

6 and 7 December 2017 Board of Visitors

Meeting of the

Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center

Monterey, California

6 – 7 December 2017 Contents

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

TAB A - Administrative Details FEDERAL REGISTER ANNOUNCEMENT

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Army

Army Education Advisory Subcommittee Meeting Notice

AGENCY: Department of the Army, DoD.

ACTION: Notice of open Subcommittee meeting.

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

DATES: The Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center (DLIFLC) Board of Visitors Subcommittee will meet from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on December 6 and from 08:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. on December 7, 2017.

ADDRESS: Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center, 1759 Lewis Road, Monterey, CA 93944.

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

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

Purpose of the Meeting: The purpose of the meeting is to provide the subcommittee with briefings and information focusing on the Institute's accreditation effort through the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges. The subcommittee will also address administrative matters.

Agenda: December 6—The subcommittee will receive briefings on the Institute's ongoing self-study to reaffirm its academic accreditation. The Subcommittee will complete administrative procedures and appointment requirements.
December 7—The Subcommittee will have time to discuss and compile observations pertaining to agenda items. General deliberations leading to provisional findings will be referred to the Army Education Advisory Committee for deliberation by the Committee under the open-meeting rules.

Public Accessibility to the Meeting: Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b, as amended, and 41 CFR 102–3.140 through 102–3.165, and subject to the availability of space, this meeting is open to the public. Seating is on a first to arrive basis. Attendees are requested to submit their name, affiliation, and daytime phone number seven business days prior to the meeting to Mr. Kesten, via electronic mail, the preferred mode of submission, at the address listed in the “FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT” section. Because the meeting of the Subcommittee will be held in a Federal Government facility, security screening is required. A photo ID is required to enter the facility. Please note that security and gate guards have the right to inspect vehicles and persons seeking to enter and exit the installation. The facility is fully handicap accessible. Wheelchair access is available at the main entrance of the building. For additional information about public access procedures, contact Mr. Kesten, the subcommittee’s Alternate Designated Federal Officer, at the email address or telephone number listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section.

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

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

A 15-minute period near the end of the meeting will be available for verbal public comments. Members of the public who have requested to make a verbal comment and whose comments have been deemed relevant under the process described above, will be allotted no more than three minutes during the period, and will be invited to speak in the order in which their requests were received by the Alternate Designated Federal Official.

Brenda S. Bowen, Army Federal Register Liaison Officer.
[FR Doc. 2017-23976 Filed 11-2-17; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5001-03-P

TAB B - Meeting Agenda

**Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center
Board of Visitors (BoV) Meeting
6 – 7 December 2017**

Wednesday, 6 Dec 2017

- 8:15 am Leave Embassy Suites lobby for the Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center
- Escort by: Mr. Detlev Kesten, ADFO
- 8:30 am Arrive Weckerling Center, Presidio of Monterey, Bay View Room
- Park in Reserved Visitor Parking Spaces
- Received by Dr. Betty Lou Leaver, Provost, DLIFLC
- 8:30 am – 8:45 am Welcome Remarks, Bay View Room, Weckerling Center
- COL Phillip J. Deppert, DLIFLC Commandant
- Col Wiley L. Barnes, Assistant Commandant, DLIFLC
- Dr. Betty Lou Leaver, Provost, DLIFLC
- Attendees at (1) Below
- 8:45 am – 9:00 am Call to Order
- Dr. Richard Brecht, BoV Chair
- BoV FACA and Accreditation Compliance, Administrative Business, (Review of DLIFLC Mission & Vision Statement, BoV Operating Procedures)
- Mr. Detlev Kesten, ADFO
- 9:00 am – 9:30 am Ethics Briefing
Bay View Room, Weckerling Center
- Mr. Michael Bruun, Paralegal, SJA
- 9:30 am – 9:45 am Break
- 9:45 am – 10:30 am Introduction of Commandant's Priorities
Bay View Room, Weckerling Center
1. COL Phillip J. Deppert, Commandant, DLIFLC
2. Col Wiley L. Barnes, Assistant Commandant, DLIFLC
3. Dr. Betty Lou Leaver, Provost
- 10:30 am – 10:45 am Introduction of ACCJC Accreditation Self-Study
Bay View Room, Weckerling Center
4. COL Phillip J. Deppert, Commandant, DLIFLC
5. Col Wiley L. Barnes, Assistant Commandant, DLIFLC
6. Dr. Betty Lou Leaver, Provost
7. Dr. Erin O'Reilly, Accreditation Manager, DLIFLC

Attendees:

- Dr. Stephen Payne, DLIFLC Historian
- Mr. Detlev Kesten, ADFO

- 10:45 am – 11:45 am ACCJC Self-Study Review
Bay View Room, Weckerling Center
- Dr. Erin O'Reilly, Accreditation Manager, DLIFLC
- 11:45 pm – 12:00 pm Leave Weckerling Center for Belas Dining Hall
- Escort: Mr. Detlev Kesten, ADFO
- 12:00 pm – 1:00 pm BoV Lunch
Belas Dining Hall
- MLIs Attending: MSgt Like Watkins (CMLI-UPF); SGT
- David Choi (MIL-UAB)
- SGT Colin Ridlon (MLI-UMA)
- PO Joel Kelly (MLI-UMC)
- 1:00 pm – 1:30 pm Leave Belas Dining Hall for DoD Center
- Escort: Mr. Detlev Kesten
-
- 1:30 pm – 2:00 pm Observe DTRA Class (2+ in action)
- Dr. Rong Yuan, Dean, Resident Education, CE
- 2:00 pm – 2:30 pm Leave DoD Center for Weckerling Center
- Escort: Mr. Detlev Kesten
- 2:30 pm – 3:45 pm ACCJC Self-Study Review (Cont.)
Bay View Room, Weckerling Center
- Dr. Erin O'Reilly, Accreditation Manager, DLIFLC
- 3:45 pm – 4:15 pm Next steps for accreditation at DLIFLC
- Dr. Stephen Payne, Accreditation Liaison, DLIFLC
- 4:15 pm – 4:30 pm Move to Embassy Suites

Thursday, 7 Dec 2017

- 8:45 am Leave Embassy Suites lobby for the Defense Language Institute
Foreign Language Center
- Escort: Mr. Detlev Kesten, ADFO
- 9:00 am Call to Order
Bay View Room, Weckerling Center
- Dr. Richard Brecht, BoV Chair

9:00 am – 9:30 am (ALA)	Update on Basic Course ICP & Academic Language Academies Bay View Room, Weckerling Center - Dr. Tatiana McCaw, Program Manager, Faculty Development, DLIFLC
9:30 am – 9:45 am	Break & Official BoV picture Steps of the Weckerling Center
9:45 am – 10:00 am	Move to Cook Hall
10:00 am – 10:30 am	Student Sensing Session Cook Hall, Conference Room
10:30 pm – 11:00 am	DLIFLC Academic Senate meeting Cook Hall, Conference Room
11:15 am – 11:30 am	Move to Weckerling Center 11:30 Bay View Room, Weckerling Center
11:30 am – 1:00 pm	Prepare outbrief (Working Lunch) Bay View Room, Weckerling Center - Attendees at (2) below
1:00 pm – 1:15 pm	Break
1:15 pm – 1:45 pm	Preliminary observations to Command Group and Provost Bay View Room, Weckerling Center
1:45 pm – 2:00 pm	BoV Administration: Meeting Evaluation, Scheduling Bay View Room, Weckerling Center - Mr. Detlev Kesten, ADFO
2:00 pm – 2:30 pm	BoV Outbrief to DLI Leadership, Staff & Faculty Gold Room, Weckerling Center - Attendees at (3) below
2:30 pm – 2:40 pm	Closing Remarks Gold Room, Weckerling Center - Col Wiley L. Barnes, Assistant Commandant, DLIFLC
2:40 pm	Adjournment

(1) Attendees for 6 December - Welcome Remarks

Dr. Richard Brecht, Member, Board of Visitors
Dr. James Keagle, Col, Retired, Member, Board of Visitors
Dr. Ervin Rokke, Lt Gen, Retired, Member, Board of Visitors
Dr. Galal Walker, Member, Board of Visitors
Dr. William Whobrey, Member, Board of Visitors
Mr. Craig Wilson, Member, Board of Visitors
COL Phillip J. Deppert, Commandant, DLIFLC
Col Wiley L. Barnes, Assistant Commandant, DLIFLC
Mr. Steve Collins, Chief of Staff
Dr. Betty Lou Leaver, Provost
Mr. Detlev Kesten, Associate Provost for Academic Support & ADFO
Dr. Stephen Payne, DLIFLC Historian

(2) Attendees for 7 December - Working Lunch

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

(3) Attendees for 7 December - BoV Outbrief to DLI Leadership, Staff & Faculty

Same as Attendee List (1)

DLIFLC Faculty

DLIFLC Staff

TAB C - Minutes

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

Meeting Dates: December 6 and December 7, 2017

Place: Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center (DLIFLC)
Monterey, CA 93944

Board of Visitors Members Present:

Dr. Richard Brecht, Chair and Member, Board of Visitors
Dr. James Keagle, COL, Retired, Member Board of Visitors
Dr. Ervin Rokke, Lt Gen, Retired, Member Board of Visitors
Dr. Galal Walker, Co-Chair and Member, Board of Visitors
Dr. William Whobrey, Member, Board of Visitors
Mr. Craig Wilson, Member, Board of Visitors

BoV Alternate Designated Federal Officer

Mr. Detlev Kesten, Associate Provost for Academic Support

December 6, 2017

Welcome Remarks

COL Phillip Deppert, DLIFLC Commandant, and COL Wiley Barnes, DLIFLC Assistant Commandant welcomed all in attendance. All individuals in attendance introduced themselves to the BoV.

Call to Order

Dr. Richard Brecht, DLIFLC Board of Visitors chairperson, called the meeting to order at 0858. Dr. Brecht welcomed returning members and DLIFLC for hosting the meeting. Mr. Detlev Kesten announced that in attendance there were two DLI faculty members, Dr. Erin O'Reilly, who is Accreditation Manager and Dr. Stephen Payne who serves as the DLIFLC historian. The pair would later provide a briefing on the Accreditation Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) Accreditation self-study process. Dr. Brecht again greeted the BoV, Provost, Commandant and Assistant Commandant. Then he invited the BoV members and guests to go around the room and introduce themselves. After the introductions, Dr. Brecht and the group applauded Dr. Erin O'Reilly for the exceptional self-study report. The Commandant, COL Deppert, also commented on the exceptional and detailed quality of the self-study report.

BoV FACA and Accreditation Compliance, Administrative Business

Mr. Kesten briefly discussed re-appointments and renewal packages, which would be provided to the Board the following day. Next, Mr. Kesten discussed the updated Operating Procedures for the board, which he previously distributed to the BoV. He highlighted a few key changes. The first change was to the mission statement; a phrase was added about DLIFLC being a degree granting institution. It reads as follows:
"As an Associate of Arts Degree and certificate granting institution DLIFLC is wholly committed to student service member success. Our mission is to provide the highest quality

culturally based foreign language education, training and evaluation to enhance the national security of the United States."

Before the move to adopt the operation procedures, Mr. Kesten opened the floor for discussion and comments. The group discussed the mission statement. Dr. Brecht expressed objection to the order of the sentences. He stated that the national security is the military's first mission; accreditation was a value that was added, legitimately, after the fact. Accordingly, Dr. Brecht recommended sentences be reversed to accommodate accreditation but not distort the organization's primary mission. Dr. O'Reilly responded that the faculty and the academic senate ordered the sentences this way so the mission statement would end on a strong note, which they did not feel was the case when the accreditation part was at the end of the mission statement.

COL Deppert stated that this mission statement was a month long process in light of DLIFLC efforts in shared governance. He gave credit to everyone at the institute, the faculty advisory committee, academic senate and beyond, in formatting the mission statement. COL Deppert agreed to flipping the two sentences and without compromising the essence of the current mission statement. Mr. Kesten concluded the intent is to switch the two sentences around in the mission statement. Mr. Kesten stated that the DLIFLC leadership would come back the next day with the changes. Mr. Kesten moved on to page three, which was an addition to the operating procedures, which read:

"Board members will conduct a self-evaluation following each meeting and make public the results in accordance with Accreditation Standard IV.C.10 of the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges."

Mr. Kesten asked the BoV to recall the last December meeting in Maryland, where all members did their first self-evaluation. This time again, it would be handed out at the end of the meeting. The only change to the Operating Procedures was that the self-evaluation would be formalized and made public as a part of the whole package that went into the Federal register. These self-evaluations would be published without names; only the information, the feedback, and dates would be included. Subsequently, there was a group discussion and then a vote to adopt the new phrase mentioned above to the Operating Procedures. The group voted, all were in support and the motion was adopted.

The next item presented was on the last page of the Operating Procedure. It stated:

"The Board will review the Operating Procedures at a minimum of every three years in accordance with Accreditation Standard IV.C.7 of the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges."

Mr. Kesten added that the board has been reviewing the Operating Procedures on a regular basis. The last time a thorough review done was when the title from President to Chair was changed. Then the board and Alternate Designated Federal Officer (ADFO) looked at the whole document in 2016. Mr. Kesten stated that this time the review process needed to be formalized in writing. He also stated that the ADFO would keep track of the 3-year period to review the operating procedure. After a brief group discussion about adopting the review

process mentioned above to the Operating Procedures, group voted. All were in support as the motion was adopted. Mr. Kesten closed the topic and invited the board members to prepare for their Ethics briefing.

Ethics Briefing

Mr. Michael Suttan was introduced. He is one of the attorneys on post, and a designated ethics counselor with the Army. He certifies the UG450 financial disclosure forms that the BoV is required to fill out. In addition to Mr. Suttan, the team included paralegals, Mr. Mike Brunn and Ashley Stewart.

Mr. Suttan stated that the purpose of the training was to provide a refresher and to help members determine issues that may arise. The items that were discussed are : Rules, Principles of Ethical Conduct Executive Order 12674, Statutory Basis for SGE, Status, Counting Days as an SGE, Conflict of Interest, Representational Conflicts, Gifts from Outside Sources, Ethical Decision Making Considerations, Gifts from Outside Sources: Foreign Sources, Gifts between Employees, Contractors in the Workplace, Hatch Act- Political Activities and Use of Government Position.

Mr. Suttan addressed comments and questions, which included, the online ethics training. He stated that in order to access the JAG-C website for online training, BoV members need to have a CAC card. The board expressed concern about that. COL Deppert suggested that BoV could make recommendation to the Army regarding non-CAC cardholder access issues to the JAG-C website. Mr. Kesten said that he would follow up on the access issues with Mr. Suttan.

Break

Commandant's Priorities

COL Deppert stated that the target across the institute was raised to 2+/2+/2, in reading, listening and speaking respectively, and for the intermediate and advanced courses it was 3/3 and beyond. He reported that Col Barnes, Dr. Leaver and he himself have remained focused and are incrementally approaching the target within all of DLIFLC language programs.

Currently, the challenges remain in the Levantine/Arabic program and the Russian program. Students are not attaining the levels that were anticipated. In the near term, COL Deppert has planned for faculty developers and curriculum designers to work on solving those issues.

COL Deppert stated that he would start at the macro level, the Office of Secretary of Defense (OSD) level and down to what DLIFLC leadership is doing inside the institute.

1. COL Deppert reported that he has participated in the DOD quarterly meetings called the Defense Language Steering Committee. Inside that cycle of quarterly meetings the newly appointed and newly positioned Deputy Assistant to the Secretary of Defense (DASD), named Fred Drummond (Force Education and Training) is responsible for

policy oversight. COL Deppert indicated that, in order to get the best-screened and selected students to DLIFLC, he was having a recurring conversation with the services.

COL Deppert pointed out that something could be done to better screen and better assess potential linguist candidates beforehand. This would be better for the individuals and for DLIFLC. He presented what he had suggested to the Defense Language Steering Committee, with Drummond in the room. He suggested to the committee that, “if the services could assess the feasibility of implementing something like a behavioral health screening at the recruiting station level for potential military linguists, similar to what a couple of the services do for the special operation forces, then when they arrive at the institute after basic training, or boot camp, there is at least a level of stability”. The recruiters have the tools and capabilities to do this behavioral assessment.

COL Deppert explained the reason the behavioral assessment is important is that students’ visits to behavioral health and psychologist have begun to climb due to the pressure and rigor of the courses. COL Deppert added that the process of change could be long. It would take a long time to get it through the DASD level, PNR and levels above him. That is why we are starting this conversation now.

2. COL Deppert stated that at the strategic level what was never mentioned from the DOD level down to DLIFLC leadership and across the services is, what it means for DLIFLC to obtain 2022 goals of 2+/2+/2. Does every class that starts in 2022 moving forward need to achieve 2+/2+/2, or is it in an incremental, where what a language obtains has a sustainable average? DLIFLC has asked this long-term strategic question to the Department of Defense and the services, but has not received any answer yet.

Mr. Drummond and the Services’ senior language officials noted down the question and sometime in the next couple of Defense Language Steering Committee meetings they are supposed to come back together to discuss. At this point, the services will have the opportunity to make their own recommendations to Mr. Drummond. Then as a requirement, base institution DLIFLC will execute whatever is needed.

COL Deppert stated that the big question is: Are we organized effectively now to achieve the mission of the 2+/2+/2 requirement by 2022? There are a number of new things in place organizationally across the enterprise that DLIFLC wants to look at. For example, is the learning block chart correct? Are the new processes in place correct? Are they aligned in doing what DLIFLC wants them to do? He added there are very large teams looking at these and other numerous questions. The teams handling these are called the Tiger Teams.

3. COL Deppert discussed the creation of the new Center for Leadership and Development and the Office of Academic Excellence. The first briefing from Tiger teams was about a month ago. Col Wiley and COL Deppert have given the team more homework to do. So, it is expected for the teams to come back to the DLIFLC leadership between late January and early February. By the next BoV meeting, a slightly different organizational structure of the institution might be in place.

Dr. Brecht reminded his fellow board members of the objective of reporting BoV recommendations. Mr. Kesten stated that this is the way for the BoV to affect change internally. COL Deppert added that the recommendations could also have external impact.

Dr. Rokke asked if there was an ongoing substitutive dialogue with the Cyber communities. COL Deppert responded that the communication would be energized in the spring; in fact, he would begin with Cyber School in February. COL Deppert offered, as a larger recommendation, that the services' cyber schools engaging with the DLIFLC probably would be helpful.

The BoV agreed to work on recommendations based on COL Deppert's presentation of topics. Mr. Kesten then welcomed the ACCJC accreditation team to prepare for their presentation/briefing.

INTRODUCTION OF TOPIC: ACCJC ACCREDITATION

ACCJC Self-Study Review

Dr. O'Reilly offered an opportunity to talk about the ACCJC institutional self-evaluation. The document, which is unique in that it is a narrative description of DLIFLC academic institution and its operations, also identifies DLIFLC's self-identified strengths and known areas of weakness or need for improvement. It tries to gather from where DLIFLC has evolved as an institution and where it is going into the future. Dr. O'Reilly stated her goal is to engage the BoV in a conversation about opportunity and a conversation about possibility; based on their reading and questions.

Overview

The Overview was used to set the stage for who DLIFLC competitors are, what the team will be expecting when they come in March, some of the challenges that regional accreditors are facing. After the overview, the BoV would be able to look at the separate standards themselves and the subsections of the document.

In Accreditation context, the first topic is DLIFLC staffing. The faculty and staff at DLIFLC are in the unique position that almost 100% of its faculty is full-time. The regional accreditors are dealing with community and junior colleges and with the "adjunctification" of Education. The DLIFLC counterparts from community colleges have a full-time faculty staffing at about 3 out of 10. Dr. O'Reilly presented this as important because it has implications for curriculum and development, Academic Program reviews, types and levels of student Support Services, and increased opportunities for collegial engagement and also, on how we can move forward as an institution. When DLIFLC looked at the ACCJC standards, a lot of them are written from the perspective of concern regarding community colleges and overall academic integrity of programs. So, some of the standards may seem like they do not necessarily pertain to DLIFLC or they simply are not a concern because DLIFLC has appropriate staffing levels.

The next topic Dr. O'Reilly presented was information about program completion. In the community college setting it is anywhere between 20 - 60% program completion rate.

Students who enroll in a community college with the intention of completing an academic degree generally do so over a period of 6 years. DLIFLC is in the unique position where students are placed into an academic program and they are not allowed to drop out, or choose a different program. Accordingly, the program completion rates are quite high. DLIFLC has about 80% completion rate. The program completion rates are one of the key mechanisms that ACCJC will be looking at in March. With some of the larger societal questions about the roles of higher education and taxpayer money going into higher education, the question for DLIFLC is how it can be a better custodian of these funds. Moreover, how can the institute make sure students are receiving the education that they need? According to Dr. O'Reilly, these topics and issues will be discussed during ACCJC visit.

Changes from 2012

Another topic was regarding the institutional self-evaluation and changes from 2012. The ACCJC revised some of the standards in 2014/2015; one was the updated requirements to the mission statement, another one was the coming of age of data and higher education, to make decisions, which includes emphasis on student outcomes. So how are students using the data, and how is the institution making decision based on it? There is a large emphasis on that.

Since 2012, distance learning, or online learning emerges as a main player for higher education. The question is, whether DLIFLC is going to offer online programs. If so, how is DLIFLC using its funds, and if it is a good custodian, as at the state level there are funding challenges associated with online programs.

In the self-evaluation, one repeat topic can be seen throughout the standards is how the money is being used.

As for the process changes, the self-evaluation report is now 100% digital (before, it was all paper). In addition, now there is a quality focus essay at the end of the report and it is not evaluated, but it was created to help continue the discussions that come from the self-evaluation process. The quality focus essay is used to help encourage institutions to engage and act on the findings of the report.

The other process change is that the ACCJC leadership is going to have portfolios of schools. The Commissioners are now going to be more engaged with the institutions. The DLIFLC liaison representative from the commission is Dr. Win, the president. He will be working with DLIFLC and in the future, he will be the go-between for all questions. He will be the DLIFLC translator for the ACCJC and will be here during the next visit to help work with the visiting team.

Dr. O'Reilly indicated that the purpose of the meeting was to prepare the BoV so that they are able to engage with the accrediting visitors in March. In addition, to support or make other recommendations for items DLIFLC leadership has listed in the self-evaluation report, the ACCJC Commission Board will ask the BoV what their involvement was in the accreditation process; if there were any areas of disagreement; or if there were any areas that board members had conversation with the faculty and staff of DLIFLC. They may ask

the board if there were any difficulties in engaging with the self-evaluation document, the process, or feedback on the overall experience with the administration at DLIFLC

Dr. O'Reilly then continued with the BoV and reviewed each section of the self-study, starting with the introduction, which included the command history and demographics data for students. In this section, the ACCJC wants DLIFLC to identify metrics that are institutionally useful, such as what needs to be tracked for student achievement data. Dr. O'Reilly stated DLIFLC has broken the demographics data into the following: language, military service unit and gender. That is the demographic information that DLIFLC would typically look at as an institution.

Additionally, Dr. O'Reilly explained that several conversations at the student committee and at the officer level took place regarding Equity Groups, which is a big topic within higher education. The big underlying question is: Are there student demographics that require different types of student support? If so, how is DLIFLC addressing those needs? Dr. O'Reilly added that all students, once they get to the DLIFLC, have the same access to the same resources regardless of background, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, and heritage. Everyone is treated equally. The ACCJC visiting team is invited to meet with the officers and representatives of different service units to confirm that all of the Department of Army, Department of Defense and federal policies and regulations related to the diversity and equity groups are adhered to.

Standard I

Dr. O'Reilly went on to presenting other standards and sub standards of the ACCJC self-evaluation document. One of the main sections of these standards was the commission policies and US Department of Education regulations. These are to be used as a checklist to check compliance of third party contracts; these are contracts groups outside of DLIFLC. ACCJC wants to see if DLIFLC has control over faculty or other third-party contractors, and to see if they are providing educational services. This is important currently because of teacher shortage in some languages; DLIFLC is using the same contracting as DLI Washington to bring in short-term faculty.

Standard I.A Mission

Dr. O'Reilly stated that DLIFLC is not the only institution that had to revise its mission statement going into this process. The purpose of the mission statement is to show what the institutions are doing in support of students and to identify the outcomes.

Standard I.B: Academic Quality & Institutional Effectiveness

This standard looks at whether DLIFLC has systematic evaluation processes; how does the institute identify a measure of learning outcomes and all of its academic programs? DLIFLC is very strong at it. DLIFLC uses the revision process through a campaign plan, annual program reviews, and its Academic Program reviews etc. Another thing ACCJC will be looking at what are the changes the institute has made based on these review processes. One of the issues in 2012 was DLIFLC did not have a systematic evaluation process for all programs. Therefore, from 2012 to 2017, the process has been changed. However, since the new processes have just started being used they have not been evaluated in terms of its

effectiveness. Mr. Kesten announced the time as 12:18pm, and said it was time to start making their way to the DoD center for the graduation.

Leave for Graduation and DoD Center

Self-Study Review (Cont.)

Standard I.C: Institutional Integrity

This Standard looks at means of internal and external communication and its integrity. This includes all of DLIFLC representatives. ACCJC will be looking at public websites, web pages pointing inward and outward. The Commission will also be looking at all of publications, policies, memoranda, and any decision-making processes

Standard II. A: Instructional Programs

Dr. O'Reilly stated that Standard II is the largest standard; it describes DLIFLC academic programs and looks at academic programs that identify student-learning outcomes. There is a component of student advisement. Dr. O'Reilly highlighted that student advising at DLIFLC is a little different; it is teachers meeting with students who may be in academic jeopardy and helping them to correct their course. Academic advising for the report's purpose is to sit down with the student and ask what their future educational goal is. What classes do you need to graduate? Where are you going after you graduate?

There is a general education component to the AA degree. These should be transferable courses. This is big for community colleges because they are looking at a large transfer population. So, this is what Standard 2A is looking at.

Standard II.B: Library and Learning Support Services

There are two important things in this standard: The first one is a survey that shows if DLIFLC library is providing the services that are needed. The second one is whether it has an advisory committee. Faculty should have a key role in determining the collections and the services provided by the library. According to Dr. O'Reilly, DLIFLC has not had a library advisory committee since 2014 and has not done a survey since 2002. Therefore, DLIFLC is behind the curve on this one, but the head librarian has already started working on the process. When we meet here in March, we will have already made progress. The issue with the library and the survey is linked to the larger issue of systematic evaluations of all of our academic programs.

Standard II.C: Student Support Services

Slides

Standard III. A: Human Resources

Slides

Standard III.B: Physical Resources

The physical resources are handled by the garrison, which was helpful in writing this standard. DLIFLC has different pots of money for the handling of physical resources and the physical plant. This means that institutional leadership does not have to be in the

position of deferred funds for investing in new technology or hiring faculty. Therefore, that, for the purpose of this report, is very helpful.

Standard III.C: Technology Resources

Slides

Standard III.D: Financial Resources

Many community colleges operate in resource-constrained environments with shrinking state and federal funding. Therefore, the accrediting commission is concerned and wants to know how DLIFLC is allocating its resources. DLIFLC has evidence to show that they are being used to help improve academic outcomes, academic programs and institutional quality, everything from adequate staffing numbers to improving our physical plant, to having the resources necessary setting up new programs. One of the challenges for the visiting team might be financial reserves. Since DLIFLC has annual appropriations, the institute does not carry funds from one fiscal year to another.

Standard IV.A: Decision-Making Process

Dr. O'Reilly stated that the decision-making process has everything to do about shared governance or institutional governance bodies. The ACCJC is advocating that institutional improvement happen through meaningful dialogue with the various stakeholders. They are looking for shared governance to be in policy. In September, leadership put out a shared governance guide, which spoke to this standard explicitly, which was very helpful. This standard also speaks to the role of the BoV as an advisory board. The main goal is to review at least one academic issue, or issue with student learning outcomes per meeting. If this is done, then BoV maintains its focus on academic innovation moving forward.

Mr. Wilson suggested that the BoV members go and hear from the faculty, the students, the deans, and the faculty senate, independent of a meeting with the commandant, and make these recommendations from within the institution. Dr. O'Reilly agreed.

Standard IV.B: CEO

Dr. O'Reilly pointed that Chief Executive Officer for DLIFLC is Commandant. Dr. Keagle mentioned that continuity is something that the BoV urged, pushed for and supported for a long time. This is not just continuity in terms of time in office, but also continuity with regard to rank. Dr. O'Reilly added that one of the questions expected is BoV role in supporting a new Commandant with the challenges presented in moving the institution forward. Dr. Brecht offered that the most valuable thing for leadership is critical and creative thinking. This requires perspectives, outside perspectives; BoV's job is to provide this full range of perspectives from the point of view of the 3-star serving as a college president, to someone deep inside the pentagon, to someone still active in business and education."

Standard IV.C: BoV

Dr. O'Reilly continued to standard 4C, the Board of Visitors. One of the outcomes of this standard was the need to improve public transparency on the Board of Visitor's activities. DLIFLC needs to align some of the operating procedures to the standards. They were last reviewed in the December 2016 meeting, but they were not aligned with the standards at

that time. The other thing needed is for DLIFLC leadership to share DLIFLC student achievement metrics with the BoV.

Mr. Kesten introduced Dr. Payne and opened up the topic of the Next steps for the accreditation at DLIFLC.

Next Steps for Accreditation at DLIFLC

Dr. Stephan Payne stated that the objective of this briefing was to obtain a recommendation from the Board of Visitors that DLIFLC pursue the possibility of a BA degree.

The granting of a BA would do several things for DLIFLC, including help attract top quality students and attract faculty that could help move in the right direction for the 2+2+ and beyond. Dr. Payne added that the BA would really lift the status of DLIFLC.

Bachelor of Arts Degree

However, according to Dr. Payne, the process is lengthy. Dr. Payne outlined the steps from getting a letter from OSD requesting DLIFLC to obtain BA status to congressional approval to award BA degrees to ACCJC approval or rejection. Congress would look to see if DLIFLC's proposal is in competition with a public university, and the reason it is not in competition with a public university is that the foreign language programs emphasis is on reading and writing. DLIFLC is looking at operational use of the foreign language to better prepare students. Dr. Payne confirmed that this is just preliminary work.

Adjournment

Dr. Brecht adjourned the meeting at 5:02 pm.

December 7, 2017

Call to Order

Dr. Brecht called meeting to order at 9:16am. Mr. Kesten offered greetings to the BoV and started the day recognizing the new and revised Mission Statement, which was passed out to all present. He thanked COL Deppert for reviewing it and then he read the new statement:

“Our mission is to provide the highest quality culturally based foreign language education, training and evaluation to enhance the national security of the United States and as an Associate of Arts Degree and certificate granting Institution. DLIFLC is wholly committed to student service member success.”

Following the reading, Mr. Kesten asked the BoV to vote for the approval for the recommendation to adopt this revised Mission Statement. All voted in favor of the recommendation to adopt the revised Mission Statement.

Next, Mr. Kesten continued with the agenda, which was the updates of the current term expirations and the overall department time. He added that in March, the attendance should be Dr. Brecht, Dr. Rokke, Dr. Walker, and Dr. Whobrey while other members are simply waiting for signatures. Once those signatures are given, DLIFLC could possibly have 12 people.

Update on Basic Course ICP & Advanced Language Academies (ALA's)

(Canceled)

Official BoV Group Picture

The DLIFLC BoV members assembled for a group photograph.

Student Sensing Sessions

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

DLIFLC Academic Senate Meeting

BoV members met with Academic Senate members to obtain feedback and to discuss faculty concerns. Closed session.

BoV Working Lunch Break (Start Outbrief Compilation)

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

BoV Outbrief to DLIFLC CMDT, AC and Provost

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

BoV Administration: Meeting Evaluation, Scheduling

BoV Members completed the self-assessment of the December 2017 meeting. The BoV is scheduled to meet on March 6-8, 2018.

BoV Outbrief to DLIFLC Leadership, Staff & Faculty

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

Below is a summary of the provisional outbrief:

1. Greater dialogue, between DLPT test constructors, curriculum development and faculty. This is based on the fact that, Teachers like to know what is being tested and how it is being tested. Test development professionals who make up the test need to know what is being taught and how it is being taught.
2. The board applauds ongoing efforts of the DLIFLC leadership team for actively soliciting the foreign language requirement of the emerging cyber domains, as well as increasing complex challenges to the air, land, sea.
3. The board recognizes and applauds the continued work on shared governance, structures and processes. Senior leadership is demonstrating success. We encourage continued opportunities to encourage faculty involvement that is dynamic and plays an important role in professional development.
4. The board encourages the Commandant to recommend the design and inclusion of behavioral assessment at the time of recruitment. The board does recognize that this is a legitimate effort and something that needs to take place. We are encouraging the leadership to continue that push and make this change in recruitment policies.
5. The board is delighted to see that leadership is now being infused at all branches, and levels. However, the board has concern about balancing continuity and refreshment of senior DLIFLC leadership. Specifically, the board sees the need for lengthening the military tours; two years of a commandant is not enough. We are also looking toward a more flexible approach towards assignment and reassignment of senior leadership position.
6. The board commends the ongoing Tiger Team 2022 effort to accommodate the DLIFLC 2+/2+/2 plan, and looks forward to seeing a Tiger Team report at the next meeting. This will lead to the way of finding DLIFLC way up to that goal.
7. The Board endorses the DLIFLC self-study in preparation for the ACCJC accreditation team for March of next year.

Mr. Kesten opened the floor for questions or comments.

The Chair of the Tiger Team 2022, Dr. Clare Bugary commented that along with what BoV was briefed about Tiger Team. DLIFLC also has a campaign plan that has detailed action plan for all of the schools on how they are going to get to 2+/2+. She believed that self-study report should include the campaign plan.

Closing Remarks

Col Barnes stated that the BoV were there to make sure that the leadership, faculty and staff who are doing the work of educating Airmen, Soldiers and Marines have all the advocate, catalyst for positive change and support that they could possibility have.

Col Barnes offered a resounding thank you to the board for doing that and Detlev and his team for doing another wonderful BoV. Additionally, he thanked everyone who briefed and those who contributed to the self-study. Finally, he offered a thank you to all in the room.

Adjournment

Dr. Brecht adjourned the meeting at 2:24 pm.

TAB D - Subcommittee Members/Mission/Meeting Purpose

Subcommittee/Board Members:

Mr. Scott Allen, Member, Board of Visitors
Dr. Richard Brecht, Member, Board of Visitors
Dr. James Keagle, COL, Retired, Member, Board of Visitors
Dr. Ervin Rokke, LTG, Retired, Member, Board of Visitors
Dr. Galal Walker, Member, Board of Visitors
Dr. William Whobrey, Member, Board of Visitors
Mr. Craig Wilson, Member, Board of Visitors

Mission:

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

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

Meeting Purpose:

The purpose of the meeting is to provide the subcommittee with briefings and information focusing on the Institute's accreditation effort through the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges. The subcommittee will also address administrative matters.

TAB E - Observers and Guests

Guests or Observers present at the December 2017 Meeting:

COL Phillip J. Deppert, Commandant, DLIFLC

Col Wiley L. Barnes, Assistant Commandant, DLIFLC

Mr. Steve Collins, Chief of Staff

Dr. Betty Lou Leaver, Provost

Dr. Stephen Payne, DLIFLC Historian

Dr. O'Reilly, Accreditation Manager

DLIFLC Faculty

DLIFLC Staff

TAB F - Handouts

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

1. BoV Operating Procedures
2. 2017 Army Ethics Brief
3. Accreditation Self–Study Report Brief
4. Bachelor of Arts Degree Initiatives
5. Faculty Development Support Brief
6. BoV DEC 2017 Self-Evaluations

TAB G - BoV Provisional Recommendations Forwarded to the AEAC for Meeting
conducted on 6 and 7 December 2017:

BoV Provisional Recommendations: Meeting conducted on 6 and 7 December 2017:

1. Greater dialogue, between DLPT test constructors, curriculum development and faculty. This is based on the fact that, Teachers like to know what is being tested and how it is being tested. Test development professionals who make up the test need to know what is being taught and how it is being taught.
2. The board applauds ongoing efforts of the DLIFLC leadership team for actively soliciting the foreign language requirement of the emerging cyber domains, as well as increasing complex challenges to the air, land, sea.
3. The board recognizes and applauds the continued work on shared governance, structures and processes. Senior leadership is demonstrating success. We encourage continued opportunities to encourage faculty involvement that is dynamic and plays an important role in professional development.
4. The board encourages the Commandant to recommend the design and inclusion of behavioral assessment at the time of recruitment. The board does recognize that this is a legitimate effort and something that needs to take place. We are encouraging the leadership to continue that push and make this change in recruitment policies.
5. The board is delighted to see that leadership is now being infused at all branches, and levels. However, the board has concern about balancing continuity and refreshment of senior DLIFLC leadership. Specifically, the board sees the need for lengthening the military tours; two years of a commandant is not enough. We are also looking toward a more flexible approach towards assignment and reassignment of senior leadership position.
6. The board commends the ongoing Tiger Team 2022 effort to accommodate the DLIFLC 2+/2+/2 plan, and looks forward to seeing a Tiger Team report at the next meeting. This will lead to the way of finding DLIFLC way up to that goal.
7. The Board endorses the DLIFLC self-study in preparation for the ACCJCC accreditation team for March of next year.

Detlev Kesten
Alternate Designated Officer, DLIFLC Board of Visitors
6 March 2018

I hereby certify this 6th day of March 2018 that to the best of my knowledge, the foregoing minutes to be accurate and complete.

Dr. Richard Brecht (Chair)

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "R. Brecht", is written over a light blue rectangular background.