

6, 7 and 8 March 2018 Board of Visitors
Meeting of the
Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center
Monterey, California

6 – 8 March 2018 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 March 6, 7 and 8, 2018.

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

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Detlev Kesten, the Alternate Designated Federal Officer for the subcommittee, in writing at Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center, ATFL-APAS-AA, Bldg. 634, Presidio of Monterey, CA 93944, by email at Detlev.kestn@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 plan for its students to achieve higher proficiency scores on the Defense Language Proficiency Test (DLPT). The subcommittee will also meet with the ACCJC accreditation site visit-team and receive updates on the Institute's accreditation. It will also address administrative matters.

Agenda: March 6 and 7-The subcommittee will receive briefings associated with DLIFLC's higher proficiency goals and the Institute's actions in supporting said goal. The subcommittee will be updated on the Institute's on going self-study to reaffirm its academic accreditation, and meet with the members of the ACCJC accrediting commission during their site visit. The subcommittee will complete administrative procedures and appointment requirements. March 8-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 on a military base, security screening is required. A photo ID is required to enter the base. Please note that security and gate guards have the right to inspect vehicles and persons seeking to enter and exit the installation. Weckerling Center is fully handicap accessible. Wheelchair access is available on the right side of the main entrance of the building. For additional information about public access procedures, contact Mr. Kesten, the subcommittee’s Alternate Designated Federal Officer, at the email address or telephone number listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section.

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

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

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

Brenda S. Bowen,

Army Federal Register Liaison Officer.

[FR Doc. 2018-02293 Filed 2-5-18; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5001-03-P

TAB B - Meeting Agenda

Attendees:

1. Col Wiley L. Barnes, Assistant Commandant, DLIFLC
2. Dr. Robert Savukinas, Interim Provost, DLIFLC
3. Mr. Detlev Kesten, ADFO

- 1:15 pm – 3:00 pm Introduction of Topic: DLIFLC Campaign Plan overview
Bay View Room, Weckerling Center
1. Introduction by COL Phillip J. Deppert, Commandant, DLIFLC
- Attendees:
2. Col Wiley L. Barnes, Assistant Commandant, DLIFLC
 3. Dr. Robert Savukinas, Interim Provost, DLIFLC
 4. Mr. Detlev Kesten, ADFO Presenters:
 5. Dr. Clare Bugary, Chief, DCSOPS
 6. Mr. Karl Berscheid, Chief of Planning, DCSOPS
- 3:00 pm – 3:30 pm Adjournment
Dr. Richard Brecht, BoV Chair

Wednesday, 7 March 2018

- 8:45 am Leave Portola Plaza lobby for the Defense Language Institute
Foreign Language Center
- Escort: Mr. Detlev Kesten, ADFO
- 9:00 am Call to Order
Dr. Richard Brecht, BoV Chair
Bay View Room, Weckerling Center
- 9:00 am – 9:30 am Update on Basic Course ICP & Academic Language Academies
(ALAs)
Bay View Room, Weckerling Center
Dr. Grazyna Dudney, Director, Faculty Development, DLIFLC
- 9:30 am – 9:45 am Break
- 9:45 am – 11:45 am Review of 2022 Tiger Team effort
1. Introduction by COL Phillip J. Deppert, Commandant, DLIFLC
- Attendees:
2. Col Wiley L. Barnes, Assistant Commandant, DLIFLC
 3. Dr. Robert Savukinas, Interim Provost, DLIFLC
 4. Mr. Detlev Kesten, ADFO Presenters:
 5. Dr. Clare Bugary, Chief, DCSOPS
- 11:45 am – 1:15 pm Lunch (offsite, TBD)
- 1:15 pm – 1:30 pm Move to Weckerling Center

- 1:30 pm – 3:00 pm Meeting with members of the ACCJC Visiting Team
 Bay View Room, Weckerling Center
 - Attendees at (1) below
- 3:00 pm Adjournment
 Dr. Richard Brecht, BoV Chair

Thursday, 8 March 2018

- 8:15 am Leave Portola Plaza lobby for the Defense Language Institute
 Foreign Language Center
 - Escort: Mr. Detlev Kesten, ADFO
- 8:30 am Call to Order
 Dr. Richard Brecht, BoV Chair
 Bay View Room, Weckerling Center
- 8:30 am – 10:00 am Preparation time for BoV outbrief
 Bay View Room, Weckerling Center
 Dr. Richard Brecht, Member, Board of Visitors
 Dr. Ervin Rokke, Lt Gen, Retired, Member, Board of Visitors
 Dr. William Whobrey, Member, Board of Visitors
 - Mr. Detlev Kesten, ADFO
- 10:00 am – 10:15 am Break
- 10:15 pm – 10:45 am BoV Outbrief to DLIFLC Senior Leadership
 Bay View Room, Weckerling Center
 - Attendees at (1) below
- 10:45 am – 11:30 am Break
- 11:30 am – 12:00 pm BoV Outbrief to DLIFLC Senior Leadership, Staff & Faculty
 Gold Room, Weckerling Center,
 - Attendees at (2) below
- 12:00 pm – 1:15 pm Lunch & Break
- 1:15 pm – 1:30 pm BoV planning for next meeting
 Bay View Room, Weckerling Center
- 1:30 pm – 1:45 pm Move to Cook Hall for ACCJC outbrief
- 1:45 pm – 2:30 pm Attend ACCJC outbrief
 Cook Hall, Quadrant A&B
- 2:30 pm Adjournment
 Dr. Richard. Brecht, BoV Chair

(1) Attendees

Dr. Richard Brecht, Member, Board of Visitors

Dr. Ervin Rokke, Lt Gen, Retired, Member, Board of Visitors

Dr. William Whobrey, Member, Board of Visitors

COL Phillip J. Deppert, Commandant, DLIFLC

Col Wiley L. Barnes, Assistant Commandant, DLIFLC

Mr. Steve Collins, Chief of Staff

Dr. Robert Savukinas, Interim Provost

Mr. Detlev Kesten, Associate Provost for Academic Support & ADFO

Dr. Stephen Payne, DLIFLC Historian, DLIFLC Accreditation Liaison

(2) Attendees

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: March 6, 7 and March 8, 2018

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. Ervin Rokke, Lt Gen, Retired, Member Board of Visitors

Dr. William Whobrey, Member, Board of Visitors

BoV Alternate Designated Federal Officer

Mr. Detlev Kesten, Associate Provost for Academic Support

March 6, 2018

March 6, 2018

Welcome Remarks

Mr. Kesten welcomed all in attendance and asked Dr. Richard Brecht, DLIFLC Board of Visitors chairperson, to open the meeting. Dr. Brecht stated that he would like to open the meeting at 0921.

Call to Order

Dr. Richard Brecht called the meeting to order at 0921, welcomed returning members and thanked DLIFLC for hosting the meeting.

Mr. Detlev Kesten announced that, according to Mr. Wayne Joyner, Director of Federal Advisory Committee Act, nominations and re-appointments of Board members may be due in about 45 days. Mr. Kesten also announced that DLIFLC has the academic accreditation visiting team in town and the institute is in the middle of the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) team meetings. He thanked Dr. Whobrey for attending their welcome reception yesterday and stated that due to ACCJC visit, the BoV visit is 3-day long to provide the ACCJC team the opportunity to attend the BoV meetings while they are at DLIFLC.

BoV Administrative Business (Review of DLIFLC BoV Operating Procedures)

Mr. Kesten passed out the operating procedures that were approved in December 2017. He stated the BoV operating procedures include some of the changes that the board had agreed upon at the last meeting. He pointed out to the added verbiage to ensure it complies with the accreditation requirements. The addition was about making sure the board members review the procedures periodically as well as complete the self-assessment. He confirmed that those were the only changes to the operating procedures.

COL Philip Deppert thanked everyone for coming and acknowledged all the challenges BoV members have gone through in terms of appointments and reappointments. He stated that it was important for DLIFLC that all of the events that week converged at one time, with the accreditation team members, the BoV, and Mr. Brian Kirby, Deputy to the commanding General Combined Arms Center concurrently being at the institute. He reiterated that this was a very significant week for DLIFLC.

COL Deppert indicated that BoV will be detailed on the campaign plan and changes in leadership assignments at DLIFLC, and stated that key operations across the institute are running smoothly.

COL Deppert informed the BoV that there are 13,000 years of combined teaching experience across the institute that is spread across approximately 1600 faculty. He announced that the oldest DLIFLC faculty member started work in 1961 and is still here going strong, while the next senior-most faculty member started teaching in 1969.

Mr. Kesten closed the topic and invited the board members to prepare for their Ethics briefing.

Ethics Briefing

Mr. Michael Suttan introduced himself, stating that 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 Bruun 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 asked for comments and questions and concluded the briefing.

Mr. Kesten asked the board to come up with some questions or ideas with which the members can assist DLIFLC.

Dr. Brecht indicated that he would like to help direct his team. He identified that one of the major tasks of BoV in this meeting was the accreditation. The second thing was what he understood from COL Deppert as being secession and appointments for the Provost position and other leadership roles.

Dr. Brecht expressed his desire to move forward with the discussion of the tiger teams and see the reports that show where the institute was in regards to 2 + 2 + 2, unless COL Deppert sees any issues with the accreditation. He added that leadership change was a good thing for the Institute, and if needed, there can be a general discussion about it.

Official BoV Group Picture

The DLIFLC BoV members assembled for a group photograph.

OVERVIEW OF CURRICULUM SUPPORT AND FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

Ms. Masako, the director of Curriculum Support Division (CSD), talked about her division and its role.

Ms. Masako stated that CSD is tasked to support all curriculum related efforts across DLIFLC in an advisory capacity, that it does not really have direct contact to work on curriculum, and that the CSD's key contact is when there is a need to train new developers. She emphasized the difference between teaching a class and developing materials that could be used effectively by other teachers, the latter necessitating adherence to curriculum development guidelines and principles. She asserted that many basic courses still need to have solid core materials while making sure that there is flexibility that allows teachers to develop additional materials as they see it fit.

Dr. Rokke brought up the question about the copyright uses and user licenses.

Ms. Masako and Dr. Dudney stated that only two people work on this on a part time basis. Ms. Masako further stated that a copyright office would be very helpful. However, to establish one central location for the clearing of copyright issues requires additional resources.

Ms. Masako continued that CS is striving for streamlining CD and gave an overview of CS support to UGE and other directorates.

Dr. Brecht asked how DLIFLC targets or finds weaknesses in curricula, and what CS input for weaknesses is.

Dr. Kanbar, the provost of UGE schools, intervened and stated that schools have annual and biannual program reviews in place. These reviews are held at the schools and are attended by deans, and sometimes by the Provost. She also mentioned the end of course reviews and sensing sessions that are held for the program effectiveness and teaching effectiveness. Dr. Kanbar added that the leadership reads these reviews carefully, especially to see weaknesses from students' perspective, and that there are sensing sessions with the teachers as well.

Dr. Brecht asked how focused DLIFLC is on the 2+2+2 requirement.

Ms. Masako stated that DLIFLC now has a Curriculum Review Board (CRB), which will set the standards and the process for systematic review and update of curricula.

Dr. Brecht asked about the flexibility with the curriculum. Dr. Kanbar stated that the core curriculum is producing 4 hours of instruction per day for 4 days a week in order to provide teachers with the flexibility for 2 additional hours of materials and 1 hour for assessment.

Dr. Whobery was impressed by this model that features balance between flexibility and stability.

Dr. Brecht asked about the institutions that are actually going 2+ that DLIFLC is exchanging with.

Ms. Masako stated that DLIFLC is exchanging programs with NSA, other than military academies, but it is still in the forming phases of this initiative. Each academy has a different approach on how it promotes autonomous learning and brings together the cultures.

Dr. Brecht suggested that outside of NCS, the CIA by ILA have the best programs and going to their flagship might be helpful.

Dr. Kanbar stated that NCS has been very generous with sharing materials, and that DLIFLC is in great coordination with NCS but that it is not much so with FSI.

Faculty Development Support (FDS)

Dr. Dudney explained the main function of the FDS is to support resident and nonresident faculty and help students reach proficiency goals. The division does that by customized professional development programs tailored to the different needs of the faculty.

Dr. Dudney added that FDS consists of three parts: Student Learning Services, Instructor Certification Course (ICC) and Instructor Recertification Course (IRC). It is responsible for all certifications for teachings, and the design of some workshops.

Dr. Brecht asked if all of these programs have 2+ at the heart of their whole orientation.

Dr. Dudney answered that they are planning to do a redesign of those courses, although currently, many of those components are already present in them.

Dr. Dudney added that ICC is important training, and it is a TRADOC requirement that every 5 years this Recertification takes place. One of the challenges is the resources needed to complete the Re-certification Programs. There is a tiger team looking at DLIFLC processes, the 2022 initiatives, and the 2+2+2 requirement.

Dr. Dudney continued, saying that one of the programs that has been very labor intensive but very successful is the Diagnostic Assessment Certification (DA): DA trainers and DA specialists. It provides teachers with the tools to be able to report the 2+2+ goals, regardless of the semester the students are in. FD is too small to do all of the diagnostic assessments at the division level. Instead, it helps teachers become diagnostic assessment trainers. Then they support a cadre of teachers.

Dr. Dudney showed the Student Learning Services Introduction to Language Studies (ILS) programs slide. She explained that Student Learning Services provides train-the-trainer and certifications for teachers. SLS is under decentralized model. It provides students with

information, strategies, and knowledge needed for them to successfully start their language program. This is for all students who start the basic course.

Working Lunch

COMMANDANT'S PRIORITIES

COL Deppert decided to start with the mission first (2022, 2 + 2 and beyond), and then discuss tiger teams, and finally, leadership and other topics as they relate to the mission.

1. COL Deppert reported that since BoV's last visit, it illuminated from the bottom up that the institute has some significant challenges with the curriculum level of proficiency, one of which has been identified by Dr. Rob Savukinas, along with the school faculty, is the lack of curricula that are developed to help the students reach the 2+2+2 level.

COL Deppert pointed out that the critical thing to keep in mind is that OSD and its individual services have not agreed upon whether all undergraduate languages must obtain 2 + 2 + 2 by 2022, or whether the classes beginning fiscal year 2022 are required to do so. At this point, DLIFLC will continue to provide its best military input and advice.

COL Deppert stated that the Institute needs to know what it is supposed to be. Mr. Drummond, Deputy Assistant to the Secretary of Defense (DASD), tasked each of the services to come up with their position preference. COL Deppert indicated that he believes the Army is going to prefer classes beginning 2022 to move towards 2+/2+, but he is not clear about the other services. He asked Col Barnes to shed some light on the Air-Force preference.

Col Barnes stated it appears to him that the services are concerned about setting the standard at 2 + 2 + 2 without the students being able to achieve, as it could be a major problem. The reason is the Air Force would not be able to fill all the operational positions unless they change something so there could be many different hybrid options to include a certificate of completion. Col Barnes thinks the Enterprise needs a better assessment of how DLIFLC is using the current resources. He thinks the institute needs to understand how it is using its resources now in order to find out if it needs additional resources to achieve the mission.

COL Deppert reported that, after attending many Defense Language steering committee meetings, he knows for a fact that the Office of Secretary of Defense (OSD), Mr. Drummond, Deputy Assistant to the Secretary of Defense, and his predecessors at the ASD level are continuously trying to hold together the coalition of the services to get to a universal community-wide decision that is important, but that this is quite challenging.

2. COL Deppert discussed a new process developed at DLIFLC, which looks at curriculum development needed for the programs, as well as its prioritization. This would allow the institute to identify where the curriculum needs are by language.

Dr. Brecht commented that at the university level after 4 years of language instruction, the linguists are not even close to a 2+ range. The only way to achieve 2+ or 3 range is 1 year in-country immersion. He stated that, objectively speaking, the task DLIFLC is setting out to do is something that the academy has no experience in any broad way of accomplishing, even if the students are highly motivated, self-disciplined and professors, programs and students have a lot of time.

Dr. Brecht said that since the very beginning, he felt like no one quite appreciated the difficulty of the task. He feels no matter how much time the institute spends on finding out about the resources needed, curriculum needed, type of faculty needed, it still needs in-country abroad programs not only for three weeks, but for a longer period.

COL Deppert pointed out that there is a decision about 2+/2+ and beyond, which needs to be made and which is still hanging out there. He stated further that, at the same time, realizing that not all the variables can be controlled or fixed, Dr. Savukinas, Col Barnes and other folks identified that gaps and are beginning to put in place what is called a Curriculum Review Board (CRB), which focuses on process prioritization and dedication and how DLIFLC should internally resource these matters. COL Deppert asked Dr. Savukinas to explain this process.

Dr. Savukinas started out by saying that the Provost organization had an off-site on January 19, with the purpose of obtaining an institutional definition of what a trained and ready faculty, and what flexible curriculum mean. The organization had a cross-section of DLI who put forth definitions. Concurrently, the institute had the two DLI 2022 task forces; they were to focus on curriculum and faculty. The objective of the Provost organizations was to provide those definitions to the task force that has to put forth a definition of inclusion. The objective of that group was two folds: Is DLIFLC structured to meet the goal in the areas of curriculum and faculty development? The DLIFLC leadership had to take a step back to see what was meant by those definitions in order to establish task metrics and the way ahead of the faculty development plan, which addresses the meaning and definition of a trained and ready faculty. The leadership knows that the current model of decentralized curriculum development process is not working for DLIFLC. The existing faculty members supplement the existing curriculum with tailored instructions. Each school has two curriculum specialists and a quality control element located in the Associate Provost for Academic Support. Faculty members are under no obligation to use the curriculum materials developed by teacher-curriculum developers. This is purely a support function. There are three Arabic schools and each one is doing their own curriculum and faculty development differently. Therefore, the DLI 2022 review that you will get today touches on these as a remedy. The newly established CRB is to determine which language programs need curriculum development support the most. (The board members are Dr. Savukinas (Chair), representatives from UGE, APAS, TA, CE and host of curriculum developers.)

Dr. Savukinas further stated that with the curriculum review board, there are two channels of curriculum review input. The development will be rapid. In order to do this,

the Provost's Office looked at how many people across the enterprise has a master's degree or higher in curriculum and instructional design. They would be given no more than 120 days to update the curriculum, and then they would go back to their assigned roles. This way they would still be DLI employees but an external group, not from their own team. There will be an evaluation component built into the curriculum.

Col Barnes injected that this model is in line with the military motto for task force, limited duration, specified objectives and mission complete.

Dr. Savukinas continued that the other component is the sustainment of curriculum, which is being able to endure long-term task. Therefore, as the classes come in curriculum needs to be supplemented with timely and meaningful components that is relevant to the student.

3. COL Deppert talked about the civilian and military leadership changes, He announced the Army has recently made the commandant position a permanent 3-year position, the assistant commandant position remains 2 years. He shared that his successor is an Army intelligence colonel, currently works at army cyber command. COL Deppert stated that the first transition document he gave to his successor was the self-study because to him it signifies the most comprehensive document that explains the breadth, depth and scope of this institution.
4. COL Deppert then had general discussion about other topics related to DLIFLC mission.

The hybrid option, predicting that it would be the next model of operation where, for example, crypto linguists, foreign area officers, and human intelligence collectors each would have a particular mission.

COL Deppert stated that what DLIFLC is looking at is the idea of a student council.

Dr. Whobery added that it would be interesting to see if there is a way to include those students who are now in the field, thereby getting relevant feedback from them.

COL Deppert responded by saying that DLIFLC reached out to 27 of them and brought them all to DLIFLC for a couple of days and out of that came our visit to Indiana University. He said DLIFLC is continuing to expand the network and go across the entire defense line program, including the flagships.

Dr. Brecht commented that the important thing about immersion is whether it is "real" and that "authentic" immersion does not always mean the language and/or the culture is real. Authentic means you are in a place where the consequences of your behavior, your language and cultural behavior have consequences. If I do not know when the subway is stop running in Moscow in the middle of winter which I missed and you are at 20 degrees below zero and the last train just left that is authentic.

Dr. Brecht cautioned that the Return on Investment (ROI) is not always in proficiency and that there are other variables, such as learning how to learn, and learning how to use languages.

COL Deppert said that DLIFLC has begun to look into two Army installations, Fort Irwin and Camp Hunter Leggings for the possibility of conducting local immersions

Break

DLIFLC CAMPAIGN PLAN OVERVIEWS

Dr. Bugary, stated that the Campaign Plan is not just a once a year document that DLIFLC is just printing, and that stakeholders have to be accountable. Each director and Dean put the action plan about the work they did, in SharePoint, which they can update regularly, and others can view. This way, it becomes a project management tool that is actually a part of the campaign plan.

Dr. Bugary added that these plans are to get us to 2022 of the 2+2+ graduation standards. This is a living document but it is also an archive. All of the documents and everything associated with each strategy is in SharePoint. Therefore, this is a repository for the historian to collect all the information that he needs about the institute.

Karl Berscheid, Chief of Planning, explained the Campaign Plan SharePoint site and mentioned that it is an interactive system, through which all involved parties can contribute by adding or modifying tasks. There is a great involvement with individuals and it has given DLIFLC a lot more granularity in ways that it was not able to achieve previously through the power point system.

Mr. Berscheid informed that the Campaign Plan team gets together quarterly to update the command group and the provost office on the status and of completion of certain segments.

Karl Berscheid explained the meaning of some of the tabs/fields in campaign plan, including how many e- portfolios have been implemented, and their effectiveness will be measured by the feedback it receives.

Dr. Whobery asked where the numbers were coming from. He said he saw 60%, 65%, but did not know what that meant. He asked about how objectivity instead of subjectivity was achieved.

Dr. Bugary stated that it is part art, part science and that this was the point of the chain. If the leadership thinks that something looks off, they remind the faculty to go back and fix it.

Karl Berscheid specified that students, faculty and curriculum are the three lines of effort, the three pillars that the tiger teams have focused on and that the three all relate to one another.

Dr. Rokke commented on the challenge that 17% of DLIFLC graduates stayed in the military, while the remaining left, asked what can be done to make them more committed to the professional decision that they made to proceed down this path.

Dr. Bugary explained that there are a couple of initiatives, one of which is an emissary program, through which every quarter DLIFLC brings four peers, that have graduated in the last year, year and a half, who are doing mission and who have a good story to tell since those stories are relevant to the current students.

Dr. Bugary stated that curriculum development and faculty development have big challenges with the effectiveness. They created their campaign plans but there are other matters that they have no control over that might cause them to not be successful. They are waiting for the results of the tiger team to re-adjust their action items.

Dr. Bugary also stated that the beauty of this system is that it allows the senior leaders to look at the progress, and determine whether a given division will be ready by 2022 and challenge the entries that are flagged with green.

Training Analysis Overview on SharePoint

Dr. Bugary stated that training analysis conducts the studies to see if there is an increase in efficiency levels, and how effective OCONUS and CONUS are.

Dr. Brecht asked about where the gaps are and if anyone owns these gaps.

Dr. Bugary stated that there are many gaps and that is why COL Deppert asked the leadership if they were organized the way they need to be in order to be successful in 2022. The leadership formed the tiger team in the various subcommittees and found out all sorts of processes in place and the gaps. For example, during a curriculum discussion, there were representatives from curriculum support. The leadership thought curriculum support was responsible for the curriculum; if it broke, it was on them. However, the discussion revealed that once the curriculum is handed over to the schoolhouse, CS had no way of knowing what went on in the schools. No one shares with CS what goes on in schools.

Dr. Bugary further stated that as a result of those conversations, the leadership formed the Curriculum Review Board. The idea is that members of the board would have a shared look at the processes and prioritize things accordingly.

Review of SharePoint: CE

Slides

Review SharePoint: Distance Learning

Mr. Karl Berscheid stated that when students need to maintain their language proficiency, they could do it from a distance while they are abroad, as is the case with FAO students. There is also an online support system (i.e., GLOSS) for students to improve their language proficiency.

Review SharePoint: Emerging Languages

Mr. Karl Berscheid explained that the immersion language offices over at the DOD center want to expand the number of languages both CONUS and OCONUS. There are communities around the country, which have high concentrations of people from other countries. DLIFLC is examining ways to integrate with other cultures without going outside of the boundaries of the United States.

Dr. Brecht recommended a resource, called the MLA language map, which might be beneficial to DLIFLC. He added that it is a map of the United States with all the Heritage Community and the density around the country. It can be searched by language and area around the country.

Dr. Rokke asked if the campaign plan was an accurate assessment and whether it is a strong management tool that provides the DLIFLC leadership with the measurement it needs.

Dr. Bugary said that in terms of a management, the tool is giving a level of visibility and a method for accountability that was not there before.

Dr. Brecht summarized three major points DLIFLC still needs to do: (1) the institution versus the component priorities; (2) gaps in ownership; and (3) mapping resources against priority.

Dr. Bugary agreed.

COL Deppert recapped the two questions that he has asked across the institute and to the UGE deans as they came up that ultimately the Institute has to answer: What percent of DLIFLC teachers are ready and prepared to teach at the 2 +2 + 2 level and what percentage of curriculum across the Institute is at that level?

Dr. Brecht inquired about how the management structure could provide DLIFLC with the answers to these questions.

Dr. Bugary said that the curriculum review board would help DLIFLC in that effort.

Adjournment

Dr. Brecht adjourned the meeting at 3:16pm

March 7, 2018

Call to Order

Dr. Brecht called the meeting to order at 0903.

Mr. Kesten announced that today's presentations are on the Advanced Language Academy (ALA) and a background on the basic course ICC. Dr. Bugary, representatives from UGE who were part of the 2022 plans and some APAS folks will be participating in the discussion. Mr. Kesten mentioned that the president of the Academic Senate is also going to join the meeting to bring the Senate's perspective. In addition, there will be a session with three confirmed members of the ACCJC team in the afternoon.

Update on Basic Course Instructor Certification Course (ICC) & Advanced Language Academies (ALAs)

Dr. Claudia Bey provided an overview of the Advance Language Academy in the context of the Parthenon because everyone at DLIFLC is working together to reach 2+2+2 and beyond. Faculty Development division is mostly responsible for the trained and ready faculty. The Advanced Language Academy. The Institute is still going through changes in teaching practices and the way DLIFLC does things in the language classrooms.

Dr. Bey stated that the FD started at the top with the senior leaders in 2015 because the senior leaders are the ones who create the conditions to make change and transformations happen. Then, it went down the hierarchy more or less. FD folks worked with academic specialists and trained them to train the teachers in the schools because the academic specialists have a close impact on what is happening in the classroom. The division also had an ALA that was abbreviated and more tailored to the military associate dean on how they can help in this effort. FD gets a great deal of input and we work together closely with universities, flagships and FSI. DLIFLC hosted Glen Davidson, Thomas Garza, Sonia Sherry, Aver Swindler, Lyman Hagar, Lecher Goldstein, and Allah Algibabi. Not only did these scholars work in the ALA but they also worked in different schools to give workshops to the faculty who were not part of the ALA at that time.

Dr Brecht commented that the impressive thing about that list of professionals is that it has a mix of people that are actually in the classroom teaching. It is actually people running the program to guarantee a 3+3+3 and who know the military, like Lyman Hagar, who are focused on practical output and not on an academic dream.

Dr. Grazyna moved on to giving an example of the supporting processes to the program to help implement some of these concepts in practice. She stated that FD trains the trainer in the schools to design the ALA for teachers. FD works with department chairs, and designs a workshop on teacher development after they observe the classes to see if the ALA is working. FD also developed practical hands-on 40-hour workshop on class observations and included a teacher development component, transforming the way class observations are done. Typically, what used to happen is that a department chair would go to classes, take some notes and meet with the teacher. It was very summative as to what worked and

what did not; the developmental component was missing. After such ALA workshop, FD received a lot of positive feedback from deans and chairs.

Dr. Whobery asked about the feedback loop with respect to focusing on the specific areas using the campaign-plan-management tool.

Ms. Grazyna answered that ALA is put together in close coordination with UGE schools. FD collects a great deal of input and feedback on processes that are happening and not happening, and then it structures the ALA content and process based on that input.

COL Deppert offered a critical input, arguing that the ALAs are missing student input for faculty members.

Dr. Brecht noted that he sees ALA as a practical integrative mechanism towards 2+2+2, and that it brings all the consequential in a practical way to understand what schools are doing towards 2+2+2.

Dr. Bey presented the next slide on ALA for senior leaders. This ALA will focus on looking at what needs to be accomplished, as a change process and FD will provide some analytical tools that would allow participants to look at the organizational compass what they have accomplished since last ALA and what they need to accomplish to get to the goal 2+2+2 and beyond.

Dr. Bey discussed a new comprehensive instructor certification program. She informed that this is an initiative in effort to see how to bring teachers and students to higher levels of proficiency. There are several collaborative efforts together with the Academic Senate and with the UGE associate provost to draft this document, which is still in draft form and needs some fine-tuning.

Dr. Bey explained that with the new certification program, the teachers who attend the program would come out with a professional portfolio and then receive more mentoring and coaching in schools. They will also develop an individual development plan.

Dr. Brecht asked what criteria would be used for new hires in this program.

COL Deppert stated that everyone has to pass the certification program even if they have world-class qualifications. Until they pass the certifications programs, DLIFLC cannot put them in front of initial entree trainees. Upon a question by Dr. Brecht, COL Deppert confirmed that certification program is different from training program.

Dr. Bey stated that the course overview of the ICC would be oriented to faculty with the DLIFLC mission, adult learning and teaching the different skills. She said that because we now have the added layers of getting people to 2+ and beyond, FD has been working on a revision of the ICC to implement these concepts. It is a 4-week course and it has five teaching days. It starts out with microteaching in the course, then have teachers plan lessons and finally implement the lessons in their actual environment with real students. Peers and

workshop facilitators observe the teachers, who receive feedback and do it again a couple of days later with different content.

Dr. Bey further stated that it is a yearlong process for certification with accompanying and mentoring in schools along with electives. FD does a fairly extensive feedback report for chairs to continue working with their teachers, mentoring them and getting them be successful in the department. Then, in-school trainers work with the chairs and teachers, as teachers are not specialized in the area.

Dr. Whobery asked about the requirement for full certification or advanced certification.

COL Deppert said the leadership is working towards defining that at an institute level.

Ms. Bey added that this would be an outcome of what FD did when they looked at specific competency as to what a master teacher needs. Maybe based on the concept of teacher leader, coaching other teachers and so forth. FD prepares them to be able to fulfill that role.

Break

Review of 2022 Tiger Team Effort

Mr. Kesten welcomed back Dr. Bugary.

Dr. Bugary informed that last June, COL Deppert asked the civilian leadership whether we were organized to hit 2022, which led to wider discussion and many issues and concerns came out of the discussion. Then, the leadership sat down and organized those issues and concerns into categories.

Dr Bugary continued that, afterwards, the leadership formed tiger teams and subcommittees of the tiger teams. There were four subcommittees: 1) Curriculum; 2) Semester Teaching; 3) Evaluation; 4) Technology. Each subcommittee was charged with defining their problem statement using Military Decision Making Process (MDMP) to solve it and do the mission analysis to come up with the recommendation.

Dr. Bugary stated that, originally, subcommittees did not include a discussion on faculty. However, as the discussions went on, it became clear that the tiger team needed to add faculty development, along with the MLI utilization. A separate subcommittee was formed for Student Learning Services. As a result, there are eight subcommittees.

Dr. Brecht asked who decides whether the tiger team subcommittee did not do enough.

Dr. Bugary answered that the tiger team looks at all the subcommittees' work prior to putting out final recommendations. Then the leadership put a brief before the commandant.

Lunch

Meeting with members of the ACCJC Visiting Team

Mr. Kevin Ballinger, Dr. Jill Stearns and Dr. Chialin Hsieh from ACCJC team introduced themselves and provided brief descriptions of their roles and workplaces.

Dr. Brecht asked whether this was a first review for everyone for DLI.

Mr. Ballinger stated that they would not repeat team members for any one institution.

Next, members of the BoV introduced themselves. They talked about their roles as BoV members and the capacity in which they serve on the board.

Mr. Ballinger asked how a board could be advisory and whether it sees the outcomes of the meetings and the advice is being followed at DLIFLC. He specified that the ACCJC team is used to the boards that are political agencies, they can hire and fire the Chancellor.

Dr. Brecht stated that BoV role has been confined and delineated by federal so the board is clear of its role. The board member's job is to come in with a lot of experience from a military and an academic side.

The process of BoV at DLIFLC is intake; the board is bombarded with information. It is the job of the board to pull the mask away from the presentations, and look under the hood and poke holes in what needs to be improved.

Dr. Rokke added that the board's impact on the institution is largely a function of a very subjective credibility with people. The board tries to build on the credibility and tries to be helpful with the leadership to accommodate, in terms of actions.

Dr. Whobery added that the board receives quite a few briefings and updates in terms of information. The board then puts together the important issues that emerged and outbrief to the commandant and the entire faculty.

Mr. Kesten clarified that the recommendations are made to the commandant, not during the board visit, but after they get approved by the Army Education Advisory committee (AEAC). They review the BoV observations and make sure they are in line with federal regulations. Once approved by AEAC, DLIFLC gets the directions from the director of the Federal Advisory Committee Act and ADFO publishes them in the Federal Register. Only then do they become recommendations.

Dr. Whobery explained that the part of board's task is finding the balance between broad institutional issues and finding one or two particular issues to focus on. The board is serving the national interest.

Dr. Brecht added the board has only one mission, and that is to help the students graduate and that the nation needs this.

Dr. Hsieh asked how the board evaluates and measures its effectiveness as a board member serving the institution.

Dr. Brecht explained that board's recommendations and response of the Institutions with the Department of Defense is the measure of board's effectiveness. For example, the board recommended and came in very strongly that faculty need pay increases because the salary did not accommodate the cost of living. It was not that because the board made it happen, but the fact that the board kept drumming on the issue. Another issue that the board worked on was that the military has a habit of turning people over every two years. The first year is used in finding out and figuring out everything that is wrong and then the second year planning on how to correct these things, but then the next person comes in and starts all over again. Dr. Brecht added that this has just been approved that now the commandant is at DLIFLC for three-year terms with the possibility of renewal. Dr Brecht stated that it might not sound a lot but when dealing with an institution as big as DLIFLC, it is a significant improvement from where the institution was before the board made the recommendations. He concluded that things like this is how board evaluates itself; by using data.

Dr. Rokke stated that the board is intimate with the institution on many levels. The board members mix up and talk with students and faculty members, which might appear as subjective assessment but there is value in it.

Mr. Kesten added that there is a formal self-evaluation to be done by each board member after each BoV meeting. DLIFLC wanted the board members to provide anonymous feedback.

Mr. Kesten explained the process of BoV member selection and approval and the status of the memberships.

Dr. Stearns commented that DLIFLC has much to be proud of and that it has generous budget that other institutes wish they had. It is just great to see what folks at DLIFLC are doing and their commitment and achieving amazing results. Clearly, there are challenges to try to blend the worlds of military and academe. ACCJC team is going to have some suggestions for ways that they may lean towards improvement. Overall, the team sees excellence in the way in which the board and the institute is making it work.

Dr. Brecht appreciated and thanked ACCJC team's effort and understanding in that it is not easy for academics and military to understand each other's culture.

Adjournment

Dr. Brecht adjourned the meeting 3:30 pm.

March 8, 2018

Call to Order

Dr. Brecht called the meeting to order at 0900.

Start Outbrief Compilation

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

Break

BoV Outbrief to DLIFLC CMDT, AC and Provost

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

BoV Administration: Meeting Evaluation, Scheduling

BoV Members completed the self-assessment of the March 2018 meeting. The BoV discussed the potential schedule to meet in June 2018 depending on the approval of membership renewals.

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. The board appreciates the efforts of DLIFLC faculty and staff as well as the visiting accreditation team for what is clearly an effective and inclusive approach towards re-affirmation.
2. The board applauds the Campaign Plan development starting with access and transparency made possible by the use of SharePoint. The board encourages the inclusion of institutional priorities, consideration of potential gaps, and resource implications.
3. The board believes that the CRB can make a significant contribution towards the 2022 goal.
4. In parallel with the CRB effort, the board encourages the development of a process for ensuring faculty development programs are consistent with the 2+/2+ and beyond goal.
5. Consistent with the board's former recommendations and the 2+/2+ and beyond goal, it is convinced that all immersion programs play a critical role in the language learning process

6. As in earlier recommendations, the board believes the extension of the Commandant's term to three years is appropriate. The board continues to stress the value of increasing the Assistant Commandant's term beyond two years and encourages the Commandant to address this issue with the appropriate authorities.
7. It is apparent that the quest for 2+/2+ and beyond exceeds the traditional pursuit of excellence at this institution. Success will require a transformation of not only structures and processes but also institutional culture. The board applauds the efforts underway as significant towards this goal (e.g., CRB, CP, and Tiger Team). Every member of the DLIFLC team, leadership, staff, faculty, and services, must be included in and must take ownership of this effort.

Move to Cook Hall for ACCJC Outbrief

The BoV moved from the Gold Room of the Weckerling Center to Cook Hall to attend ACCJC outbrief.

Adjournment

Dr. Brecht adjourned the meeting at 2:30 pm.

TAB D - Subcommittee Members/Mission/Meeting Purpose

Subcommittee/Board Members:

Dr. Richard Brecht, Member, Board of Visitors
Dr. Ervin Rokke, LTG, Retired, Member, Board of Visitors
Dr. William Whobrey, 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 plan for its students to achieve higher proficiency scores on the Defense Language Proficiency Test (DLPT). The subcommittee will also meet with the ACCJC accreditation site visit-team and receive updates on the Institute's accreditation. It will also address administrative matters.

TAB E - Observers and Guests

Guests or Observers present at the March 2018 Meeting:

Mr. Kirby Brown, Deputy to the commanding General Combined Arms Center

Dr. Jill Stearns, ACCJC visiting team member

Dr. Jennifer Hamilton-Zellet, ACCJC visiting team member

Mr. Kevin Ballinger, ACCJC visiting team member

Dr. Meghan Chen, ACCJC visiting team member

Mr. Jeff Stearns, ACCJC visiting team member

Ms. Sarah Shepard, ACCJC visiting team member

Mr. Michael Zimmerman, ACCJC visiting team member

Dr. Angelica Suarez, ACCJC visiting team member

Dr. Chialin Hsieh, ACCJC visiting team member

Ms. MaryBeth Benvenuti, ACCJC visiting team member

COL Phillip J. Deppert, Commandant, DLIFLC

Col Wiley L. Barnes, Assistant Commandant, DLIFLC

Mr. Steve Collins, Chief of Staff

Dr. Robert Savukinas, Interim Provost

Mr. Detlev Kesten, Associate Provost for Academic Support & ADFO

Dr. Stephen Payne, DLIFLC Historian, DLIFLC Accreditation Liaison

DLIFLC Faculty

DLIFLC Staff

TAB F - Handouts

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

1. BoV Itinerary 6 to 8 March 2018
2. BoV Operating Procedures
3. 2018 Army Ethics Brief
4. Curriculum Support Brief
5. Faculty Development Brief
6. Advanced Language Academy Brief
7. BoV March 2018 Self-Evaluations

TAB G - BoV Provisional Recommendations Forwarded to the AEAC for Meeting
conducted on 6 and 7 March 2018:

BoV Provisional Recommendations: Meeting conducted on 6 and 7 March 2018:

1. We appreciate the efforts of our faculty and staff as well as our visiting accreditation team for what is clearly an effective and inclusive approach towards re-affirmation.
2. We applaud the Campaign Plan development starting with access and transparency made possible by the use of SharePoint. We encourage the inclusion of institutional priorities, consideration of potential gaps, and resource implications.
3. We believe that the Curriculum Review Board (CRB) can make a significant contribution towards the 2022 goal.
4. In parallel with the CRB effort, we encourage the development of a process for ensuring faculty development programs are consistent with the 2+/2+ and beyond goal.
5. Consistent with our former recommendations and the 2+/2+ and beyond goal, we are convinced that all immersion programs play a critical role in the language learning process.
6. As in earlier recommendations, we believe the extension of the Commandant's term to three years is appropriate. We continue to stress the value of increasing the Assistant Commandant's term beyond two years and encourage the Commandant to address this issue with the appropriate authorities.
7. It is apparent that the quest for 2+ and beyond exceeds the traditional pursuit of excellence at this institution. Success will require a transformation not only of structures and processes but also institutional culture. We applaud the efforts underway towards this goal (e.g., CRB, CP, Tiger Team). Every member of the DLI team, leadership, staff, faculty, and services, must be included in and must take ownership of this effort.

Detlev Kesten
Alternate Designated Officer, DLIFLC Board of Visitors
8 June 2018

I hereby certify this 8th day of June 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". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke at the end.