One key consideration of the *Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement* level is the role that dialogue, particularly among faculty, plays in the overall achievement of student learning goals and targets. The statement in the rubric reads that “Dialogue about Student learning is ongoing, pervasive and robust.” The team found that the self evaluation did not address the existence of faculty dialogue in any substantial or meaningful way. The institution partially meets this standard (I.B.1).

The institution has a well-established and integrated Strategic Planning and Annual Program Review process. The DLIFLC Commandant spearheads, and the senior leadership and administrative staff fully support and carry the out this process. The comprehensive Program Review and Planning agenda is well documented, and appropriate activities and Lines of Efforts are established and disseminated through a SharePoint information management portal. The institution meets this standard (I.B.2).

Progress is continually tracked and updated through a color-coded method of identifying items completed or in progress of completion. All indicators are linked to the Core Competencies, which all support the learning mission of the institution. The institution meets this standard (I.B.3).

While progress is monitored through the learning targets and achievement benchmarks that are linked to the Annual Program Review, there is no evidence that Student Learning Outcomes are specifically linked to Program Review as the rubric prescribes. The institution partially meets this standard (I.B.4).

The shift away from the engagement of faculty in the “Off-site” strategic planning model, which demonstrated a pervasive and robust approach, in favor of a leadership-driven

approach leaves the team unclear about whether this has resulted in a “pervasive and robust” dialogue about student learning. The institution partially meets this standard (I.B.5).

The institution has established avenues for feedback on its planning processes. The team was not able to discern whether these evaluation mechanisms had themselves been reviewed for their effectiveness in improving instructional programs and services. The institution partially meets this standard (I.B.6).

The institution partially meets Standard I.B.

Recommendations:

Recommendation #2

Institutional Planning

To meet the standards and achieve a level of *Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement* in Planning the team recommends the institution evaluate its planning processes and systems evaluation mechanisms to ensure they are effective in improving instructional programs and services. (I.B.5, I.B.6, IV.A)

Commendations:

Commendation #1

The team commends the institution for its nimble, action-oriented research agenda that supports the development of agile, targeted and innovative solutions for student learning.

Commendation #2

The team commends the institution for its use of cross-functional, cross-departmental “Tiger Team” approach to identifying needs and problems and developing effective solutions.

STANDARD II

Student Learning Programs and Services

A. Instructional Programs

General Observations:

The Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center (DLIFLC) offers 24 languages and dialects at its Presidio of Monterey campus and 65 languages and dialects through the Washington branch of the Defense Languages Institute (DLI-W). The DLIFLC language courses carry academic, college-level credit and encompass the basic level of language instruction up through established proficiency levels. The DLI-W courses, in addition to those classes taught through the Language Training Detachments (LTD), are comprised of intermediate and advanced-level instruction that is targeted to specific job duties and part of ongoing professional development. DLI-W and LTD courses are non-credit and taught in both face-to-face and online formats.

The self evaluation describes in great detail how student success is defined by the DLIFLC in each language it teaches, including how languages are chosen to be offered, how proficiency levels are established, how students with demonstrated aptitude are placed into classes, how faculty are chosen, and the evaluative tools used to assess student proficiency. The report narrative also describes how the institution employs technology to deliver instruction on campus and throughout the world, regardless of where their students are located. In addition to a mandatory orientation to technology, on-campus students are issued PC tablets and have access to a significant amount of other technology resources to support their studies. Finally, the narrative mentions the need to continue, if not increase, the efforts to follow up with DLIFLC graduates, especially once they have left military life, to determine the efficacy of the language training in civilian occupations.

Findings and Evidence:

The languages offered at DLIFLC are selected by the Department of Defense, the National Security Agency and by the five branches of the armed services based on national security concerns and military deployments and/or conflicts throughout the world. All courses, whether credit or non-credit, are designed to enable students to meet the externally-created and validated Interagency Language Roundtable (ILR) proficiency scale. The institution has clearly articulated proficiency levels for all graduates, including distinctions between Reading, Listening, and Speaking Proficiency. The ILR proficiency scale determines the content of the basic, intermediate and advanced level curricula, which ranges from 2R/2L/1+S for DLIFLC graduates to an NSA goal of 3R/3L/3S for DLI-W and LTDs program completers. Whether DLIFLC or DLI-W based, the language instruction supports the mission of the institution. (II.A, A.1.)

Assignment to DLIFLC is based both on the results of the Defense Language Aptitude Battery (DLAB) test and a specific request for trained personnel from either the Department of Defense or from one of the five military branches. Because the student population is based solely upon staffing needs in conjunction with DLAB test results, consideration is not given to diversity, demographics or to a particular local economy. (II.A.1.a)

DLIFLC discontinues language programs in response to shifts in political and/or military needs, but due to the nature of the student population, such discontinuation is phased in and done with a minimum of disruption. The introduction of new languages is much more challenging, especially in terms of securing trained faculty in a short period of time. (II.A.6.b)

The institution structures each language program around established Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and Final Learning Outcomes (FLOs), both of which are included in each program syllabus. As revealed through interviews with DLIFLC administrators and faculty, a coordinated syllabi project was successful in transitioning all syllabi to a common format.

The team suggests the institution improve the manner in which it documents how assessment data are collected, analyzed and reviewed to make improvements to curriculum particularly because of the frequency of new course cohort sequences (II.A.1.b, c). Faculty Advisory Councils and the Academic Senate review assessment results, but the team had to coach the institution to providing evidence of faculty dialogue regarding evaluation of the student assessment data and/or whether that dialogue played a role in curriculum changes. Interviews, with key DLIFLC faculty and administrators, satisfied the team that this dialogue does take place, but that it is not well documented. (II.A.6)

The institution places great emphasis on “outputs” or the number of students who achieve 2/2/1+ with a goal of reaching 2+/2+/2+ over time. The Washington-based Defense Language Steering Committee, on which the Commandant represents DLIFLC, develops SLOs based on the ILR descriptors; their efforts are bolstered by guidance from both the Defense Language Curriculum Working Group (DLCWG) and the Defense Language Testing Working Group (DLTWG). Both working groups help the institution meet its Department of Defense language proficiency goals. These SLOs are evaluated through formative and summative evaluation tools that include standardized quantitative instruments in addition to qualitative interviews and classroom visits. All of this data becomes part of the Annual Program Summary, which is part of the quantitative data portion within the Annual Program Review (APR) process. This summary serves a dual purpose of informing the internal constituencies – faculty, military command, and civilian academic leaders – regarding the efficacy and quality of their programs, and an external audience – the military branches and Department of Defense – about DLIFLC’s success rates.

The amount of data collected at all steps of a student’s experience at DLIFLC is impressive. From the initial aptitude test that qualify military personnel to attend the institution to the Interim Student Questionnaire (ISQ) and End-of-Course Student Questionnaire (ESQ) to the Defense Language Proficiency Test (DLPT) that assesses student proficiency at the point of completion, the institution evaluates students’ language competencies to ensure academic quality and to meet a military goal. The structure of the on-campus experience is one of tremendous student support with hours devoted to instruction that surpass Carnegie unit requirements with small faculty-to-student ratios and additional learning support services available at the end of each class day.

Similarly, while there is extensive data available regarding student achievement of student learning outcomes and program evaluation, the team could not determine how data on student achievement at the off-campus locations were incorporated into the overall decision-making process. The vast majority of students who attend DLI-Washington and the LTDs are graduates of the DLIFLC basic level language training; evaluating their assessment data, particularly attainment of prescribed proficiency levels, is imperative to the work of the institution.

The institution meets the standard in terms of its campus-based programs. The overarching proficiency goals of DLI-Washington and the LTDs are included in the Campaign Plan and Lines of Effort, and, thus, pertain to DLIFLC self evaluation. Further follow up and a site visit to DLI-Washington and a representative sampling of LTDs should be considered. The team determined that the institution is at the *Proficiency Level* for program review following the ACCJC rubric.

The self evaluation report describes in great detail the ways in which the institution evaluates the rigor of its curriculum through a variety of formative and summative assessments. The results of those assessments, which occur throughout the program and at the conclusion in preparation for graduation, highlight areas for potential changes and/or additions to the curriculum. Central to this evaluation is the development and ongoing refinement of the Proficiency Enhancement Program (PEP), which has, at its core, ways to increase proficiency without increasing the length of study. Such methods include smaller class faculty-to-student ratios and a review of the minimum required score on the Defense Language Aptitude Battery for entry. However, interviews revealed that the desire to raise the minimum score is possibly being circumvented by military command demands to “waive” students into the institution with DLAB scores below the established minimum due to shortages in appropriately trained personnel. (II.A.2.c)

The institution recognizes the role of faculty professional development in improving student retention and performance as evidenced by their Instructor Certification and Recertification courses and greater emphasis on faculty use of technology in the classroom. It also recognizes the advantages of having peer-level academic coaches, known as Military Language Instructors (MLIs), who are recent graduates, to assist students who may be struggling with language acquisition. The institution acknowledges the need to hire a minimum of 58 new faculty in order to meet the demand for trained personnel in a variety of languages to increase student retention rates and/or to adequately address the deficiencies that students bring with them who are admitted via waivers to the minimum DLAB score. (II.A.2.c,e)

DLIFLC is dedicated to varied modes of instructional delivery and the use of technology in and out of the classroom to enhance student learning and student retention. Most impressive is its recognition of the need to recognize different student learning styles, especially as they relate to language instruction, and to adjust teaching strategies accordingly. (II.A.2.d)

Based on the nature of its degree programs, the institution is able to assess the validity of its instructional programs through the Defense Language Proficiency Test (DLPT) and Oral

Proficiency Interview (OPI), both of which are administered at the conclusion of the program. An external advisory committee, the Defense Language Testing Advisory Board, reviews the DLPT. This advisory committee is currently reviewing the DLPT (and OPI) in its fifth iteration to ensure both the rigor of the curriculum and, in the latest review, whether the test includes any potential cultural biases.

As noted above, each language program has a single syllabus that outlines both the program-level SLOs and the individual course-level SLOs. Based on the use of the DLPT and the OPI at the conclusion of the program, the institution does, in many ways, function as an outcomes-driven institution where demonstrating proficiency is the only way to both earn a diploma or degree and transition back to a military assignment related to a student's chosen language. (II.A.2.g, h, i)

The institution's self evaluation of its general education lacked clarity; interviews with key administrators satisfied the team that general education requirements are appropriately addressed. DLIFLC only offers nine out of the 27 general education units required for the degree. The Area H: Physical Education requirement is satisfied through every entering student's completion of their Military Basic Training. The remaining 15 units must be taken at regionally-accredited institutions or through CLEP or DANTES tests. The institution recognized when it first applied to be accredited that it lacked the faculty expertise to provide most general education classes and the funding to support them. Working with administration, the faculty agreed to follow the basic general education pattern required at most California Community Colleges, especially with Monterey Peninsula College close by to facilitate completion of the required courses. The general education requirements have been revised several times since they were first introduced, the most significant change being the removal of a lab requirement to meet the Area C: Science requirement which was one factor that resulted in approximately a 60% increase in the number of Associate Degrees awarded; another factor was the broadening of the Area E: Social Sciences requirement to include any social science class, not just a history course.

Where the institution does offer courses that meet general education requirements, six units may be earned during the basic language training and "double-counted" towards two general education requirements. However, rather than having a single course meet a particular General Education requirement, the institution's catalog suggests that, for example, Area D: Humanities may be satisfied by completion of AS 140, AS 240 and AS 340. This same grouping of classes also meets the Area G: Area Studies requirement. Rather than "double-counting" the classes, it appears that one unit from each of these two-unit classes meets each requirement. This is an odd practice, especially since these three classes also meet major requirements, so in essence, they are triple-counting the subject requirement but parsing out the units for two out of three of the requirements (G.E. and major). (II.A.3, 3a)

Students are oriented on the general education requirements prior to entry and information is available in the catalog, on the website, and in the A.A. Degree Office; however, the team could not determine whether the students fully understood the institution's general education philosophy that the majority of general education requirements must be taken elsewhere or through CLEP and DANTES testing. The self evaluation notes that greater faculty

understanding of the general education pattern will positively impact student understanding of the general education philosophy. (II.A.3, 3.a)

DLIFLC's instruction is tied directly to what most students will do after graduation. Included in this process is the necessity to maintain and increase language proficiency in their military or NSA assignments. Through the catalog and other materials available in the Education Center, students are clearly introduced to the concept of being lifelong learners and the need to acquire their knowledge in multiple ways. In addition to continuing their language instruction through the LTDs after graduation, the institution adjusts its curriculum according to feedback from their "clients" and from their graduates who must function in sometimes difficult environments. (I.A.3.b, 5)

The institution's catalog is brief and succinct. It includes essential information and provides guidance to entering students. The institution updates its catalog on a regular basis and undergoes a thorough review by various offices and as part of the APR. Because the student population is assigned to DLIFLC, the catalog does not serve as a marketing tool as many college catalogs do. The description of the G.E. requirements, as noted above, could be clearer especially in terms of how the individual courses that comprise Area D and Area G are broken down. While the catalog makes reference to transfer of credit, it refers students to the Associate of Arts Degree Office for further information, but more information in the catalog would be useful. (II.A.6, II.A.6a, c)

Military culture and civilian culture are quite different, and in an institution such as DLIFLC, this difference can play an unintended role in driving certain education/curriculum decisions over others. One example of the challenges that DLIFLC faces with balancing military institution and academic institution priorities is in the area of Academic Freedom. To its credit, the institution created an Academic Freedom statement to be used as a gauge; however, its self evaluation notes the statement must be "tempered" due to its unique nature and recognize the challenge of implementing this policy and culture in its planning agenda which states, "Leadership at all levels will endeavor to create a culture through which academic freedom is integral to innovation and feedback." In interviews with members of the Academic Senate, there appeared to be very little concern regarding limits to academic freedom because there is clear recognition of the inherent limitations that come with being federal employees of an institution funded by the Department of Defense. (II.A.7)

On the other hand, the benefit to teaching and learning within a military context is the Uniform Code of Military Justice, which governs the actions of all soldiers, regardless of context, school or battlefield. Students are informed about the UCMJ prior to their arrival at DLIFLC, and then it is reiterated during their orientation and in the Student Handbook. Likewise, the institution also provides Equal Employment Opportunity and other trainings to students, staff, and faculty to instill cultural sensitivity and to ensure that individuals' rights are not violated. The institution relies upon the Civilian Personnel Advisory Center (CPAC) to provide guidance to supervisors or employees who may be in violation of these policies. (II.A.7.c)

Standard II.A.8 does not apply to DLIFLC because all students are members of the armed

services and/or are sent to the institution by the NSA due to national security needs.

Conclusions:

The self evaluation report describes an institution whose focus is abundantly clear: foreign language instruction in service of the national security and military need for crypto-linguists and language professionals who meet increasing standards of language proficiency in addition to cultural sensitivity and cultural competence. All efforts of the institution, in its various forms, are clearly focused on this goal and are reflected in its mission. The institution meets this standard (II.A.1).

However, less clear is the way in which the ACCJC Accreditation Standards apply to DLI-Washington and the LTD's. Devoted to intermediate and advanced level non-credit instruction, these entities provide training in many places, and in many ways, including online, but because they are non-credit courses and do not count towards the associate degrees granted by DLIFLC, it is unclear as to how to evaluate these programs and whether the assessment processes and data should be taken into account for the purposes of DLIFLC. The institution mostly meets this standard (II.A.2).

The institution's catalog includes a description of all General Education requirements, most of which must be completed at other institutions and transferred in for those seeking an Associate's Degree. While the basic General Education requirements are clearly spelled out, the three DLIFLC courses that do meet General Education requirements need to be more clearly defined. Despite the lack of clarity, the institution meets this standard (II.A.3).

The only type of Associate Degree DLIFLC offers is in foreign language, and the requirements for each language are clearly articulated in the catalog. The institution meets this standard (II.A.4).

While DLIFLC has indicated that it intends to study the post-service employment options for its certificate and degree graduates once they leave the military, they collect and utilize information about current service members' proficiency and performance in their chosen language on a regular basis. The DLPT and OPI are the primary indicators of professional competency; however, subsequent intermediate and advanced training at the LTDs also provides useful data to ensure that graduates meet professional standards and military assignment demands. The institution meets this standard (II.A.5).

The DLIFLC catalog is comprehensive. Entering students not only complete an extensive orientation to the Institute and their certificate or degree program, they also have continuous access to academic advisement and general education information through various offices on campus. Every student receives a program syllabus, which includes all individual course objectives and student learning outcomes related to that program and the individual courses at the beginning of the program. All DLIFLC syllabi follow a common format. However, in several places, student learning objectives are listed as student learning outcomes. The institution meets this standard (II.A.6).

The institution has developed an Academic Freedom policy that pertains to faculty, most of

whom are civilians working at a military-based institution. Because all students at DLIFLC are soldiers in one of five branches of the military, the Institute relies upon the Uniform Military Code of Justice for all student conduct-related issues. A more clearly articulated statement of student rights and responsibilities separate from the UMCJ might serve the students better. However, the institution meets this standard (II.A.7).

Standard II.A.8 does not apply.

The institution mostly meets Standard II.A.

Recommendations

Recommendation #3

Off-site Programs and Services

To improve the effort to fully meet the standards, the team recommends that the institution design, implement and assess a system of periodic evaluation of the instructional and support services provided to students in DLIFLC programs at locations outside the Monterey campus (II.A.2; II.B.1; II.B.3.a, II.C.1.c).

Commendations

Commendation #3

The team commends the institution for its comprehensive system of monitoring classroom learning to identify academic problems early and implementing interventions for student success.

Commendation #4

The team commends the institution for the frequency, depth and range of its assessments of student learning and of student satisfaction with support services, and for the variety of ways in which the assessments are used to improve classroom instruction, faculty development, and instructional support services.

STANDARD II

Student Learning Programs and Services

B. Student Support Services

General Observations

The Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center (DLIFLC) responded clearly to each section of Standard II.B. and provided documents and other evidence that support each of its assertions about meeting the standards. However, the level of detail in each response varies, and the evidence provided was occasionally tangential to the central point of the standard. Moreover the institution provided little evidence regarding assertions about its many off-site or “distance” instructional and support activities which literally span the globe.

The institution regularly cited surveys as means for assessment-based decision making and program improvements, but the quantitative results of the surveys are not presented or analyzed in the narrative, nor does the self-evaluation report make clear the “decision pathway” from survey results to dialog about the results to support-service improvements. Fortunately, on-site interviews and additional document reviews were able to fill in most of these gaps.

Findings and Evidence

Interviews with staff at the institution affirm the self-evaluation report’s descriptions of student support services at the Monterey campus and the role they are intended to play in achieving student learning outcomes.

Admission to the institution is consistent with its mission of language and cultural-competence training for active-duty military personnel and other authorized government employees. Admission is based on the need of military branches (Army, Navy, Marines, Air Force, and National Guard) for specific numbers of personnel with skills in specific languages, and the branches’ assignment of individuals to the DLIFLC for that training. The assigned personnel take the Defense Language Aptitude Battery (DLAB) and, depending on the DLAB score and the branch’s language needs, the student is assigned to a particular language for the prescribed length of study for that language.

The student body of approximately 3,500 is diverse ethnically and in terms of gender, and is drawn from the US military as well as other government agencies. The institution periodically assesses students’ academic and other needs through surveys administered in class or at points of service delivery; satisfaction surveys are also available to students online. Faculty assessment of in-class learning, student performance on instructional measures, and oral and written language proficiency standards are frequent.

Academic problems are identified early and lead to referral to the Student Learning Center and/or to instructors/advisors within each language school and/or diagnostic assessment specialists for assistance. Staff and instructors work as a closely-knit team to assist students to succeed. Cultural competency assessment is built into the OPI (Oral Proficiency Interview) at the end of the language course. The concern on the part of instructors and administrators for students' learning and their success in the institution's programs is evident

throughout the structure of the institution, and is attested to by the students and institution staff. (II.B)

Although many of the institution's wide variety of support services are funded and provided by the Presidio of Monterey rather than by the institution itself, and are available to military personnel outside the institution as well as to DLIFLC students, the institution closely monitors those services, and student satisfaction with them, using the online Interactive Customer Evaluation (ICE), which is available to students on demand at any time. In-class surveys of students' academic experiences are the Interim Student Questionnaire (ISQ), which is administered in class midway through the course, and the End of Program Student Questionnaire (ESQ) at the end of the course of study. But the findings of the various surveys are not presented or discussed in the narrative of the self evaluation report.

These same military support services, and the same evaluative mechanisms, are said to be provided at DLI-Washington and at the various Language Training Detachments around the world, but the self evaluation report's descriptions and supporting evidence were insufficient for the team to confirm this assertion. The institution's services for its Associate Degree students include the maintenance of academic records including transcripts, advising how to pursue an Associate credential review, and graduation certification. These are available to and are the same for all DLIFLC students. (II.B.1)

The institution's annual catalog is generally accurate and sufficiently detailed, except as noted in the team's response to Standard II.A., where the institution should provide more information on general education requirements; it is available in hard copy and online and is updated each year. (II.B.2)

Support services at the DLIFLC campus in Monterey are comprehensive and available to all students there. These include the main library and the Student Learning Center (SLC). The self evaluation report asserts that "comparable educational services" are available at the DLI-Washington site and at other military installations in that area through contractors, that the services are "commensurate with the contracted institution's guidelines," and that the services are "regularly" evaluated by DLIFLC staff through visits to DLI-Washington and/or email, videoconferencing, and phone conversations. Similarly, the self evaluation report asserts this same comparability in "quality of life and educational support" for the non-credit, non-degree instructional programs provided by DLIFLC at the Language Training Detachments (LTDs) operated by the institution in a wide variety of sites around the world. But the self evaluation report does not provide evidence to support these assertions of comparability or assessment of comparability. (II.B.3.a)

The self evaluation report's descriptions of support services and the team's on-site interviews of DLIFLC students and staff all confirm that through an impressive array of offices, recreational opportunities, religious ministries and family-support resources, the Presidio of Monterey and the institution create and sustain an environment that encourages personal and civic responsibility, as well as intellectual, aesthetic, and personal development for all its students. However, there is no evidence provided in the self evaluation report to actually document the use of these opportunities or the students' or institution's assessment of them as

they relate to enhanced student learning. The institution should periodically assess students' use of the services available to them, especially for the contribution they make to student retention and student success. (II.B.3.b)

Counseling and advisement services are available to all students at the institution through monthly academic advising sessions provided by instructors/advisors, a more in-depth advising based on instructors' diagnostic assessment of student learning and progress, and the students' development of an Individual Study Management program in the Student Learning Center. Instructors receive formal training in these mechanisms prior to working with students, and ongoing in-service opportunities in advising strategies are also made available to them. Students evaluate these counseling and advising services using the same survey instruments used by the institution to assess student satisfaction with other support services, including the ISQ and ESQ, and the survey results indicate that counseling and advising do support student development. Students can also use the Associate Degree Office's services to assess the academic units and/or CLEP and DANTES scores that many of them bring to the institution and/or the General Education units they will take at DLIFLC or other institutions to outline a plan for completing an Associate Degree. The institution has awarded a very impressive 6,800 Associate degrees in the ten years since they were first authorized to do so. (II.B.3.c)

The institution is in an enviable position, of which it takes full advantage, to provide programs, practices, and services that support and enhance students' understanding and appreciation of diversity. The very nature of its core mission and instructional programs, foreign languages and the cultures in which those languages are embedded, builds into every course and every learning experience an opportunity to better understand diversity. In addition, the institution participates in Presidio of Monterey-sponsored events such as Women's Equality Day, African-American History Month, Asian/Pacific History month, and the observance of Ramadan. Equal opportunity training is also offered to DLIFLC staff members. The self evaluation report provides no evidence that these out-of-classroom events and opportunities are formally assessed by students or the institution for their contribution to student learning but interviews with staff members, during the site visit, indicated that informal evaluations do take place usually through conversations with participants. On the other hand, the cultural-competence skills that are now central to language instruction at DLIFLC are very carefully assessed throughout the course and again at the end of the course in the required Oral Proficiency Interview (OPI). The institution could enhance its understanding of its own broader contribution to students' understanding of diversity by surveying the students who participate in the impressive array of out-of-classroom activities available to them at the Presidio.

As noted earlier, the institution uses the Defense Language Aptitude Battery (DLAB) instrument, which has been in use since 1971, to determine a student's recommended placement into the four language categories. The higher the DLAB score, the higher (i.e., more difficult) the language category into which the student is deemed qualified. The current placement scores are 95 for Category I, 100 for Category II, 105 for Category III, and 110 for Category IV. Ultimately, student placement is determined by the US Military and its need for a certain number of trained linguists in particular languages. Thus a student with a

lower-than-recommended DLAB score can be placed into a higher-level language group via a “waiver” initiated by the service that is sending the student to DLIFLC. As the military services, including the National Guard, to an increasing extent, seek higher levels of language competency in DLIFLC graduates, especially in the high-demand and high-difficulty languages, the use of “waivers” has increased. In some of the Category IV (most difficult) languages, up to 20% of the assigned students did not achieve the recommended score on DLAB. This raises serious concerns about student success, and secondarily the validity of the DLAB scores used for placement. The institution will complete an extensive attrition study in the next several months that was described to the visiting team but was not available in its final version for review at the time of the visit. Interviews with institution staff members, however, indicated a very high level of concern with attrition rates and a closely related concern with the increasing use of waivers for student placement. These concerns have been discussed at the institution and with the military services over the past two years. The completed attrition study should cast valuable light on which students are succeeding (or not) and why, the use of the DLAB scores as predictors of success, the role of waivers in these trends, and perhaps the role that support services play in helping students succeed in these very challenging academic programs.

The self evaluation report cites a 2004 Master’s thesis by Chin Han Wong at the Naval Postgraduate School as confirming that the DLAB is free of gender bias and that its scores are strongly correlated with later student success in each of the language groups. However, the self evaluation report does not address possible bias for race or ethnicity, a potentially important gap given the very diverse student body. DLIFLC staff members indicated that the DLAB is being revised and a newer version will be in use in one or two years’ time; the team was also told that this revision will include a review of race/ethnic bias as well as gender bias.

The institution secures student data and student records permanently and confidentially, and has adequate systems for backing up records whether in electronic or hard-copy format. The team was told that similar systems are in place to ensure the security of records at the DLI-Washington site, but there was no opportunity for the team to confirm this independently. The institution adheres to the federal Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA). These student records policies are printed on the student transcript and are available in internal documents (e.g., DLIFLC Regulation 350-10) but are not published in the catalog or described on the web site. (II.B.3.f)

As noted throughout this section of the team report, the institution relies heavily on a set of student-satisfaction surveys to monitor and assess student use of and satisfaction with the wide array of support services available to students through the institution itself as well as through the Presidio of Monterey more generally. The on-line ICE (Interactive Customer Evaluation) is available to students at any time, to submit concerns or complaints about particular services. They can do so anonymously or, if they would like a response, with their name. Hard-copies of the ICE survey are also available at various service centers. The service provider is required to respond within three days, and they are closely monitored by an ICE Coordinator for adherence to that standard. Use of the feedback from students is the responsibility of each service provider.

The ISQ (Interim Student Questionnaire) and the ESQ (End of Program Student Questionnaire), both of which all students are required to complete during and at the end of their courses, also have a section on student satisfaction with support services such as the Student Learning Center (SLC), but their principal purpose is to assess overall program quality, curriculum, classroom instruction, texts and other materials, tests, and instructional support. The findings are compiled and reported to stakeholders, i.e. service providers, deans, and instructors, within 24 or 48 hours of their completion by students. The Evaluations staff review all responses for “red flag” issues (e.g., sexual discrimination, harassment) that need to go immediately to the top of the DLIFLC command structure, while most responses are discussed and acted upon at the school, classroom and service-provider levels. The self evaluation report cites several examples of survey results leading to improvements (e.g., library hours). In addition to the surveys above, students assess the Student Learning Center’s orientation, counseling and advising services on a Scantron form, and SLC staff compile and discuss those results on a regular basis. (II.B.4)

Conclusions

The institution closely monitors the wide variety of support services and student satisfaction with them, but the narrative in the self evaluation report does not present or discuss the findings of the various surveys. Nor is there discussion of the monitoring of services at DLI-Washington and the various Language Training Detachments around the world. The institution’s support services for its Associate Degree students include the maintenance of academic records including transcripts, advising how to pursue an Associate credential review, and graduation certification. These are available to and are the same for all DLIFLC students. The institution partially meets this standard (II.B.1.)

The institution provides a catalog for its constituencies with precise, accurate and current information concerning the institution’s mission and vision statements, its accreditation status, a history of the institution, an overview of its administrative structure and its faculty and programs, a brief description of the various support services, instructional policies (e.g., fees, hours of instruction), the various language programs, and detailed descriptions of language proficiency levels, and how they are assessed. The institution meets this standard (II.B.2).

The institution is very attentive to the support needs of its students. It relies heavily on satisfaction and other surveys to assess student needs, student use of the services, students’ perceptions of the services’ support of their academic needs, and the identification of service improvements. But the self evaluation report does not present or discuss the results of the surveys, nor does it describe in sufficient detail how decisions are made based on these results. This information, however, was made available during the site visit via interviews and further requests for evidence. The self evaluation report does not provide evidence to support assertions of comparability or assessment of comparability of educational services provided at DLI-Washington or for the non-credit, non-degree instructional programs provided at the Language Training Detachments (LTDs) around the world. The institution did not provide evidence to support these assertions of comparability or assessment of comparability. The institution mostly meets this standard (II.B.3.a).

The team confirmed that the institution creates and sustains an environment that encourages personal and civic responsibility, as well as intellectual, aesthetic, and personal development for all its students. It is suggested that the institution periodically assess students' use of the services available to them, especially for the contribution that they make to student retention and success. The institution meets this standard (II.B.3.b).

The institution provides counseling and advisement services to all of its students. Students evaluate these services through survey instruments, and services are provided to assessment services that are used to outline a plan for completing an Associate Degree. The institution provides programs, practices, and services that support and enhance students' understanding and appreciation of diversity, but it could enhance its understanding of its own broader contribution to students' understanding of diversity by surveying the students who participate in available out-of-classroom activities available at the Presidio. The self evaluation report does not address possible bias for race or ethnicity. The institution's staff members indicated that the DLAB is being revised; will be available in one or two years; and will include a review of race/ethnic bias as well as gender bias. The institution partially meets this standard (II.B.3.e).

The institution could strengthen adherence to the Standard II.B.3 by publishing its policies related to student-record access and privacy regulations in the catalog and/or on its website. The institution partially meets this standard (II.B.3).

The institution has an impressive array of evaluative mechanisms that are used effectively by staff and instructors for program improvements. The institution meets this standard (II.B.4).

The institution mostly meets Standard II.B.

Recommendations

See Recommendation #3

Recommendation #4

Aptitude Assessment

To fully meet the standards, the team recommends that the institution establish a schedule on which the DLAB is periodically reviewed and revised as necessary to ensure the accuracy of its placement scores and to minimize gender and racial/ethnic testing or cultural bias (Standard II.B.3.e).

Commendations

See Commendation #3

See Commendation #4

STANDARD II

Student Learning Programs and Services

C. Library and Learning Support Services

General Observations:

The Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center's (DLIFLC) libraries and learning support services sufficiently support its instructional mission. These include the Aiso Library, Chamberlin Library, web-based resources from the Language Science and Technology Directorate, on-site libraries at Language Training Detachment (LTD) locations, a DoD Center Resource Materials Development Center of books and media, and military unit-provided support. Other learning support services include the Student Learning Center (SLC) for the basic courses and its counterpart, the Academic Support Center (ASC) for continuing education students, the Diagnostic Assessment Center (DAC), and resources provided by the directorate of Language Science & Technology. These services provide students and instructional staff with adequate access to the libraries and other learning support services, regardless of their location or preferred means of delivery.

The institution's self evaluation report provides ample evidence of the quality of its learning support services. The libraries and support centers are well-staffed and have extensive resources to assist students in the process of developing their language proficiency. The library's collection of materials related to language acquisition is extensive and current. Study rooms are available in the library for small group sessions. In addition, Aiso's weekly hours of operation (75.5) are impressive for an institution its size. Learning support services include advising, analysis, and support components differentiated by enrollment status. The Student Learning Center assists students in the process of initial acquisition, while the Academic Support Center assists students enrolled in DLIFLC's Continuing Education program. Both offer a variety of tutorial services and workshops for the students and should be commended for teaching explicit study skills and teaching students how to understand their own learning styles.

Findings and Evidence

The Libraries and Learning Resources at the DLIFLC are extensive and comprehensive with ample staffing to support the campus mission. Resources for language learning include books, online resources, workshops, technology applications, and a variety of other support mediums to assist students with language mastery. Students at both beginning and advanced levels of language acquisition access these services through the various libraries, the Student Learning Center (SLC), and the Academic Support Center (ASC). (II.C.1.a, c)

The library system is well-funded and provides contemporary educational equipment and materials to support student learning. The library system's FY2010 budget was \$226,798 for all library materials and subscriptions. Students can access additional materials through an inter-library system that meets the requirements of both faculty and students in a flexible and efficient manner and is required to adhere to Army contracting regulations and administrative guidelines for all purchases of resources and services. The library system makes purchases in a timely manner which conforms to DoD procurement requirements. (II.C.1.a, e)

Language instruction focuses on linguistics, language learning, and cultural studies; therefore the libraries sustain collections that are both broad-based and specific. Combined, Aiso and Chamberlin Libraries provide over 125,000 references to support instruction specifically highlighting foreign languages, cultures, and the acquisition process. In addition to books, holdings also include video recordings, newspapers, magazines, journals, games, maps, and computer software related to all levels of language instruction. (II.C.1.a)

Learning support services include Aiso Library, Chamberlin Library, web-based resources from the Language Science and Technology Directorate, on-site libraries at Language Training Detachment locations, a DoD Center, Resource Materials Development of books and media, and military unit-provided support. Other learning services include the Diagnostic Assessment Center, the Student Learning Center (SLC) to assist students enrolled in basic courses, and the Center for Continuing Education which serves as a resource for students continuing their studies at an advanced level. (II.C.1.a, c)

Electronic access to library materials is excellent; students are easily able to access facilities, cutting-edge technologies, and innovative language tools. The libraries provide 75.5 weekly hours of library operation, sufficient staffing, workstations providing access to .mil websites and general public websites, cable broadcasts, word processing, and language software. In addition, students have wireless access to various language enhancement programs on the internet via Army Knowledge Online (AKO) as well as a vast array of free online language resources that may be used to enhance language learning activities irrespective of location. Especially noteworthy are the librarians' outreach programs, distance education programs, on-site libraries and SLC and ASC support services for students located at Language Training Detachment sites. (II.C.1.a, c)

Student achievement is monitored and specific interventions are provided when a student drops below a 3.0 grade point average. Interventions consider a variety of factors contributing to a sub-standard achievement level such as study habits and individual learning style. Options for assistance include unit specific support such as seventh hour, evening study hall, tailored homework, and peer tutors as well as individual help from instructors. (II.C.1.a, b, c)

DLIFLC engages in robust planning, research, and evaluation activities to ensure the quality of its library and learning support programs. For example, library and SLC users are surveyed upon completing workshops or tutorial services. The institution recently evaluated the Student Learning Center to ensure responsiveness to the ever-changing needs of the DLIFLC faculty, staff, programs, and students. At the time of the visit, this study had been completed and preliminary information shared with program staff, but they had not had time to completely analyze the results yet. However, evidence was provided to demonstrate that initial results support improved learning outcomes for students receiving support versus those that do not. (II.C.2)

The library's directorates regularly research, evaluate, and provide a variety of products, such as language related publications, games, CD's and DVD's, in order to support the quality of its instructional programs. The recently reinstated Acquisitions Advisory Board will meet monthly with representation from faculty and students within each language program. Various

sub-committees anticipate working on a variety of issues surrounding acquisition of materials and technologies. (II.C.1.a, b, II.C.2)

The team observed a smooth and reliable process for handling contracted services. The library has multiple contracts with outside entities that allow for flexibility in acquiring needed materials while extending its holdings in a cost-effective manner. The institution and the DoD closely monitor purchases and services made via contract to ensure compliance with federal procurement procedures and regulations. (IIC.1.e.4)

Particularly commendable is the overlap of research, planning, professional development, and SLO's. The Division of Continuing Education's Academic Specialist Center provides assessment and coaching for all CE faculty and students, both resident and off-site, in language learning. This group supports teaching and learning via the development of targeted, innovative solutions to address curricular and instructional needs of both instructors and learners. For example, the SLC provides a mandatory week-long orientation for all new students to foster the development of well-articulated cognition skills in the target language. The team found ample evidence of faculty dialogue around instructional and curricular assessment data and student and faculty satisfaction surveys regarding library services. (II.C.1.a,b,e, II.2)

Library facilities are well-maintained and secure. DLIFLC contracts with the City of Monterey for its building maintenance and with PRIDE Services for its janitorial services and maintains security via a motion-sensitive 3M camera system, as well as regular police patrols by officers in the nearby Presidio. The team determined that library staff are trained in security requirements, policies and procedures and daily review of security procedures guiding library closing. (IIC.1d.2)

Conclusions

DLIFLC supports its language programs by providing library and other learning services that are sufficient in quantity, currency, depth, and variety to support students regardless of location or means of delivery. Its two main libraries have combined holdings of over 125,000 volumes. Students and faculty may request materials or interlibrary loans, place holds, renew materials, and email staff electronically. Library acquisitions are guided by an overarching plan, stable budget, and specific purchasing protocols that also permit patron requests insofar as they conform to the library's mission. Overall, DLIFLC meets the standards in all respects with the exception of Standard II.C.1.c which was not completely assessed, because the institution did not evaluate off-site locations in the self evaluation report. The institution mostly meets this standard (II.C.1).

Learning support services are proactively utilized and broadly accessible to students in all programs of study whether on or off site. Since 2005, the SLC has served over 25,000 students. The Student Learning Center empowers students initially acquiring a new language with skills and resources to help them succeed, while the Academic Support Center within the directorate of Continuing Education assists students at upper levels of proficiency. At the Diagnostic Assessment Center, all students have access to diagnostic assessment throughout their training. The institution meets this standard (II.C.2).

The institution mostly meets Standard II.C.

Recommendations

See Recommendation #3

STANDARD III Resources

A. Human Resources

General Observations

The Human Resources section in the self evaluation was straightforward and comprehensive, focusing on current practices and procedures; the evaluative sections summarized the Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center's (DLIFLC) own assessment of its progress and achievements, while the planning agendas, though sparse, established several future directions. Importantly, each specific standard and sub-standard component was supported with a wealth of collaborative evidence and documentation.

The planning agendas however, lack specificity: timelines for the development and implementation of human resource actions plans, assignment of responsibilities to individuals and/or to groups, and how each planning action enhances, or links to, its focused mission and overall institutional outcomes. Understandably the unique and different personnel systems, military and civilian, make exact planning problematic; however, such information would allow DLIFLC to develop and implement personnel programs and services more effectively amid uncertainties in both political and governmental arenas, and would allow the planning proposals in the self evaluation to be a better working guideline for future human resource activities.

Findings and Evidence

DLIFLC is fortunate to have a cadre of uniquely talented, dedicated, and enthusiastic faculty, administration, and staff who provide quality programs and services for its foreign language students. This institution-wide commitment is especially apparent from reviews of documented evidence and numerous interviews with members of all constituent groups, including students themselves. Clearly, this dedication continues to be a major and distinctive characteristic at the institution.

DLIFLC employs highly competent and committed faculty and staff. In order to achieve the institution's overall mission to provide "culturally-based foreign language training and education," the institution draws on both military and civilian workforces, using diverse, and in some ways, discrete, personnel systems, that outline policies and procedures for the selection of qualified faculty and staff. The faculty are hired under Title 10 United States Code, Chapter 81, Section 1595, while support staff is hired under the normal federal authority, Title 5 United States Code.

Regardless of the responsible hiring agencies, the institution has in place standardized and equitable selection processes for all employees directly linked to its mission. DLIFLC established, for instructional faculty, a detailed job qualification and selection criteria, with interview questions designed to ascertain the applicant's knowledge/use of technology, instructional methodology, as well as educational experience; additional advanced testing is also administered using both the target language and English. The successful candidate must submit proof of educational programs and earned degrees from institutions accredited by recognized U.S. accrediting agencies as well as the U.S. Department of Education; those candidates who received degrees outside of the U.S. have transcripts validated through the National Association of Credential Evaluation Services (NACES).

The DLIFLC hires non-professional (non-teaching) employees or support staff using criteria outlined in the complex federal hiring guidelines listed under Title 5 United States Code regulations issued by the Office of Personnel Management, the Department of Defense, and the Department of the Army. The selection criteria for non-teaching staff include priority directives to hire American citizens and veterans, as well as processes to first consider internal candidates. (III.A.1.a)

The visiting team confirmed that DLIFLC conducts formal and systematic annual evaluations for all employees to ascertain performance effectiveness and continuous improvement. Employee evaluation procedures, specified in accordance with the Department of the Army Regulations 690-400, encompass institutional responsibilities, employee-established objectives, as well as compliance with recognized ethical standards; in all cases, constructive and meaningful discussion sessions are inherent and critical components.

In particular, at the beginning of the annual evaluation cycle, employee and supervisor jointly design employee-established evaluative standards; these evaluations, in concert with other board recommendations and funding availability, form the criteria for merit pay for faculty, or cash awards for support staff. Currently, as indicated in the self evaluation planning agenda, the institution is reviewing the merit pay system for transparency, equity, and effectiveness; the Shared Government Special Event held in February 2012 for all employees is one excellent example of this progress. (III.A.1.b)

All language faculty have direct responsibility for developing and assessing student learning outcomes utilizing tailored strategies and methodology to improve student learning. Instructors work as a team and evaluate each student's progress through a battery of standardized and non-standardized assessments with individual counseling after each test, culminating in a final Defense Language Proficiency Test. At the same time, team leaders, department chairpersons, and other academic specialists also observe the classes to evaluate teaching effectiveness and student learning. Significantly, these performance standards link directly to institutional goals with measures of teaching effectiveness built into the evaluation process. (III.A.1.c)

DLIFLC follows the code of professional conduct for all personnel as stipulated in the Joint Ethics Regulation, the Standards of Conduct for Department of Army Personnel (AR 600-50), and the institution's own Professional Code of Ethics. These regulatory policies define ethical conduct and are incorporated into the evaluation process, as well as mandated in initial and continuous training for all employees including the Board of Visitors. (III.A.1.d)

Staffing requirements are based on a modeling process known as a Table of Distribution and Allowances (TDA) which is a compilation of workload factors and is built using guidelines from Army Regulation 570-4. The number of full-time faculty is based upon resource formulas developed by the Department of the Army: two faculty members for every eight students in the beginning category language, and six for advanced categories; administrative support staff are built on a model that results in 9-15 personnel to support approximately 125-250 faculty.

The Provost and administrative staff use this TDA documentation process for new programs or projects after an evaluation of the educational requirements inherent in the mission has been

conducted. A key aspect of this evaluation includes assessments based on educational needs, fiscal resources, and the available experience levels already present within the institution. (III.A.2)

At a minimum of every three years, the Chief of Staff in conjunction with the Provost's Office analyze and assess all personnel policies, including employment regulations and grievance processes. The Chief of Staff then routes these policies and regulations to all staff for further review/feedback to provide an impartial and reliable set of written procedures consistent with the overall educational mission. This all-inclusive review process, including an evaluation of the policies themselves, is regularly validated by the Civilian Personnel Office to verify compliance with the rules or regulations of the Office of Personnel Management, the Department of Defense, or the Department of the Army.

All Official Personnel Files (OPFs) are maintained by the Department of the Army West Regional Personnel Center in Fort Huachuca, Arizona. This Center is tasked with the essential responsibility of compliance with all laws and regulations regarding the security of these records. Additionally, other working files, available to all employees, are maintained and secured onsite at DLIFLC to facilitate and simplify ease of access. (III.A.3.a, b)

DLIFLC also follows the laws, policies, and criteria set by various federal government agencies regarding equality, diversity, and integrity for all staff. Onsite, the institution maintains two units responsible for collecting and reporting statistical diversity data: Equal Opportunity (EO) Office for all military personnel and an Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) Office for all civilian staff.

As evidenced by the documentation and interviews, these two offices work closely with other entities, each with multiple and complementary roles. The Inspector General's Office is responsible for confirming that all laws are applied fairly and equitably; the Civilian Personnel Advisory Center routinely conducts periodical reviews with various employee groups; the Staff Judge Advocate is responsible for ascertaining legal compliance; and, the American Federation of Teachers Union ensures and verifies that no group is disadvantaged. To ensure equality and integrity amongst all students, the Provost and Dean of Students conduct periodic student surveys to determine classroom climate, while program deans regularly obtain student feedback through "sensing" sessions, course reviews, and feedback.

Significantly, DLIFLC has an ongoing, exemplary, and comprehensive professional development program providing for skill training/improvement and educational enrichment. These workshops and seminars include both pre- and in-service activities on mentoring techniques, recertification proficiencies, educational leadership and technology, visiting scholar seminars, and academic team development.

Of importance, this wealth of available professional growth opportunities can be expanded and enhanced specially for all leadership and supervisory personnel. Specific training sessions on new administrative challenges, conflict identification and resolution, new technology tools, or techniques for more meaningful communication would greatly augment the effectiveness of managerial support of the institutional learning goals.

Other workshops, focusing on recognizing and promoting individual integrity and cultural uniqueness, can be highlighted and expanded in view of the increasingly diverse employee and student populations. All these events, scheduled throughout the year, will offer all campus entities, including students and the community-at-large, the opportunity to freely exchange thoughts and ideas in a respectful environment. The self evaluation and interviews with various campus groups verified that these numerous workshops, seminars, conferences, specially focused classes, and other related training sessions are developed and accessible to everyone. (III.A.4.a, b, c)

Moreover, tuition assistance is made available to all employees, and recipients are encouraged to share newly-acquired information and skills with all constituent groups. Such feedback is a critical element in the institution's continuous review of these efforts. The team confirms that the effectiveness of all these on- and off-campus events and programs are consistently assessed, evaluated, and refined to increase effectiveness at meeting the institutional mission and outcomes. (III.A.5.a, b)

Finally, personnel and other human resource planning follow requirements and procedures as stipulated in the Army Manpower Management Program rather than incorporated into a distinct institutional planning agenda. These regulatory processes mandate that positions be linked to the mission of the institution, while instructional requests are linked to future student enrollments; additional needs not included within the above structures are accepted based on budgetary and resource availability. (III.A.6)

Conclusions

Overall, the team determined that DLIFLC is especially committed to achieving its stated mission of foreign language training and education to support, ensure, and enhance national security. Although required to adhere to various and varied federal regulations and governing entities, the institution continues to focus on pertinent learning outcomes in all courses and programs; it is dedicated to selecting sufficient highly qualified faculty and staff for its instructional programs and services, performing focused evaluations, increasing student awareness of the importance of language usage within a specific culture, and supporting the professional development of all employees. The institution exceeds the standard (III.A.1, 2).

The team encourages DLIFLC to continue its efforts to implement its own stated planning items focused on appropriate professional development, assurance of continued equity for all employees, development and implementation of an equitable transparent faculty merit pay system, and a future plan for reimbursements. The institution meets the standard (III.A.3, 4, 5).

To the extent possible, given its responsibilities to divergent authorities, the team suggests the institution consider and develop a working contingency plan integrated within an institutional-wide strategic plan. This operational document, involving all constituent groups, would allow the institution to more effectively prepare for changing leadership, unexpected policy re-directions, modifications to current or new guideline/procedures, political and fiscal uncertainties, and shifting global circumstances. Indeed, DLIFLC has already acknowledged the need to establish a clear policy for the management of human resources when its reimbursable

program ends. The institution meets the standard (III.A.6).

The institution meets or exceeds Standard III.A.

Recommendations

None.

Commendations

Commendation #5

The team commends the institution for its cadre of talented, enthusiastic and diverse faculty and staff that are highly-dedicated to providing quality programs and services.

STANDARD III Resources

B. Physical Resources

General Observations

The Standard III.B. self evaluation is complete, organized, and well-written. The introduction section, in particular, provides a good sense of the overall physical resources standard.

The Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center (DLIFLC) works closely with other military service branches and the Department of Defense (DoD) to anticipate future educational facilities requirements and to create a structure for addressing them through the development of the Real Property Master Plan that is supported by congressional funding.

Findings and Evidence

The Institute provides safety, fire protection, and security through a number of cooperating internal and external agencies. For example, there are two independent safety offices: the Installation Safety Office, a DLIFLC agency, and the Garrison Safety Office, a U.S. Army Garrison, Presidio of Monterey (USAG POM) agency. Both agencies serve as a hub for coordinating safety-related matters ranging from the management of program-initiated requests for maintenance to the promotion of safety awareness. (III.B.1)

Safety criteria are established by Department of Defense (DoD) guidelines as well as an external agency, the Presidio Municipal Services Agency (PMSA), a group under government contract. Items the contract requires include the production of real-time maintenance logs. Processes include inspections conducted by both internal and external groups, Incident Report Forms, and calls submitted by the DLIFLC community. (III.B.1)

DLIFLC has a Facilities Master Plan, titled “Real Property Master Plan, Presidio of Monterey, California,” dated November 2009. The Plan is a foundational facilities planning tool for all educational and support sites within the institution. Evidence used in the development of the Plan includes demographic and economic forecasts as well as military branch-specific trends, goals, and needs. This big-picture work is operationally complemented by ongoing dialogue and coordination efforts under the auspices of the “DLIFLC Campaign Plan 2011-2015”, the institution’s strategic plan. The Campaign Plan includes objectives related to physical space requirements, safety, energy efficiency, and energy security. (III.B.1)

The institution works effectively to meet its facility needs by coordinating facility development work across DLIFLC and other Department of Defense (DoD) organizations. This is evidenced by the Real Property Planning Board (RPPB) which is the coordination body that oversees the Real Property Master Plan, Presidio of Monterey, California.

The DLIFLC Information Technology team includes a number of groups that chart and prioritize technology upgrades needed in classrooms and related infrastructure support for current and future operations. Technology resources are managed through the Office of the Chief Technology Officer (OCTO) who serves as the central instructional technology support provider for the institution. In 2006, the OCTO implemented the Information Technology Plan. (III.B.1)

The institution conducts regular facilities evaluations and has a process through which programs can request improvements ranging from requesting new construction to minor facilities remodeling. A facility manager representing each program is responsible for processing sustainment, restoration, and modernization requests. These requests move from the program to the DLIFLC Space Manager and then to the USAG POM Department of Public Works where priorities are established and resources allocated. The safety of equipment is monitored at the program level. (III.B.1)

In addition to its Facilities Master Plan, the institution has a number of planning documents that chronicle priority projects and document the allocation of resources to those priorities. Although the various programs blend owned facilities with leased facilities, for purposes of addressing safety issues, all assessment and responses are channeled through the same service providers to expedite response time. (III.B.1)

Leased facilities generally meet the same standards as on-campus locations. Emergency facility situations are handled by the lessor as part of the terms of the lease or by specific contract. A number of internal military departments provide police and security services at all sites. The institution ensures access to its facilities by meeting all federal accessibility regulations and by making additional improvements as funding allows. (III.B.1.b)

DLIFLC assesses the use of its facilities on a regular basis, with a process for prioritizing room assignments that is designed to maximize their effectiveness. This process is grounded in the academic and student services areas and centered on the type of instruction or services planned. The focus is to consolidate schools and languages as close together as possible. Various agencies conduct an analysis of classroom utilization data to maximize DLIFLC congressional construction funding. (III.B.2)

DLIFLC uses a combination of internal planning mechanisms at the program level combined with demographic forecasting data and consultant analyses of opportunities to acquire, renovate, update, and construct facilities to create long-range capital improvement plans. These plans encompass the strategic assessment of resource availability and needs across all programs. (III.B.2.a)

Through the Planning and Review process, programs have the opportunity to identify space needs. These requests are aggregated and are prioritized by the Real Property Planning Board (RPPB) in conjunction with program leaders of other DoD organizations. Final recommendations for space allocation, renovation, and other physical resource needs are funded at the congressional level. (III.B.2.b)

Conclusions

The institution provides safe and sufficient physical resources that support its programs and services. The campus is vital, attractive, safe, and well maintained. The institution has experienced significant growth in recent years and faced challenges to meet that demand. The institution meets this standard (III.B.1).

The institution plans and evaluates its facilities and equipment on a regular basis, taking utilization and other relevant data into account. Long-range capital plans support institutional

improvement goals and reflect projections of the total cost of ownership of new facilities and equipment. Information on facility projects is comprehensive and well communicated. The team observed that facilities planning are integrated with institutional planning. The institution meets this standard (III.B.2).

The institution meets Standard III.B.

Recommendations

None.

STANDARD III

Resources

C. Technology Resources

General Observations

The Technology Resources section of the Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center (DLIFLC) self evaluation was exceptionally meticulous and all-inclusive, delineating DLIFLC hierarchy of technological programs and services, the roles/responsibilities of each technical and instructional support unit, details on the information infrastructure, as well as a concise history of upgrades and modifications from 2006 to the present. Also outlined were technology themes on the availability and uses of varied media, both special/regular services offered to faculty and students, and hardware/software maintenance and training. Importantly, the full technological plan, covering 2006 to the present, incorporates periodic assessments of policies/procedures to determine its continued effectiveness in achieving the institution's mission. A critical element of these evaluations addresses decision-making actions based on outcomes.

Findings and Evidence

With its widespread use on campus, technology resources at DLIFLC play an indispensable role in supporting and sustaining effective instructional programs, services, and learning outcomes. A hierarchy of support units ensures appropriate resource allocations, training and professional development for faculty/staff, ongoing assistance for students, research and evaluation of new/existing technology, as well as a multitude of specialized services and programs designed to improve operational and technical effectiveness.

Overseeing these units, the Language Science and Technology Directorate (LS&T) provides leadership, coordination, and open communication for the successful implementation of technology support throughout the campus. Specifically, these individual units are responsible for identifying and addressing technology needs: for audio/visual services (Audio Visual Services); the development of both on- and off-site distance learning materials such as the Blackboard/Sakai systems (Technology Integration Division and the Distance Learning Division); for curricula and supplemental materials for all course levels (Curriculum Development); and for technical/non-technical language solutions/training for students and faculty (Language Technology Evaluation and Application -- LTEA).

Other units are responsible for security consideration and updates, hardware/software configurations/updates, and, network, server, and mobile operational support (Presidio of Monterey Network Enterprise Center). Other ancillary departments assess and provide effective working contacts with outside agencies and institutions, including contracted online services and resources, maintaining the institution's technical infrastructure/equipment, and, assuring system reliability and back-up. Significantly, the Language Technology Specialists (LTS) play critical roles in direct assessment of needs, providing necessary training, resolving problems, and communicating both present and future needs to the LTEA and to the Chief Technology Officer. In total, though there may seem to be a multitude of departments with discrete functions, the team validated that this highly structured system of distinct, but complementary roles and responsibilities, allows for, promotes, and enhances a solid institutional-wide technology program. (III.C.1, 1.a)

Of critical importance is the technology training for all constituent groups covering a wide spectrum of topics from introductory sessions focused on new hardware/software to advanced instructional techniques used in language teaching and learning. As new technologies or upgrades are acquired, LTS design and implement scheduled/as-needed training programs online, individually, in the classroom, or in small group settings.

With the assistance of the Student Learning Center, student literacy and technology training is closely integrated within the official language program, while faculty training includes the initial mandatory pre-service training through specialized in-service workshops on software as the Microsoft Office Suite, SharePoint, Blackboard, and the new Sakai course management system. The institution regularly measures and assesses effectiveness of these training efforts through direct observations, instructor manipulation of software programs and features, and post-training surveys. (III.C.1.b)

The institution directly incorporates feedback from these training programs and services into considerations for future training and for acquiring new technologies or upgrades. The team confirmed that DLIFLC has a dynamic hierarchy structured to actively encompass all technology considerations on- and off-site, which include maintaining, replacing, or upgrading the infrastructure and system backups, as well as researching and planning for the acquisition of needed or recommended technology. At each stage, decisions are directly based on responses from IT personnel, students and faculty; on the needs of incoming/continuing students as well as faculty/staff; and new strategies to assist in language instruction. This constant and systematic assessment of technology use, resources, and potential are used as foundations for instructional improvement and effective learning outcomes.

This same hierarchy is also responsible for other services that seamlessly support and maintain the institution's technology infrastructure. These services include contracted online services/resources for distance learning, vendor support and quality assurance, and an extensive security/backup system. As such, all constituent groups are actively involved working collaboratively in technology planning, policy development, and decision-making as a multitude of resources are effectively considered, allocated, and utilized to meet the varied needs of the instructional programs and services. (III.C.1.c, d)

Through interviews with IT personnel and a review of the evidence, the team verifies that this active involvement in all aspects of technology has a critical influence on institutional planning. In conjunction with the Language, Science and Technology Directorate, the Office of the Chief Technology Officer (OCTC) administers the implementation of a comprehensive planning process incorporating all these multiple elements. Together with other equally critical components such as unit goals/objectives and fiscal resources, the institution continually evaluates the complete technology plan through staff/student feedback as well as periodic surveys, and is instrumental in forming the basis for both operational and system priorities. Ultimately, the OCTC is responsible for a fully functional, efficient, and secured academic network and infrastructure which assists the institution in accomplishing its mission and enhancing educational learning. (III.C.2)

Conclusions

DLIFLC has a robust, secured, and dependable technical infrastructure which supports and assures the institution's mission to deliver quality foreign language learning programs and services. Although various departments have different roles and functions, each area has specific identifiable responsibilities directly supporting instructional learning linked to the institution's mission. Thus, by fully utilizing the expertise and commitment of its technology staff, the

institution is dedicated to providing and maintaining a high standard of technological support for faculty, staff, and students.

The team confirms that DLIFLC has already outlined working, and in some case, extensive agendas and is diligently implementing many of its projects. The institution is applauded and encouraged to continue its efforts to implement stated planning items: assuring timely and appropriate faculty/student support; replacing equipment, updating software, and maintaining auxiliary services; and, implementing an institutional-wide comprehensive survey to provide additional input and assessment of programs and services. The institution exceeds the standard (III.C.1).

Already in place and operational is the institution five-year technology plan (2006-2011). DLIFLC may want to consider designing and implementing a more current five-year plan with the participation of all constituent staff and groups. Since the information field is constantly evolving, and since these adjustments heavily impact the delivery and functionality of the technical infrastructure, a more updated relevant planning document would allow the institution to better prepare for changing technologies, unexpected compatibility issues, budgetary indecisions, and shifting political priorities. The institution meets the standard (III.C.2).

Significantly, where possible in the next five-year plan, DLIFLC should consider including a working timeline for the development and implementation of their proposals, and how each accomplishment enhances, or is linked to, educational outcomes and to the institution's mission. Indeed, within its own stated planning agendas, DLIFLC has already recognized many of these points and has laid the foundations for future directions by designating individuals or groups responsible for each activity.

The institution meets or exceeds Standard III.C.

Recommendation.

None.

Standard III Resources

D. Financial Resources

General Observations

For the most part, the Standard III.D. self evaluation is complete, organized, and well-written. The introduction section in particular provides a good sense of the overall financial resources area. There are a few areas where the self evaluation contradicts itself and includes typographical errors.

The Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center (DLIFLC) does have a number of processes that help set funding priorities. However, it's difficult to collect evidence and assess a specific issue, statement, or process because of the military command structure, Department of Defense (DoD), and Federal Government financial system requirements. In some cases, there are very complex funding planning, allocation, and expenditure processes. There exist collaborative processes through the use of various resource allocation committees to ensure that the use of financial resources effectively supports the institution's educational mission.

Findings and Evidence

DLIFLC is funded by Congressional appropriations and various grants channeled through the DoD. The institution works closely with the DoD and other military service branches to anticipate future educational mission requirements and to create a structure for addressing them that is supported by appropriate funding. (III.D.1.b)

At a local level, there is a division of responsibilities in running the institution. DLIFLC's primary focus is on the language and cultural instructional area with an overall annual budget of \$341 million dollars. The U.S. Army Garrison, Presidio of Monterey (USAG POM) focuses on the human resources support, facility resources, and technology resources. The budget process used by DFIFLC for its responsibilities is a multiyear process called the Planning, Programming, Budgeting, and Execution System (PPBE). The process starts by using a document called the Program Objective Memorandum (POM) which outlines and identifies mission requirements and resources to implement the programs the institution proposes in order to accomplish its mission. This process includes identifying the training quotas or workloads, human resource requirements, and actual funding allocations. (III.D.1)

The institution uses a multi-layered and collaborative process to ensure that the use of financial resources effectively supports the institution's educational mission. Funding requests are processed through each of the DLIFLC directorates or programs. The results are then reviewed and prioritized by the Provost and the Program and Budget Advisory Committee (PBAC) with recommendations to the Commandant who requests funding from the next level up. (III.D.1)

After initial funding is approved, funding allocations are reviewed and reconciled by a process that includes the PBAC which makes revision recommendations to the DLIFLC Commandant. This Committee includes representatives from across the organization. (III.D.1.a)

The Command Guidance document, which outlines priorities, and the Campaign Plan, a strategic planning document, are integrated into budget planning. The self evaluation states, “The Commandant publishes a Command Guidance document at the start of the fiscal year that outlines the DLIFLC requirements and priorities.” This opportunity is sometimes delayed, however, when the fiscal year starts but the federal budget has not yet been approved. (III.D.1.b)

As DLIFLC’s funding is appropriated on an annual basis, long term liabilities are not recognized by the institution but by another governmental agency of the federal government, the Civilian Human Resources Activity (CHRA), a unit of a centralized civilian personnel agency. (III.D.1.c)

The processes for financial planning and budgeting are made known to DLIFLC constituents. However, in an effort of continual improvement, the self evaluation includes a Planning Agenda that states in part, “It is critical that the DLIFLC promote, among the directorates, more robust participation in and understanding of the PBAC process to increase the directorates’ capability to execute mission.” (III.D.1.d)

There are a number of financial control mechanisms in place but the two that are primarily used are the Management Control Program and the PBAC process. Other financial control processes include the use of compliance and review of checklists and an annual assurance statement that is signed by each office and provided to the Commandant who in turn signs another assurance statement that is submitted to the Commander of the Army Training and Doctrine Center. These assurance statements certify that required internal control processes have been followed and evaluated and any deficiencies corrected. (III.D.2)

In 2010 the institution implemented a new Army financial control system called the General Fund Enterprise Business System (GFEBs) that is currently only being used by a few personnel at DLIFLC. The prior system did not provide necessary analytical tools and could not be audited by external entities. A Planning Agenda indicates that additional training will be forthcoming and that the system can be used for an external audit starting in FY 2013. (III.D.2.a, b, g)

Each year the institution completes the Accreditation Annual Fiscal Report, for the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC). The report includes a request to submit a copy of the institution’s annual audit report. Over the last few years, in response to this request, DLIFLC has included in part the following statement to ACCJC:

“DLIFLC is a Department of the Army school and must follow the regulations and policies of the US Army. The Army does not allow separate audit reports or audited financial statements to be conducted by independent organizations. Rather, the Army directs a set of procedures to ensure fiscal responsibility and guard against malfeasance. Under Army procedures, the DLIFLC Commandant has a Management Control Program that specifically implements the Federal Managers Financial Integrity Act, as well as, both Army and the Army’s subordinate Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC) guidance on management controls...” (III.D.2.a)

The institution uses a Planning and Review process to ensure that the use of financial resources effectively support the institution’s educational mission. This is accomplished using the PBAC and an Annual Review Process. Assessments of previously allocated expenditures are conducted

to determine if the resource allocations have achieved the desired objectives. Studies indicate, for example, that the Proficiency Enhancement Program (PEP) that promoted smaller class size, professional faculty, and the use of technology has been a success. (III.D.3)

Conclusions

Financial planning and resource allocation is based on the institutions mission and goals and is integrated with institutional planning. DLIFLC works closely with the Department of Defense and other military service branches to anticipate future educational mission requirements and to create a structure for addressing them that is supported by appropriate funding. The institution meets this standard (III.D.1).

The college's planning and budget development process appears to be well understood by the institutions community and reflective of departmental program review and identified needs. A review of financial documents, including the budget, review checklist, and annual assurance statements reflected appropriate allocation and use of financial resources to support student learning programs and services. The institution practices effective oversight of all finances. All financial resources are used with integrity in a manner consistent with the mission and goals of the institution. Contractual agreements with external entities are consistent with the mission and goals of the institution, governed by institutional policies, and contain appropriate provisions to maintain the integrity of the institution. The institution meets this standard (III.D.2).

The team determined that the institution has a process for systematically assessing the effective use of financial resources. The college meets this standard (III.D.3).

The institution meets Standard III.D.

Recommendations

None.

Commendations

Commendation #6

The team commends the institution for strategically allocating resources to achieve its mission with high quality.

STANDARD IV Leadership and Governance

A. Decision-Making Roles and Processes

General Observations

The Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center's (DLIFLC) position as a government and military institution gives rise to aspects of governance unlike other institutions of higher learning. As a military organization, the leadership structure is clearly defined. The Commandant, selected by the U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC), serves three years prior to reassignment. As chief administrator, the Commandant oversees multiple levels of military and civilian administrative positions including the Provost, the highest ranking civilian leader. Schools and directorates reporting to the Provost through five associate provosts are headed by deans and directors. While the military and civilian leaders coordinate planning and implementation of the institution's mission through regular joint meetings, DLIFLC operates within a military chain of command.

Within this hierarchical structure, constituent group input (students, faculty, administrators, and staff) is highly valued. Robust processes exist to gather input to inform planning and improvement initiatives aimed at excellence in "culturally-based foreign language education." Processes include chartered groups (e.g., Academic Senate, Faculty Advisory Councils, and Deans Council), working groups and ad hoc teams. Student impact in institutional processes occurs via systematic data collection from surveys, focus groups ("sensing session") and routine classroom evaluations. All constituencies understand and acknowledge the responsibility of the chief administrator.

Findings and Evidence

Written policy documents exist that govern the role and the manner in which administrators, faculty, and staff participate in the planning and decision-making processes. These professional guidelines include the negotiated agreement between DLIFLC and the American Federation of Government Employees, standards of conduct for federal civilian personnel, TRADOC's supervisory guide, and Academic Senate (AS), Faculty Advisory Councils (FAC) and Deans Council By-Laws. The five-year Campaign Plan provides long-term strategic direction and a roadmap of measureable outcomes to record progress in the achievement of goals and objectives. (IV.A.1, 2)

Through documents and meeting minutes the team found evidence of similar governance and decision-making processes at every level of the chain of command. As an example, Academic Senate and Faculty Advisory Councils serve as the main voice for faculty issues related to academics and professional development. As representatives elected by faculty, members identify initiatives with potential benefits to the instructional process and provide ideas leading to academic program quality improvement. In this role, they regularly provide input to senior leaders to improve the academic proficiency of the students and offer suggestions about significant school issues. (IV.A.2.b) FACs align with the Deans Council in the same manner that the Academic Senate works with the Provost and senior leadership. In addition, FACs represent the voice of faculty at the school level and provide upward communication to the

Academic Senate. In this manner, communication occurs upward to higher levels of authority and outward through the school. The “chain of command” leadership framework, unique to DLIFLC, nonetheless actively supports a participative governance structure. The military framework supports shared vocabulary and standards, common skills sets and competencies. Military systems are designed for rapid and effective deployment of mission-critical information. The team found evidence that FAC recommendations influenced planning and resource allocation with leadership at the school level i.e., the Dean and Assistant Deans. Similar collaborative processes occurred as the Academic Senate interacted with senior leadership. Throughout the organization, DLIFLC has processes and practices to facilitate discussion and communication. These processes include joint coordination meetings, cross-functional working groups, and department and school-level councils. The team found evidence through meeting minutes and reports that these processes impacted classroom practice, led to higher levels of language proficiency, and enhanced student learning. (IV.A.3)

Staff and students contribute input and impact decision-making processes through town hall meetings, sensing sessions and student questionnaires. (IV.A.2.a.) Staff participation occurs through inter-segmental working groups and “tiger teams” formed to coordinate efforts across departments and divisions in the implementation of institution wide initiatives. (IV.A.1)

As a military organization, DLIFLC operates within the rigorous standards of values set by the U.S. Army. In addition to responding to ACCJC through the six-year accreditation cycle, the Annual Program Review informs major military and governmental agencies about progress, problems, and future goals. The institution responded rapidly and deliberately to the 2006 ACCJC comprehensive evaluation recommendations. In addition, the TRADOC Quality Assurance Audit conducted in 2011 represented institution accreditation on a government platform. The preliminary out-brief referred to the institution as the “Gold Standard” of all TRADOC institutions. (IV.A.4)

The institution regularly evaluates leadership. Examples of these evaluations include: annual appraisals of leaders by their supervisors; external assessments by the Department of the Army, U.S. Army Combined Arms Center and Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC) and Installation Organizational Inspection Program. (IV.A.5)

Conclusions

The institution devoted considerable effort since the 2006 comprehensive evaluation to implement a governance structure that acknowledges the military chain of command yet encourages collaborative, systematic participation from students and personnel in governance processes. The institution meets this standard (IV.A.1).

While ample opportunities for constituent group participation exist, these processes are not well documented and may not be sustained under new leadership. By discontinuing routine off-site planning forums, DLIFLC changed the planning methodology. Because the institution does not engage in a regular evaluation of the planning process, the integrity and effectiveness of the new process cannot be determined. The institution partially meets this standard. (IV.A.2)

Through senates, councils and working groups, faculty exercise a substantial voice in curricular

and academic matters at the program level and constitute a substantial voice in institutional decisions related to improving student learning programs. The team found ample evidence that established structures and practices exist to facilitate effective communication among constituencies. The institution meets this standard (IV.A.3).

The team determined the institution demonstrates honesty and integrity in its relationships with external agencies by complying with Accrediting Commission Standards and TRADOC Quality Assurance Audit Standards. The institution meets this standard. (IV.A.4)

While a thorough and systematic evaluation process for leadership is in place, the team found no evidence that governance or the decision-making processes are evaluated to ensure their integrity and effectiveness. The institution partially meets this standard. (IV.A.5)

The institution partially meets Standard IV.A.

Recommendations

Recommendation #5

Decision-Making

To meet the standards, the team recommends the institution document and evaluate the decision-making processes and systems including with regard to the role of faculty and staff in institutional decision-making (IV.A.2, IV.A.5).

Commendations

Commendation #7

The team commends the institution for its military command structure that consists of DLIFLC graduates and DLIFLC former instructors who are clearly passionate about student success.

Commendation #8

The team commends the institution for its individual and organizational ethos of accountability for mission achievement and quality improvement.

STANDARD IV

Leadership and Governance

B. Board and Administrative Organization

General Observations

The Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center (DLIFLC), unlike other two-year public institutions, does not have a governing board. DLIFLC has a Board of Visitors (BoV), which is comprised of 12 members or less who are recommended by the Commandant and are approved by the Department of Defense (DoD). The BoV is an independent advisory committee that does not make policies, does not have legal or fiduciary obligations, and does not hire or evaluate the commandant, the chief administrator of the institution. The BoV advises the Army Education Advisory Committee (AEAC) and, therefore, the Commandant on all matters relating to the mission of DLIFLC. The Commandant is appointed by the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness. The Commandant is responsible for administering policies and for managing the institution in accordance with policies and regulations promulgated by the DoD.

Findings and Evidence

In June 2009, ACCJC adopted the policy on Governing Boards for Military institutions which accommodates the unique governance structure of such military institutions as DLIFLC. In compliance with ACCJC's policy on Governing Boards for Military institutions, the DLIFLC's Board of Visitors (BoV) members are appointed by the Department of Defense.

Many tasks traditionally assigned to a governing board are controlled by military policies and procedures; therefore many sections of Standard IV.B on governing boards do not apply. For example, the BoV does not establish policies or have ultimate responsibility for educational quality, legal matters, and financial integrity. Furthermore, the BoV does not select or evaluate the chief administrator. As stated in the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) of 1972 as amended, the purpose of the DLIFLC BoV is as follows:

"...to provide the Commandant, through the AEAC, with advice on matters related to the institution's mission, specifically: academic policies, staff and faculty development, student success indicators, curricular educational methodology and objectives, program effectiveness, instructional matters, research and academic administration."

Since the BoV is not a policy-making body, it does not have policy manuals or related documents. It does have its own operating procedures document (IV.B.1.d.1) which details purpose, roles and responsibilities, compensation, duties, structure, self-evaluation and development, and a code of ethics in compliance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) of 1972 as amended (IV.B.1.d.3). Furthermore, in compliance with FACA, the BoV's operating procedures document contains information on participation, ethics training, board diversity, financial disclosure, orientation, and training of new members (IV.B.1). Finally, the BoV's operating procedures describe its participation in accreditation. (IV.B.1.i)

The 12-member BoV, representing the public, academic, business, and military communities, serve a three-year term but are subject to annual reappointments. However, a major concern is the continuing problem with the reappointment process by the Department of Defense. (IV.B.1.a) To overcome these delays in reappointments, BoV members have been reassigned from its parent committee AEAC. (IV.B.1.13, IV.B.1.14 and IV.B.1.15) Furthermore, the BoV's primary role is to serve as an independent sounding board to the AEAC and to the Commandant and his leadership team. In addition, the BoV serves as a guardian of institutional integrity by assisting the Commandant in ensuring that the institution continues to fulfill its stated mission.

The BoV is active in advising and in recommending policy changes to ensure that the mission of DLIFIC is being accomplished. Since its beginning in 2007, the BoV made 18 recommendations; 15 were accepted by the institution, and the rest are in progress or limited due to factors beyond the institution's control. (IV.B.1a.3) Recommendations that were adopted and implemented include adding more culture to the curriculum and providing selected faculty members with up to 40 hours of paid leave to visit their home country in order to acquire authentic materials for classroom use. Another BoV recommendation to the AEAC stated, "The Mastery Criteria for [Modern Standard Arabic] should be reviewed to confirm correlation with the performance of task thresholds designated as appropriate to the various Interagency Language Roundtable Levels." (IV.B.1.b.4) The institution has in place an active BoV advisement recommendation process. (IV.B.1.b.5)

As an integral part of the military chain of command, the Commandant has primary responsibilities for providing effective leadership and overall management oversight for planning, organizing, budgeting, selecting and developing personnel, and assessing institutional effectiveness. (IV.B.1.b) In accordance with Section 5.13 in the Department of Defense Directive 5160.41E, the institution's Commandant establishes policies and assures quality, integrity, and effectiveness of student learning processes and financial stability. Furthermore, the Commandant is responsible for achieving the overall DLIFLC mission of providing selected military and government personnel with quality foreign language instruction that supports and accomplishes the national and defense goals.

By Department of Defense Directive 5160.41E policy, the Commandant has primary responsibility for the quality of the Institute. Through a detailed chain of military and civilian command structure for academic functions, the Commandant provides effective leadership in planning, organizing, budgeting, selecting and developing personnel to assure institutional effectiveness and mission accomplishment. The Department of Defense Directive 5160.41E clearly defines the functional areas and authority exercised by the Commandant. The DLIFLC Commandant and his chain of command encourage a collegial process via an Academic Senate and various communication tools and publications to the extent possible within military regulations and structures (IV.B.2.b.1.10, 11, 12 and 13).

While maintaining overall management oversight, the Commandant delegates authority to other members of his staff. In particular, an Assistant Commandant (AC), usually an Air Force colonel, handles the day-to-day operations, and a Provost, a civilian who reports to the

AC, is responsible for academic functions of the institution. The average term of office for the Commandant and his military staff is two and a half years. This continued military turnover is a challenge and a concern in terms of continuity of institution operations and in maintaining institutional memory.

The institution utilizes both internal and external research efforts such as manpower surveys, student load and class size, and budgeted contracts to conduct research studies for planning and for improvement purposes. Especially noted are the ongoing Longitudinal Student Achievement Data study, including the analysis of disenrollment trends of students failing to achieve academic standards, for each language taught at DLIFLC and the Annual Program Summary. (IV.B.2.b)

Education planning is integrated with resource planning to achieve student learning outcomes via DLIFLC's five-year campaign plan and five-year budget plan. Both plans are influenced by enrollment projections by the Department of Defense, Annual Program Reviews, Annual Program Summary, and related internal and external research studies and projects.

The team determined that the Commandant and his leadership team have effectively integrated educational and resource planning to impact student learning outcomes. The evidence of student success is seen in consistent increases in student proficiency results between 2006 and 2011 as detailed in the Longitudinal Student Achievement Data studies. (IV.B.2.b)

The institution has procedures in place for evaluating, planning and implementing data analysis results for continuous improvement. The Commandant and his team have continuously communicated DLIFLC goals with measurable objectives; developed and implemented faculty development programs such as the four-week Instructor Certificate course; directed all institutional research toward student learning; and by heavily investing in technology, smaller class sizes, and immersions to impact institutional effectiveness. (IV.B.2.c)

The Commandant has used SharePoint, email, and town hall meetings to communicate the intent and implementation of Department of Defense and DLIFLC statutes, regulations and policies to assure consistency in institutional practices.

The Commandant controls and executes budget and expenditures in support of DLIFLC mission and operations as prescribed by Department of Defense regulations using a Program Objective Memorandum (POM) process. (IV.B.2.d)

The Commandant established an extensive communication network both inside and outside the DLIFLC to interface with the institution constituencies. This communication network uses the *Monterey Military News*, the *Monterey County Herald*, the *Globe Magazine*, as well as engages in routine communications via email, video teleconferences and face-to-face meetings. (IV.B.2.e)

Conclusions

As a federal degree-granting military institution, DLIFLC does not have a governing board but a Board of Visitors (BoV), an independent body comprised of a cross-section of public, academic, business, and military communities. While operating as an advisory committee and as a sounding board to its parent committee, the Army Education Advisory Committee, the BoV has influence and impact on policy recommendations related to the institution's mission, academic policies, student success, curricula and program effectiveness, instructional methods, faculty, and staff development. Because of the substantial delay in appointing membership, even though the BoV was empaneled at the time of the visit, it was not during a significant portion of the time the institution was engaged in the self evaluation process. The institution partially meets this standard (IV.B.1).

The Commandant has primary responsibility for the quality of the institution. Through a detailed chain of military and civilian command structure for academic functions, the Commandant provides effective leadership in planning, organizing, budgeting, selecting and developing personnel to assure institutional effectiveness and mission accomplishment. Department of Defense Directives clearly defines the functional areas and authority exercised by the Commandant. The DLIFLC Commandant and his chain of command encourage a collegial process via an Academic Senate and various communication tools and publications to the extent possible within military regulations and structures. The institution meets this standard (IV.B.2).

The institution partially meets Standard IV.B.

Recommendations

Recommendation #6

Governance

To fully meet the eligibility requirements and the standards and ensure continued accreditation, the team recommends that the institution work with appropriate higher authorities to ensure timely appointment/reappointment of BOV membership (ER 3; IV.B & ACCJC Policy on Governing Boards for Military institutions).

Commendations

Commendation #9

The team commends the institution for the military and academic leadership of its Commandant, COL Danial Pick, and his commitment and dedication to the DLIFLC vision of "delivering the world's best culturally-based foreign language training and education-at the point of need." He is clearly an inspiration to the installation's military and civilian staff; moreover he is an inspiration to the DLIFLC faculty and their students.