DEFENSE LANGUAGE INSTITUTE
ANNUAL COMMAND HISTORY

(RCS CSHIS-6 [R3])

1 January 1986 - 31 December 1986

by
Dr. James C. McNaughton

August 1988
Presidio of Monterey, California

Contents

DEFENSE LANGUAGE INSTITUTE
FOREIGN LANGUAGE CENTER
PRESIDIO OF MONTEREY, CALIFORNIA 93944-5006

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF:

ATFL-MH (870-5c) 2 August 1988

MEMORANDUM FOR: SEE DISTRIBUTION

SUBJECT: 1986 DLI Annual Command History

1. The enclosed 1986 DLI Annual Command History describes an important year in the history of our institute. In that year we taught more students than in any other year in more than a decade. A new commandant seized the initiative on a wide number of fronts: a new masterplan was developed, proposals for Team Teaching and a New Personnel System were initiated, and the current increase in the size of our faculty got underway.

2. A close look at these recent events is essential as we continue to work towards projecting DLI into the international arena. We should all take the time to reflect upon these solid achievements of recent years and to recognize how far we have come. Those who follow in our footsteps will look back on the 1980's as a time when we were "making history" here at DLI.

3. The enclosed Annual Command History is a comprehensive survey of where we were in 1986, just two years ago. Many of the issues Dr. McNaughton addresses remain of vital concern. He has not avoided controversial matters, and many will undoubtably disagree with his conclusions. But a healthy discussion of where we have been and where we are going is a vital part of progress. I urge all DLI's leaders to read his study, and I urge you to make it required reading for new key personnel as they join your staff.

4. Following a security review, the enclosed Annual Command History is hereby republished and approved for unlimited distribution. POC this headquarters is Dr. McNaughton, Command Historian (AV 878-5536/5510).

Ronald I. Cowger

RONALD I. COWGER
Col, USAF
Acting Commandant

Encl
as

DISTRIBUTION:
C +
50 ATFL-MH
15 AFTL-NCR
10 ATFL-CMT

Preface

Describing a year in the life of any school is no easy task. When the mission of the school is to teach nearly forty different foreign languages to over 4,000 students each year from all four armed services, the prospect is daunting. The Defense Language Institute (DLI) is a military school that teaches an essentially non-military skill, where mostly foreign-born civilians teach mostly American-born soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines. A Department of Defense language college, it is administered by the U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command. Located in the United States, it teaches students to communicate with people from around the world. This annual command history attempts to capture some of these complexities and show how the parts relate to the whole.

A simple model provides the organization for this study. At its heart is the relationship between teachers and students. About the first we know a great deal, although many would argue not enough. At DLI teachers are variously encouraged, praised, cajoled, controlled and studied. About the students we regrettably know much less, and our understanding of the process of foreign language acquisition is correspondingly impoverished. Two other components of the model are the school's leaders and those who provide essential support. Finally, many external factors influence the process at DLI. I have referred to these factors generally as the policy and resource environment in which the school must operate. Each of these five components is treated in a separate chapter, beginning with the environment, then discussing in turn the management, teachers, students and support activities.

During the 1980's each of these components was undergoing significant change. Most visible was the dramatic rise in the number of students the services were sending for language training, from less than 3,400 each year in the mid-1970's to over 5,200 a decade later. Defense Department planners responded by pouring over $100 million into the construction of new facilities on the Presidio of Monterey (beginning in 1983) and by utilizing converted facilities at Lackland Air Force Base (1981) and the Presidio of San Francisco (1982). A new General Officer Steering Committee supervised school operations (1981) and a new civilian dean took charge of instruction (1981). Other changes were occurring under the surface as well. A new generation of instructors was coming on board to join the original faculty first hired in the 1940's and 1950's, while changes in curriculum and teaching methods were altering the way students learned. Foreign language word processors were beginning to appear in departmental offices. In 1985 a new commandant arrived, intent upon making a number of key mid-course corrections, includ-

ing the development of a new personnel system for the faculty and a comprehensive master plan for the school.

This study was written less than two years after the period it describes, and many of the issues it touches are still of concern. The armed services have long recognized the value of history for current operations in peace as well as in war. For this reason American military organizations have traditionally prepared annual historical reviews to serve as institutional memories to counterbalance the inevitable turn-over of key personnel. Since the early 1980's the U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command has gradually expanded its historical program by placing professional historians in each Army school to collect historical data, conduct research, teach and publish military history, such as these annual command histories.

The following study describes the Defense Language Institute in the pivotal year of 1986. It is based on historical summaries prepared by individual staff members, numerous discussions with the participants, and other documentation. Much was necessarily omitted, but I hope what remains will do justice to the whole. It could never have been written without the help of the many people who gave so generously of their time to educate a newcomer. The errors that remain are mine alone, and I hope this study will mark a new round in the ongoing dialogue I have had with so many people throughout the school since I first arrived in June, 1987. I must especially thank Virginia T. Wilson, who stepped in at the last minute to help bring an unwieldy manuscript under control.

James C. McNaughton, PhD
Presidio of Monterey, CA
June, 1988

Chapter One

The DoD Environment for Foreign Language Education

Foreign Language Requirements in the 1980's

America's critical need for foreign language capabilities was unexpectedly dramatized in the spring of 1986. In the early morning hours of April 5, 1986, La Belle Club in West Berlin was still lively, as five hundred Germans, Turks and off-duty American soldiers were enjoying the city's famous nightlife. At 1:50 a.m. a bomb blast ripped apart the scene, injuring over two hundred, including fifty Americans. A Turkish woman and 21-year-old U.S. Army Sgt. Kenneth T. Ford of Detroit, Michigan, were killed by the force of the explosion. The world stood aghast.

GEN Bernard W. Rogers, Supreme Allied Commander Europe, told reporters a few days afterwards that U.S. intelligence had "indisputable evidence" that the attack had been ordered by Libyan strongman Qaddafi. He explained how a Libyan message had been intercepted and hastily translated, and that US military authorities in Berlin were rushing to warn off-duty servicemen in the numerous popular night spots that very evening when the bomb went off. "We were about 15 minutes too late," he said. The evidence of Libyan complicity was so strong that President Reagan ordered surprise pre-dawn bombing raids on military targets in Libya ten days after the attack.[1]

This incident illustrated the dangerous world in which Americans lived in the mid-1980's and the critical need to understand foreign languages. Without the capability to communicate with the rest of the world, the US would forever be at a disadvantage. Since World War II the United States had become a world power, with commensurate world-wide political, economic and security interests. Other incidents in the mid-1980's illustrated the range of these interests. In December, 1985, a chartered airliner carrying soldiers returning from peace-keeping duties on the Sinai Peninsula crashed at Gander, Newfoundland, killing all 256 men on board, some of them Arabic linguists. In February, 1986, President Marcos of the Philippines was pushed from power, in a country where America had security interests that stretch back to the end of the last century. The Defense Language Institute had only graduated five military students in basic Tagalog in the previous three years. In April, 1986, 250 U.S. servicemen were deployed to Bolivia to provide much-needed helicopter support for the local government's anti-drug campaign. These incidents were only the most visible examples of the critical national requirement for Americans to be able to communicate with the rest of the world for commerce, diplomacy and national security.

Yet it was obvious to all that foreign language education was not an American national strength. The crisis in foreign language capabilities lacked the headline-grabbing potential of the Challenger Space Shuttle

accident in early 1986, but it was no less important. Two works published at the beginning of the 1980's pointed out in shocking detail the extent of our national shortcomings, which were little improved by mid-decade. In one, Senator Paul Simon called us the "Tongue-Tied Americans," and mockingly suggested that we erect a sign at each port of entry into the country:

WELCOME TO THE
UNITED STATES
ONE OF THE FEW NATIONS
WHICH DOES NOT PROVIDE
ITS STUDENTS EXPOSURE TO
A FOREIGN LANGUAGE[2]

Senator Simon pointed out that even though millions of Americans take a year or two of a foreign language, these are not necessarily the languages needed for diplomacy, trade or security. In 1979 the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies issued a report under the hopeful title *Strength Through Wisdom*, subtitled "A Critique of US Capability." Another report showed that in 1979 only 15 percent of all high school students were enrolled in foreign language classes. The quality of language instruction in the schools was nowhere near that of most other modern nations.[3]

Nor did foreign language education occupy a prominent place in American higher education. Most university scholars preferred to focus on literature and linguistics. Introductory language classes in colleges and universities were often left to graduate teaching assistants. During World War II the War Department had turned to anthropologists for the necessary expertise in designing language training programs. In the 1980's only a handful of academic centers existed where foreign language education was studied as a separate academic discipline. The result was that government and business could only rarely rely on the academic community to meet their foreign language needs. The capability more often had to be laboriously developed in ways that second language acquisition experts knew were far from ideal.

Yet by the middle of the decade there were signs that national awareness of the problem was on the rise. A series of powerful critiques examined the entire national educational system. The most widely discussed of these reports, released by the National Commission on Excellence in Education in 1983, bore the provocative title, *A Nation at Risk*. The commission declared that "the educational foundations of our society are presently being eroded by a rising tide of mediocrity that threatens our very future as a Nation and a people. . . . We have allowed this to happen to ourselves. . . . We have, in effect, been committing an act of unthinking, unilateral educational disarmament."[4]

In the 1980's the national mood of post-Vietnam isolationism was also moving towards a new internationalism. Americans became more used to

automobiles, electronic products and clothing from abroad, and such cultural phenomena as the immensely popular charity rock concert, "We Are the World," which won a Grammy Award as the Record of the Year for 1986. By the middle of the 1980's a national momentum had developed for upgrading foreign language education in the country. This combined with other trends in the Department of Defense to create a favorable climate for improving foreign language capabilities for national security. At the urgings of President Reagan and Secretary of Defense Weinberger, Congress provided new levels of resources for expanding and modernizing the military services. At the same time, the nation's leadership had made a commitment to rebuild the country's huge intelligence apparatus, which had been reduced to disarray during the 1970's.[5] A third factor, not to be discounted, was the services' success in recruiting large numbers of very able young people who were capable of becoming proficient linguists.

In the mid-1980's America's need for foreign language capabilities was as great as ever, but now there were signs of hope. The factors moving toward rebuilding those capabilities within the Department of Defense were picking up momentum. All these trends had an impact on the Defense Language Institute.

User Agencies

Several key components of the Department of Defense needed foreign language capabilities to carry out their national security responsibilities in the 1980's. The Defense Attache System encircled the globe. Army tactical military intelligence units needed linguist-interrogators. Special Operations Forces required special language training. All services needed personnel to serve in NATO and other multinational headquarters. But the largest requirement for military linguists was in the National Security Agency/Central Security Service (NSA/CSS) and its Cryptologic Training System (CTS), which in the 1980's absorbed more than two thousand freshly-trained military linguists each year.[6]

The Defense Language Institute was the primary provider of fulltime resident basic foreign language training to these agencies and also ran programs for refresher, remediation and advanced training for their personnel. Some ran separate command language programs, while others relied on DLI-provided nonresident training materials. Nevertheless DLI performed an essential support function for a number of what were informally called "user agencies," so called because they were the "customers" for DLI's most important "product," trained military linguists. Each of these user agencies had a different set of foreign language requirements, which were sometimes translated into differing expectations of how DLI should operate.

NSA/CSS exercised centralized control over all US signals intelligence and cryptologic activities. It supervised the service cryptologic elements provided by four service major commands: the Army's Intelligence and Security Command (INSCOM, the successor to the Army Security Agency),

the Air Force Electronic Security Command (ESC), the Naval Security Group Command (NAVSECGRUCOM) and the Marine Support Battalion (MARSUPBN). These commands used thousands of linguists to monitor communications world-wide. Three-quarters of all Army enlisted students at DLI and over ninety percent of all enlisted students from the other three services were headed for duty assignments in this field, accounting for about 64% of all students enrolling at DLI during FY 1986.[7]

Unlike most other Defense Department organizations, NSA/CSS field stations had day-to-day operational missions against real targets. They were not "getting ready" to do their jobs; they had to do them every day. Field stations were often unappealing places to work. Some were in major cities, but others were on remote sites, where living accommodations were spartan and the working hours long. Some linguists served on aerial platforms, which posed special hazards. Many young military linguists cited these hardships as reason for leaving the service after their initial enlistments were done.

For these students, initial language training at DLI was just one part of their preparation for their duties. They were given additional technical training at the Goodfellow Technical Training Center and were awarded military specialties that reflected this subsequent training, such as Army MOS 98X, Air Force AFSC 208XX, Navy NEC 9XXX, and Marine Corps MOS's in the 2600 series. Most of these duties involved transcribing voice broadcasts, "gisting" and providing rough translations. To apprentice linguists, these duties tended to be far beyond their abilities, or excruciatingly boring -- or both. There was little time on the job for remediation, and few ever had the opportunity to visit the country where their target language was spoken. Russian linguists, for example, usually spent their entire service time outside the Soviet Union.

Regardless of the service or agency involved, the Cryptologic Training Manager (CTM) exercised centralized control over the entire cryptologic training system. Rarely were he or the field station commanders satisfied with the language skills of these young linguists. Moreover, due to changes in its operational philosophy, the NSA/CSS was significantly raising its training requirements. In a Language Needs Assessment conducted in 1985 the CTM reported that NSA/CSS linguists needed to be at Level 3 proficiency in listening to perform their jobs and insisted that Level 2 proficiency be the minimum graduation requirement from a DLI basic course. Yet because of the revolving-door nature of military service in the 1980's, all user agencies remained handicapped with what many called "disposable linguists," who were trained at great expense, performed marginally for a few years and then left the service. In one 1986 study of the "826 Army SIGINT and HUMINT specialists trained in a foreign language in FY80, only 110 or 13% remain[ed] in Service or in those specialties [six years later]."[8]

The CTM worked closely with DLI to see that CTS language training needs were met. His dissatisfaction with DLI's basic course graduates, his expertise based on the CTS's own in-house language training and his

genuine concern led to an on-going dialogue with DLI. Some NSA/CSS veterans returned to DLI each year as Foreign Language Training NCO's and Petty Officers (FLTN/PO) in many departments within the school. He also maintained a permanent representative at DLI. James A. Mauk had been the CTS representative to the school (CTSRepDLIFLC) since May, 1984. He was himself a 1969 graduate of the Army Language School Russian course and had made his career with NSA/CSS, including seven years at the National Cryptologic School teaching Russian. When he was transferred in September, 1986, his assistant, Master Chief Arne Simonsen, filled in for the remainder of the year.

Other user agencies made up what was loosely called the "HUMINT community" (human intelligence). The Army and Marine Corps in particular had need of hundreds of linguists each year to serve in tactical military intelligence units as interrogators or tactical intelligence specialists. In FY 1986, 480 students came to DLI for Training Objective 7, "military headquarters and operational units." While these needs were often clearly identified on manning documents in the field, language skills often took second place to other kinds of duties. The infrequency of operational missions and the lack of in-country experience often made these the most underutilized of all military linguists. In 1985 the Army published a major revision of AR 611-6, Army Linguist Management (16 October 1985), which asserted that "a foreign language is a highly perishable skill that must be maintained through constant command emphasis and the individual efforts of each linguist" (para. 1-4). The Assistant Chief of Staff for Intelligence also established an Army Language Program Review Committee chaired by a general officer to help turn around the problem.

The United States also participated in a network of multinational headquarters world-wide that called for service members to work with their counterparts in a foreign language, be it on a NATO staff in Brussels or Naples, at a nuclear weapons storage site in an allied country or as an infantry brigade commander in South Korea. For some of these a short "Gateway" course was all that was needed. To meet some of these requirements the Army trained hundreds of Foreign Area Officers each year.

The U.S. also maintained Defense Attache Offices and a foreign military sales program throughout the world. In FY 1986 DLI trained over 350 officers in the languages of our allies (Training Objectives 1 & 2). By long-standing agreement with the Defense Intelligence Agency all of these officers were trained at the Foreign Service Institute or at one of several commercial language schools in the Washington, DC, area. These officers had the distinct advantage of being able to live in the countries whose languages they had studied. For them, conversational ability was a vitally important skill.

DLI also supported other government agencies such as the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Drug Enforcement Administration when they had foreign language requirements. But in the main, DLI served the

needs of NSA/CSS and the armed services, and it was to those user agencies that DLI was responsible for the proficiency of its graduates.

Defense Foreign Language Program

After many years of single-service language programs the Department of Defense consolidated all service language training into a single "Defense Language Program" in 1962. The Army was assigned overall responsibility to manage the program, and a new agency was established, the Defense Language Institute. The commandant of the Army Language School, COL James L. Collins, Jr., was selected to be its first director, with instructions to assemble "all DoD language training requirements," to determine how they could be "satisfied most economically and effectively," and to be the single authority to exercise "technical control" over such training.

By the 1980's the program had evolved considerably. The foreign language departments at the service academies and in the military dependents schools had been left out of the original plan, and in the 1970's the Air Force had become the executive agent for English language training. DLI had become just one voice among many in the foreign language training community within the Federal Government. The State Department, CIA, NSA and Peace Corps all had foreign language training programs of their own, which maintained informal liaison through such channels as the Interagency Language Roundtable (ILR), the Defense Executive Committee on Language Efforts (D'ECOLE) and with the NATO allies through the Bureau for International Language Coordination (BILC). For example, DLI hosted the annual BILC meeting in Monterey in June, 1986. Many independent command language training programs flourished world-wide that supported such activities as Special Forces training at Fort Bragg, North Carolina, the U.S. Army-Europe in Heidelberg, West Germany, and many other programs.

Since 1962 the Defense Foreign Language Program had evolved into a complex web of agencies with diverse responsibilities designed somehow to provide the "most effective and economical" training possible. DoD Directive 5160.41 gave the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Force Management and Personnel) responsibility to "provide overall policy guidance" for the program (para. D.1).[9] But the "primary functional sponsor for foreign language training" was the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Communications, Command Control and Intelligence) (ASD(C3I)). This placed the burden of responsibility for OSD-level management squarely on the shoulders of the Director of Intelligence Personnel and Training, Craig L. Wilson. Wilson had worked in the field of intelligence personnel and training for his entire career and had worked in the Office of the Secretary of Defense for ten years. His responsibilities were greater than normally expected of a GS-15, because the position of ASD(C3I) had been vacant for some time. This directive charged him with the responsibility to "assist and support the ASD(MRA&L) in providing policy guidance (planning, programming, management, and administration of

language training)" to the Army (para. D.4).[10] He had authored the most recent revision of DoD Directive 5160.41 and had played an active role in all aspects of the DFLP for many years.

The Army carried out its responsibilities as Executive Agent through the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Manpower and Reserve Affairs (ASA(MRA)). The Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations and Plans (ODCSOPS), Director of Training, however, was designated the "staff action office."

The "administrative responsibility to manage, operate, fund and provide personnel resource support" was given to the Army's Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC), which operated all Army schools. When TRADOC was established in 1973, DLI had formally protested having an intermediate layer of control inserted between DLI and the DA staff, but its objections were overruled. A key TRADOC planning officer, COL David A. McNerney, was later sent to DLIFLC as commandant in 1981.

This complex management structure left one office to provide overall policy guidance and another as primary functional sponsor, one as executive agent and another as the staff action office. Yet another was the administrative headquarters. At the bottom of this totem pole was the commandant of DLIFLC, who was tasked to operate DoD's foreign language academy and to "exercise technical control of the DFLP."[11]

The complexity was compounded by the turnover of key personnel in all these agencies. COL Bullard later summed it up by saying, "All of our bosses change every two years." Between 1985 and 1987 he worked under three different action officers and three Directors of Training at Army ODCSOPS.[13]

In an attempt to overcome the difficulties inherent in this arrangement, a General Officer Steering Committee (GOSC) had been organized in 1981. Under the chairmanship of the Director of Training in the Army ODCSOPS, this committee was designed to oversee the entire program. The members included the senior intelligence chiefs from the four services, the training directors of DIA and NSA, the three offices in OSD and DA with responsibilities for the DFLP, and the TRADOC Deputy Chief of Staff for Training.[13]

This committee wielded broad authority to review all aspects of the program, approve requirements, "develop policy and make recommendations for the overall management of the DFLP" (para. 1-10), and review the Army's funding. The GOSC also provided the framework for an active network of action officers who met monthly in Washington. The issues handled at the action officer level were brought into the open at the annual GOSC meetings, the only time when the principals met in person.

The GOSC met in Monterey in September, 1985, to review a dozen major issues affecting the DFLP.[14] The long-range construction program was lagging and the school reported difficulty in recruiting sufficient instructors and finding housing for students. The GOSC nevertheless directed DLIFLC to close its branches at Lackland Air Force Base and the Presidio of San Francisco within two years in anticipation of new dormitories becoming

available in Monterey. Representatives from NSA and the Army then reported on the Language Needs Assessments they had conducted earlier in the year. The GOSC endorsed a proficiency level of L-2, R-2 and S-1 as a "CTS job requirement" and a "DLI training goal."

COL Bullard had taken command in August, 1985, when COL McNerney retired. In his first GOSC meeting he moved quickly to address what he diagnosed as the major shortcomings of the school. He proposed a complete overhaul of the civilian personnel management system, telling them in executive session, "Teacher morale is very low." The GOSC gave him permission to develop a "Demonstration Project" proposal that would pull the instructors out of the civil service system, which he saw as poorly suited to an educational institution.[1]

The GOSC and its action officers remained the most important audience for COL Bullard's efforts to reform the school. At times they overruled him in some of the details of the operation of the school, and at other times they allowed individual users to interfere directly in the school, but they were a constant presence. He was later critical of this, saying, "The action officers had control when I arrived. When I went through Washington [in the summer of 1985] I had three or four people each tell me they 'ran' DLI."[16] As these staff officers and their GOSC principals came and went, few stayed long enough to master the system and make it work effectively.

The GOSC met again in Washington in January, 1986, after COL Bullard had been in command for five months.[17] By that time major changes were already underway. The new joint service regulation, AR 350-20, was being staffed, and DLI was preparing to shift to a new system for scheduling and determining training requirements, the TRADOC Structure and Manning Decision Review (SMDR) process. They endorsed several of the school's recent initiatives, including plans to close the San Francisco Branch and the Russian total immersion house, and to implement team teaching. They further directed DLIFLC to conduct a seven-hour day experiment as a way to increase student proficiency.

Close supervision by the GOSC was supplemented by frequent contacts from individual user agencies during the year. COL Bullard later said that he "was caught off guard many times" when a complaint from within the school reached one of the GOSC action officers before he had a chance to deal with it.[18]

By the time the GOSC met again at TRADOC headquarters in Fort Monroe, Virginia, in October, 1986, DLI was able to present a well-developed agenda of reform proposals. COL Bullard proudly announced that, "DLI is now in charge of its own destiny."[19] Some issues touched on the role of DLI within the DFLP, such as the Nonresident Training Program and the Linguist Proponency Office, but others were more strictly internal to the school, such as the New Personnel System, the implementation of the new graduation standard and the splitting of the Russian School.

The need for foreign language capabilities for national security and the specific requirements of the Department of Defense were thus filtered

through a complex management structure to provide for the training of military linguists. The DFLP never lived up to its initial promise of integrating all DoD foreign language training, but it was a workable system. The challenges of achieving harmony among a multiplicity of agencies within the Defense Department nevertheless remained considerable.

1. *New York Times* (April 11, 1986); *Time* Magazine (April 21, 1986).
2. Paul Simon, "The U.S. Crisis in Foreign Language," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 449 (May 1980), 31-44.
3. *Strength Through Wisdom: A Critique of U.S. Capability*, A Report to the President from the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies (November 1979); Paul Simon, *The Tongue-Tied American: Confronting the Foreign Language Crisis* (New York: Continuum, 1980); U.S. Department of Education, *What Works: Research About Teaching and Learning* (Washington, DC: GPO, 1986), 57.
4. *A Nation at Risk*, 23.
5. An overview of the shift from the disarray of the 1970's to the new initiatives of the early 1980's in the U.S. intelligence community can be found in Roy Godson, "Special Supplement: U.S. Intelligence Policy," in *American Defense Annual 1986-1987*, ed. by Joseph Kruzel (Lexington, MA: Lexington, 1986), 191-207. See also Kurt E. Mueller, *Language Competence: Implications for National Security* (New York: Praeger, 1986).
6. Defense Language Institute, *Resident Foreign Language Training Annual Statistical Report Fiscal Year 1986, 41*. A thorough and up-to-date overview of military intelligence agencies in the mid-1980's is J. Thompson Strong, "The Defense Intelligence Community," in *The Military Intelligence Community*, ed. by Gerald W. Hopple and Bruce W. Watson (Boulder, Col.: Westview Press, 1986), 15-36. For a more general introduction, see William V. Kennedy, "The U.S. Intelligence Machine," in Ray Bonds, ed., *The Modern U. S. War Machine* (New York: Crown, 1987), 42-51.
7. Defense Language Institute, *Resident Foreign Language Training Annual Statistical Report Fiscal Year 1986, 6*.
8. Letter, COL Bullard to Commander, TRADOC, Subject: Commander's Annual Assessment, 30 January 1986, 6. The same study was cited slightly differently in *A Strategy for Excellence* (May 1986), para. 6e. See also the four information papers on service linguist retention efforts included in the GOSC Briefing Book, 26 March 1987.
9. Department of Defense Directive 5160.41, Defense Language Program (DLP), August 2, 1977. This was reprinted as Appendix A to AR 350-20, 15 July 1978, and Appendix B to AR 350-20, 15 March 1987. A draft revision was presented to the GOSC on March 26, 1987.
10. AR 350-20, Management of the Defense Language Program, 15 March 1987, para. 1-8. This joint service regulation, although not published until early 1987, described the functional relationships as they existed in 1986. It superseded the previous edition of 15 July 1978.
11. AR 350-20, 15 March 1987, para. 1-5c(5).
12. Interview with COL Monte R. Bullard, 14 September 1987, 18, 23.
13. AR 350-20, Chapter 1, Section II. This mission statement is taken verbatim from the GOSC charter, approved 30 January 1981. See also Information Paper, DAMO-TRO,

Subject: Defense Foreign Language Program (DFLP) General Officer Steering Committee (GOSC) Charter, 12 January 1988, included in briefing book for GOSC meeting, 28 January 1988.

14. Memorandum, ATFL-D, Subject: Defense Foreign Language Program General Officer Steering Committee (GOSC) Summary Report for 25 September 1985, 10 October 1985.

15. Interview with COL Monte R. Bullard, 14 September 1987, 10.

16. Interview with COL Monte R. Bullard, 14 September 1987, 7.

17. Memorandum, Subject: Defense Foreign Language Program GOSC Minutes 30 Jan 86.

18. Interview with COL Monte R. Bullard, 14 September 1987, 16-17.

19. Memorandum, Defense Foreign Language Program (DFLP) GOSC 20 October 1986 Summary Report; DLIFLC *Globe* (24 October 1986).

Chapter Two

Managing Foreign Language Education

New Initiatives: A Strategy for Excellence

When COL David A. McNerney retired in August, 1985, after four years as commandant, DLI was in the midst of rapid change.[1] The General Officer Steering Committee, formed in 1981, was designed to provide DoD-wide management of the DFLP and to act as a forum for resolving many of the policy issues that had plagued it in years past. The traditional three language groups had split into six, and a new academic dean had been brought in. The most extensive building program in the history of the school was underway. But most important of all, the services were sending students for foreign language training in ever-increasing numbers. As a result of the Sandinista revolution in Nicaragua and the civil war in El Salvador, for example, the number of students sent for training in basic Spanish tripled between FY 1979 and FY 1986.

COL Monte R. Bullard, his replacement, was an ROTC graduate of the University of Michigan who entered the Army in the late 1950's as a military intelligence lieutenant. Although he was the first non-West Point graduate named to DLI as commandant since the 1950's, he had taught both Chinese and political science there. He was tracked early on as a HUMINT specialist and commanded an interrogation company in South Korea. He studied Chinese at DLI in the early 1960's and earned his master's degree in Asian Studies at the University of Hawaii. He followed this with a stint as professor of military science at the ROTC detachment at the University of California at Berkeley, where Joseph Stilwell had started his Chinese language training half a century before. While at Berkeley he wrote a dissertation on the Chinese People's Liberation Army.[2] In 1980 he went to Beijing as the first U.S. Army attache to the People's Republic of China. In 1982 he moved to the British outpost in Hong Kong, where he served for three more years as U.S. Army Liaison Officer.[3]

The soft-spoken, red-haired soldier had studied hard for his role as commandant. He was familiar with the school and, more importantly, came with a vision to overhaul the way DoD trained and managed its precious linguist assets. He saw DLI as playing a key role in reforming the state of military linguists within DoD. Foremost on his agenda was a firm resolve to change faculty working conditions. He was determined to free them from the civil service system, to encourage their professional development, and to build them into effective teaching teams. The text for his vision was the management best-seller, *In Search of Excellence,* which emphasized the importance of an organization's "culture," or its shared values. The slogan for this cultural revolution he borrowed from the academic dean, that of transforming DLI from a training institution into an educational institution of recognized national stature.

In his first months in command, COL Bullard forcefully articulated this vision. He was deliberately revolutionary, based on his perception that DLI was somehow stuck in a rut, and only a deep-reaching "cultural revolution" could turn it around. He based this on a wide-ranging critique of the entire institutional climate of the school. He publicly criticized "teaching outdated courses, not keeping up with the times and poor faculty morale which 'rubs off' on the quality of the instruction." A few months later he described how "with the rapid growth of its training load, DLI has evolved into a bureaucratic, process-oriented operation, more like a factory than an academic institute. This system has undermined teacher morale, led to mediocrity and a lowered sense of pride in our products. . . . We're not even a *good* factory."[4]

COL Bullard joined with the academic dean, Dr. Ray T. Clifford, in proposing radical changes in the civilian personnel system. Clifford had already been at work on changing the faculty's status. Within weeks of Bullard's arrival he told the GOSC that he intended to develop a "Demonstration Project" as permitted under civil service regulations. His goal was to make career patterns for the instructors similar to those of college and university faculty. This would require exempting the instructors from the civil service system. During the fall and winter months of 1985-86 a task force of personnel specialists and administrators developed a complex legislative package. The transition workshop held in early November, 1985, focussed on this new plan. Faculty suggestions were solicited, and dozens were received, but these tended to confirm to the original designers of the initiative that they were on the right track. The proposal was formally submitted in April.[5] In June of 1986 Air Force Col. Robert M. DePhilippis arrived on board as a special assistant to the commandant and was given charge of shepherding the proposal through to final approval.[6]

Linked with the demonstration project proposal was the team teaching concept, an idea the dean had also been considering. DLI had long been hampered by a fixed staffing ratio of 1.43 instructors to each section of ten students. COL Bullard and Dr. Clifford envisioned a new type of learning environment in which the instructors would develop a closer sense of personal responsibility for their students. Rather than being what someone once called the "world's largest pool of substitute foreign language teachers," the classrooms could tap into the natural energy and initiative of the teachers and students through bonding experiences. The result would be more effective learning. This was fleshed out in a lengthy concept paper sent to TRADOC in December 1985.[7] Team teaching came with an unknown pricetag. The ideal situation was programmed to be a ratio of 6 instructors to every three sections (2:1). This meant that nearly 40 percent more instructors would be required to teach the same number of students, costing about $9 million more per year in civilian pay alone.

COL Bullard also moved quickly to win DLI a wider role within the DFLP. He condemned the poor management of linguists within the Department of Defense and urged that DLI be given official proponency for all military linguists. He established a task force on this issue in December 1985. He

also launched a series of ambitious initiatives: a revision of AR 350-20, a Board of Visitors, a call for a broader research agenda and a reinvigorated approach to command language programs and nonresident training. These were outlined in his first "Commander's Annual Assessment" in January, 1986.

This momentum for deep-reaching reform culminated in the spring of 1986 in a new master plan. He called for "a strategy for excellence, a strategy to *professionalize* the Institute," taking the slogan from *In Search of Excellence* and the "Army of Excellence," the Army's official "theme" two years before (1983).[8] For several years DLI had been required by TRADOC to use five-year plans for planning, programming and budgeting purposes. A five-year plan for FY 1986-90 had been published on 25 January 1984 that reflected COL McNerney's priorities for the school, including the growth in student loads and new construction. Even COL Bullard's first five-year plan (FY 1988-92), published in early 1986 showed few signs of his new vision. Team Teaching and the Demonstration Project were mentioned, but no cost estimates were given. This format did not lend itself to COL Bullard's comprehensive approach to the problems. He chose instead to develop an entirely new management document that was both biting critique and imaginative proposal. He titled the thirteen-page plan "A Strategy for Excellence," and it was published with appendices to dispel any doubts that his visions might not be practical. This was the most original and comprehensive look at the problems of foreign language training within the Department of Defense in several years.

The plan began with a clear statement of the school's fourfold mission: resident training, command language programs, research and testing. This was supported by a concise statement of the school's "central philosophy or doctrine for the teaching of foreign languages" (para. 4). The eight points of doctrine highlighted the uniqueness of foreign language training as distinct from other kinds of military tasks such as "marksmanship, vehicle maintenance or other such psychomotor skills" (para. 4a).

The most radical portion of the masterplan was a biting critique of the status quo throughout the Defense Department. DLI, he wrote, was failing "to produce a sufficient percentage of graduates at level 2 proficiency" (p. 3). The services were not sending sufficiently-qualified students. The services were "failing to create an attractive career environment" for linguists (p. 6). The nonresident programs were out of control. Poor incentives for students and faculty, student load turbulence, out-of-date courses, and low staffing ratios all were crippling resident instruction.

He proposed an eight-point strategy to tackle these problems. First place went to "elevat[ing] the professional competency and motivation of teachers" (p. 13). Other objectives addressed graduation standards, student load fluctuations, research, nonresident training, other-than-basic resident training, testing and establishing "a systematic approach to training" (p. 13). By breaking away from conventional approaches to managing the foreign language program COL Bullard challenged the managers at TRADOC, DA, and other DoD agencies to look at the DFLP as an entire system. It took

courage and imagination to take such a broad perspective. It would take hard resources and skillful administration to bring solutions. The story of COL Bullard's leadership of DLI can be told as the story of his persistent efforts to implement this vision.

The DLI Management Structure

The DLI management structure in the mid-1980's may have appeared unusually complex, but it was well suited to the nature of the school. Its structure was directly descended from the Army Language School of the 1950's and 1960's, as modified by two key reorganizations: its merger with the DLI headquarters in 1974-75 and its modification in 1983-84 to conform to TRADOC's "School Model 83." It retained a staff-line organization of six (formerly three) language groups and a large number of supporting activities, under the overall direction of an Army colonel as commandant, an Air Force colonel as assistant commandant, a Navy commander as executive officer, and a civilian academic dean (GS-15).[9]

As symbolized by the two colonels, it was a joint service school, not just in its student body, but in its staffing. However, it was administered as an Army operation in such mundane things as administrative regulations and procedures, property accountability, and budget and fiscal procedures. Unlike most Army organizations however, it did not have a simple chain of command and limited span of control. Furthermore, many of the activities were composed entirely of civilians or had civilian directors with military assistants.

At the beginning of 1986 the command group consisted of COL Monte R. Bullard, Col. Clarence G.Lunt and Dr. Ray T. Clifford. The authority that COL Bullard inherited as commandant appeared extensive. According to DLIFLC Memorandum 10-1, the commandant "directs operation of the school," "exercises command and general supervision over all elements assigned or attached to" the school and "effects coordination" inside and outside the school.[10] The same regulation also specified that he commanded the "Army element," which implied broad powers. However, this also implied that his authority over the other services was not as extensive.

Like a university president, the commandant clearly saw his role as someone who had to project a vision and set the values of the school. He was noticeably less active than his predecessor in managing the day-to-day operations of the school, but he greatly expanded his role in articulating the mission and planning the future of the school.

Assistant Commandant Col. Lunt had a similarly broad charter, to "assist . . . the commandant in planning, directing and supervising the assigned mission."[11] The unusual arrangement of having an assistant with the same rank as the commander is partially explained by his sole specified responsibility, to command the permanent party Air Force personnel. Col. Lunt, a graduate of Brigham Young University like Dr. Clifford, had been a helicopter pilot with combat experience in Southeast Asia. He had returned to Brigham Young at mid-career to earn a masters degree in Spanish

literature and then taught Spanish at the Air Force Academy for four years. Before coming to DLI in 1983 he had served as Director of Programming and Policy for the Military Airlift Command. He had been COL McNerney's assistant commandant since June 1983 and provided valuable continuity and support to COL Bullard during his first months in command before his retirement in May, 1986. The new Assistant Commandant was Col. Jack Martines, who was an Air Force Academy graduate, had a masters degree in Latin American Studies, had taught Spanish at the Air Force Academy and had served as an exchange officer at the Spanish Air Force Academy. This was his first assignment to DLI. He came from the Organization of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Clifford had come to DLI as dean in 1981. TRADOC had abolished the previous senior civilian position of Academic Advisor in 1976. The German linguist had earned his BA and MA from Brigham Young University. He had taught for many years and served as chairman of the Slavic and Germanic Language Departments at the CIA Language School. He earned his doctorate at the University of Minnesota in 1977 before being selected at the age of 37 to come to DLI as dean with responsibilities for the academic side of school operations. This implied broad responsibility, and the dean considered himself "ultimately responsible for the quality, quantity and cost effectiveness of foreign language training at the DLIFLC and Department of Defense world-wide."[12]

He was an ideas man, with many theoretical articles on foreign language acquisition to his credit. He acted as an enthusiastic salesman for ways to improve the teaching process. Early in his tenure he designed a flexible approach to foreign language teaching he called "Progressive Skills Integration"(PSI).[13]

Clifford had two major directorates reporting to him in addition to the six language schools: the Assistant Dean for Instruction and the Assistant Dean for Evaluation and Standardization (ADES). Each of these controlled several diverse branches. Dr. Vu Tam Ich had replaced Pierre DeLespinois as Assistant Dean for Instruction in 1985. This position had once been the key academic post within the school, but when the new position of dean was established, control of the language groups had passed to Clifford instead. His reduced duties were to "function . . . as the operational and administrative arm of the dean."[14] Ich and his military assistant, Lt. Col. Horst Marschall, oversaw six divisions: curriculum, faculty and staff development, resident training and program management, new systems training and world religions and cultures.

While each division operated independently, the Resident Training and Program Management Division was the hub of school operations. Training at DLI involved a complex system of scheduling, planning, maintaining statistics and student records and controlling the academic facilities.[15] During 1986 Ich also picked up some additional activities, the Learning Resources Division (Academic Library), the Publications Division and the Research Division, while Resident Training and Program Management split into two separate divisions.

The position of Assistant Dean for Evaluation and Standardization was filled in 1986 when Dr. John L. D. Clark was hired, bringing over twenty years of experience in foreign language research and testing with the Educational Testing Service, ERIC Clearing House on Languages and Linguistics, and the Center for Applied Linguistics. This was a small directorate with two basic missions: to conduct extensive language testing, and to conduct research and evaluation.

Clifford was aided by former Academic Advisor Dr. Joseph C. Hutchinson. Hutchinson had been active in foreign language education programs for over thirty years in universities, the federal government and professional associations. He had joined DLI in 1964 as a special assistant to the director for educational technology. As Assistant Dean for Policy and Liaison, for example, he chaired the annual conference of the Bureau for International Language Coordination (BILC) which met in Monterey in June, 1986. He was also active in other professional and academic matters, such as laying the groundwork for a new academic journal, organizing a distinguished board of visitors for the school, and preparing the annual report to the accreditation commission. Hutchinson's unusual position, which was not to be found in TRADOC School Model 83, was established in 1985 as a result of a federal court order. He had filed suit against the school in federal court after 1981 as a result of the selection process for the position of dean. This newly-created position enabled him to continue to play an important role in the school.

Clifford managed resident instruction through six language school directors. These directors were expected to run their own schools, freed of much of the burden of administration. Each was responsible for more than a hundred instructors and several hundred students each year.

The military services had more extensive responsibilities for their students than most civilian educational institutions. Routine personnel actions had to be taken, the students housed, fed, paid, promoted, disciplined, given military and physical readiness training, and otherwise cared for. These functions were performed by four separate headquarters. The Army soldiers, the largest group, belonged to Troop Command, under a lieutenant colonel who reported directly to the commandant. The Air Force students belonged to the 3483rd Student Squadron of the Air Training Command, commanded by a major. The Air Force chain of command ran to the assistant commandant, who commanded all airmen on post. Navy students belonged to the Naval Security Group Detachment, commanded by a lieutenant commander. The administrative burden of this detachment was less than for the other services due to the proximity of the Naval Postgraduate School, which performed these services. The commander of the Navy element was the school executive officer. Marine students were controlled by a Marine Corps Administrative Detachment, commanded by a major. The MCAD also performed routine administrative actions for over one hundred Marine officers at the Naval Postgraduate School.[16]

The wide range of support activities that fell under neither the dean nor the troop commanders were generally placed under the executive officer and school secretary. The executive officer position was designed to work as a

chief of staff and exercise direct supervision over resource management, information management and logistics. Navy Commander Karen Hill had been the executive officer since 1983. In May, 1986 CDR Sidney D. Thornton arrived to replace her. She brought to DLI 19 years of experience in personnel and administration. With a BA in Spanish literature she had been one of the early Peace Corps volunteers, working for over two years in Bolivia in the mid-1960's before joining the Navy. The position was intended to fill a dual role. These officers commanded all Navy permanent party personnel.[17] In a less formal sense these two women also filled the important role of senior female officer in a school with about one-third female students, especially after LTC Betty J. Harris left Troop Command in May, 1986.

The executive officer was assisted in supervising the support functions of the school by the school secretary, Air Force Lt. Col. Jean M. Lesieutre, who had held that position since 1981. When he retired in May, 1986, he was replaced by Lt. Col. Edward M. Wyraz, Jr., who brought to DLI over 20 years of experience in the Strategic Air Command and a masters degree in business administration. He came to DLI from Greenham Common, England, where for four years he had been a key player in the controversial deployment of ground launched cruise missiles to NATO.

The school secretary acted as the director of support for the whole school through six diverse divisions: administrative support, security, printing, logistics, learning resources and the instructional media center. Many of these required close coordination with Fort Ord. They necessarily involved matters of high cost, such as new construction, logistics, and printing, and special requirements, such as mail control, personnel security and property accountability. Some of these activities were also involved in Commercial Activity Reviews or reorganizations.

The school organizational chart represented a balance between centralized control and loose autonomy. Several individuals and offices were autonomous and reported directly to the command group. Three external branches or offices did so: the Lackland Branch, the Presidio of San Francisco Branch, and the Washington Liaison Office. So did the Civilian Personnel Office, which maintains a vitally important function in a school with hundreds of civilian instructors. Also autonomous were the special staff: an inspector general, a public affairs office, a small protocol office, an equal employment opportunity office, and a Reserve Forces Advisor/Linguist Proponency Office.

COL Bullard did not undertake any major overhaul of this management structure, but changes occurred during the year due to changing personalities and functions. In July the Commandant brought in Air Force Col. Robert M. DePhilippis as his special assistant to help him implement his ambitious plans. Col. DePhilippis came from the Leadership and Management Development Center at Maxwell Air Force Base, where he was one of the Air Force's top management experts. The commandant put him to work leading "Towards Excellence" seminars and guiding the Demonstration Project proposal for a new personnel system.[18]

The only other major change to DLI's management structure took place at the beginning of FY 1987, when the 0387 TDA took effect. The dean took the title of provost, the school directors became deans, and the FLTA's became assistant deans. At the same time Dr. Clark established a separate research division within ADES.

The school's management structure remained stable but complex in 1986, reflecting the nature of the mission. Many normal functions for any military organization remained outside the direct control of the commandant, such as facilities engineers, construction, many personnel matters, and morale, welfare, and recreation activities. These complexities reflected the reality of the school as a joint service school, a tenant activity on a FORSCOM installation, and a military school with a predominantly civilian staff. It retained a potential for excellence, but only with careful orchestration.

Branches and Offices Beyond Monterey

When DLI Headquarters moved from Washington to Monterey in 1974, the Army's intent was to consolidate all foreign language training at a single facility. Only a small office was left behind in Washington to support the several hundred students enrolled each year in the Foreign Service Institute and commercial language schools in the Washington, DC, area. However, as foreign language training requirements climbed in the late 1970's, the facilities in Monterey approached capacity. A comprehensive facilities expansion program was launched by 1983, but DLI had already been forced to look elsewhere for classrooms and student housing. For the first time since the end of the Vietnam War, DLI opened two satellite branches, in 1981 at Lackland Air Force Base for Air Force students and then in 1982 at the Presidio of San Francisco for Army students. These satellite training locations added a further challenge to the management of the Defense Foreign Language Program.

From a small office in Arlington, Virginia, across the Potomac from Washington, LTC Kenneth C. Keating and his staff of four monitored some four hundred students each year who took foreign language training in the National Capital Region. By a long-standing arrangement, all military personnel in training for the Defense Attache System attended classes at the State Department's Foreign Service Institute (FSI). LTC Keating himself was a Foreign Area Officer with advanced Russian training. He came to DLI's Washington Liaison Office after three years with the Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA), which had boosted the number of its students by over forty percent from FY 1984 to FY 1986.[19]

Other students came to Washington for training in languages that were not taught at DLI, such as Afrikaans, Hindi, Swahili and Urdu. Others were trained there to save on PCS costs or for other reasons. During FY 1986 the Washington Liaison Office managed 414 servicemembers and 120 spouses who began training during the year. For this DLI paid contract costs of $695,000 to four commercial language schools and $1,115,000 to FSI.

The office picked up many other DLI responsibilities in the Washington area. They established a German Gateway course in 1986 for Army battalion and brigade-level command selectees who were already in the Washington area. They routinely administered the DLPT's to all students at the end of their training. They represented DLI on the Interagency Language Roundtable and at the monthly DFLP Action Officers meetings. With its AUTOVON line, telefax and a sedan, the DLI Washington Liaison performed a vital service.

Another critical mission they supervised was technical control over language aspects of the Washington-Moscow Direct Communications Linkage (MOLINK). Two experienced Russian translators, Vladimir Talmy and Stephen Soudakoff, conducted the "DLIFLC MOLINK Training and Certification Program" for the Presidential translators who operated the Washington end of the famous "Hotline." This mission was expanded in 1986 when they picked up the additional mission of training all White House presidential translators.

When projections for Russian training began to climb in the late 1970's, DLI's leaders began to look for ways to handle the increased load. In 1980 the Air Force offered to make some facilities available at its English Language Center at Lackland Air Force Base, Texas. The commandant sent his Director of Support, Maj. Ellis R. Evans, USAF, to set up a satellite branch for Air Force enlisted students who were coming out of basic training there.[20]

For five years the Lackland Operating Detachment taught up to 600 airmen per year the Russian Basic Course. Evans was promoted to lieutenant colonel and remained as assistant commandant until the branch finally closed its doors early in 1987. It remained throughout essentially an Air Force activity, although it was included in DLI's budget and property book. The students received the same instruction as the students in Monterey. In fact many of the Russian faculty transferred down from Monterey.

DLI had made plans to close the branch by 1985 as new facilities were completed in Monterey, but as construction delays occurred it continued to operate at reduced capacity. Air Force requirements for Russian slid from a high of 617 (actual) in FY 1981 to a projected low of 403 in FY 1986. Of these, only 227 translated into actual student inputs, and only 103 of these went to Lackland. In September, 1985, the GOSC approved the closing of the branch by the end of the following year.[21]

When the chairman transferred back to Monterey in 1985 the department was left in the hands of four supervisory instructors (GS-11). In all about fifty instructors transferred back to Monterey, nineteen in FY 1986 alone. By the time the last class graduated in December, 1986, and Reduction-in-Force (RIF) procedures were implemented, DLI was able to find positions in Monterey for all remaining permanent instructors. When the branch closed its doors in February, 1987, and shipped its records and equipment back to Monterey, it brought to an end a successful six-year experiment. Over 2,400 Russian linguists had been trained there for the Air Force. Its limited scope, small size and single-service character more than made up for the drawbacks

of operating a satellite branch at a location far removed from the Presidio of Monterey.

The Lackland experiment was so successful that a second satellite branch was established in 1982 for Army enlisted students at the Presidio of San Francisco, where a former Public Health Service Hospital provided nearly ideal facilities for a small branch.[22] Classrooms, administrative offices, housing and messing were all conveniently located in the same building. Here single Army enlisted students (E-6 and below) took one of three languages: Spanish, German or Korean. In FY 1984 the student input was 388, in FY 1985, 635, and in FY 1986, 456.

Under LTC William S. Devine the branch continued its training mission during 1986. In many ways he was able to provide a more intense, closely supervised learning environment for the young soldiers than was possible at Monterey. The multicultural urban setting was an added plus. Nevertheless the branch was living on borrowed time as construction proceeded in Monterey. In September, 1985, the GOSC directed DLI to close the branch by the end of FY 1988.[23]

Managing Nonresident Training

The mission of nonresident training was not very visible in Monterey, but highly visible to the user agencies. The original concept for a DoD-wide language agency included bringing under central control the dozens of command language programs throughout the Defense Department. The problems were enormous, but DLI was initially charged to exercise "technical control" over these diverse programs. The user agencies had continued to acknowledge the need for foreign language training outside the schoolhouse, including additional training for recent graduates, refresher and maintenance training for in-service linguists, as well as a variety of introductory courses for non-linguists. The difficulties in meeting this mission were compounded by the fact that many linguists in the field were not even at Level 2. Worst of all, "the DLI organization charged with these functions has never enjoyed the command interest, staff, or budget to carry out its mission. As a consequence, it has become essentially a bookstore, taking orders for DLI materials and forwarding the orders to the textbook warehouse for shipment."[24]

The Nonresident Training Division was one of five major divisions under the Assistant Dean for Instruction, charged with the broad mission of exercising technical control over command language programs called for in AR 350-20.[25] This included course development, providing assistance to field commanders, and providing language training materials. The warehouse held a wide range of training materials that had been developed over the years, much of which had been reprinted for over a decade with no attempt to update and revise. Headstart materials were available for thirteeen languages and Gateway in two, German and Korean. Other types included FLAMRIC, PDPEC, Special Forces Courses, Short Courses, Basic Courses and maintenance/refresher materials. The budget for printing materials at

the Defense Audio-Visual Agency had declined from $780,000 in FY 1984 to $225,000 in FY 1986. A dozen staff members struggled to keep up with requests from the field. Travel for on-site assistance, evaluation or supervision was rare.

In early 1986 the Nonresident Training Division encountered an unprecedented series of challenges that severely affected their ability to handle their mission. When the new commandant directed in early 1986 that all course developers return to their departments, all nonresident course development was halted, except for PDPEC's in one or two languages. At the same time a series of more mundane challenges cut into the operating efficiency of the division. The staff moved into a leased former elementary school, the Lighthouse School, in Pacific Grove in January, and regular telephone service was not installed for several months. Next, the stock of materials was transferred to another leased facility off post, the Hilltop School. When it was discovered that the structure was not sturdy enough to hold the estimated 1.4 million lbs. of materials, it was distributed throughout the building, and some was even temporarily stored under tarpaulins outside. During this move, inventory control broke down and shipments to the field were interrupted for several months. Problems were compounded by a rapid turnover in junior personnel at the GS-3/GS-5 level. In May the chief, Hank Marschik, retired.[26]

The new commandant was just at this time making a bid to increase DLI's role within the DFLP. In January he called for DLI to become the proponent agency for military linguists in all the services. "By assigning DLI the role of a proponent, we can move from a reactive, demand-driven mode of operation to a systems approach for the foreign language program."[27] At the same time Dave Olney became chief of the Nonresident Training Division. As he declared in his first message to the field, "I asked for this job because I wanted to try to help fix the most serious weakness in the Defense Foreign Language Program: the plight of the defense linguist in maintaining and improving his or her proficiency after leaving the Presidio of Monterey." Olney was a former Air Force cryptolinguist who learned Chinese at Yale University. He had joined DLI in 1967 as a Chinese instructor and worked as a course developer. For three years he was also head of the Faculty and Staff Development Division.[28]

Olney moved quickly to develop a plan to "fix" the nonresident program. He pulled together an internal DLI task force that developed a master plan and developed the concept for a new, expanded organization for the Nonresident Training Division that called for expanding it from ten to forty people and becoming a separate directorate. When the GOSC was briefed on the initial plans in October, 1986, they were pleased that DLI was moving to address the many complaints from the field and directed that the master plan be coordinated with the service program managers. By the end of 1986 the Nonresident Training Division had direction and a plan. A Nonresident Training Support Requirement Survey was sent out in December to over 300 units worldwide. Shipments of existing stocks of language training

materials were gradually resumed, but this was an interim measure while the division awaited major changes.

Managing Training Requirements

The ultimate challenge to effective management of DLI in the 1980's was managing training requirements. The Master Plan described the problem in blunt terms:

> There is a high degree of unpredictability regarding student load changes from one year to the next and a high amount of turbulence within the execution year. Some of these fluctuations are driven by rapid shifts in world political conditions which are difficult to predict. However, many of these load swings may also be the result of poor identification of requirements by the Services and the lack of an institutionalized mechanism to smooth out the wide load swings from year to year.[29]

This turbulence was reflected in enrollment figures for the five major languages, which could double in three years or drop by a third (see Figure 1).[30] Smaller languages faced even greater turbulence. The demand for Polish quadrupled from FY 1979 to FY 1983 as a result of widespread unrest in that East Bloc country, then dropped 60% by FY 1986. Chinese dropped from 290 students in FY 1982 to 114 just four years later.

Actual Student Input

	1977	1978	1979	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986
Russian	1087	972	1279	1247	1551	1384	1296	1202	1341	1293
Spanish	352	354	292	288	320	376	431	597	717	814
German	596	492	613	637	575	685	724	627	721	707
Korean	301	369	369	472	473	468	438	434	482	584
Arabic	329	310	270	198	247	369	390	587	590	463

Figure 1

The task of balancing requirements with resources was handled by the Resident Training and Program Management Division. The planning for FY 1986 had begun several years earlier, when the four services drew up their training requirements and submitted them to DLI late in 1984. The Training Operations Branch published the FY 1986 Master Schedule on 14 December 1984, based on a programmed input of 5,802 students.[31]

This was not the end of the process. Between the publication of the master schedule and the actual start date of each class, a constant barrage of adjustments was made. When confirmations were received from the services one month prior to each class start date, 5,113 students were expected, but even these figures were only approximate. The actual student input for the year was 4,909, or 85% of programmed load.[32]

These fluctuations played havoc with the planning system at DLI. As the Master Plan described it:

> DLI interfaces directly with the Service elements projecting quota requirements and has become accustomed to continually adjusting to changes in requirements. Frequently, language departments do not know how many students they will have until the day the input arrives. DLI has more or less become a "demand driven" school and does not generally reject requirements. This manner of doing business creates a serious management and resourcing problem because teaching assets cannot be rapidly shifted from one language department to another to accomodate load swings. While the formula allocates in the aggregate what DLI is supposed to get, it provides no resource buffer when, for example, DLI shrinks the Chinese Department and builds up Korean and German.[33]

During FY 1986 Spanish and French enrollments exceeded programmed loads by 13% and 19% respectively, while others fell far short: German by 23%, Czech by 48% and Polish by 38%. Each service was different as well. The Air Force cut back its programmed input by 40% in the first four months of FY 1987. Added to these uncertainties were the problems of automation support. The Army Training Requirements and Resources System (ATRRS) was not problem-free, and at one point was down for 14 consecutive days. Planning also continued throughout 1986 for future years. A TRADOC Manpower Survey Team, for example, visited DLI in April to determine manpower authorizations for FY 1988 based on the programmed student load.[34]

The new commandant was determined to bring this whole process under control. In the Master Plan he spelled out a strategy to "place tighter controls on the quota allocation process and establish finite limits on student inputs by language." This strategy had two parts. The first was to integrate DLI into the Army's Structure and Manning Decision Review (SMDR) process. The services had already submitted their FY 1987 requirements in August, 1985, and the master schedule was published by early 1986. The DA DCSPER staff had briefed DLI on this in December, 1985. When the services submitted their FY 1988 requirements to DLI in April, 1986, these were entered into the new ATTRS computer system. In May an SMDR meeting was held at DLI for FY 1989 requirements and to review FY 1988. This new scheduling process however was of little help for FY 1986 and FY 1987.[35]

The second half of the strategy was to get approval for a system to better match resources to load. The Program Management Branch developed new computer software in late 1985 to automate the process of balancing projected student load and instructor requirements by language. Resource Management developed a proposal by March based on setting a change limit of 10% up or down. This was briefed to the TRADOC TRAMEA in March and the service program managers at the SMDR in May. This plan was a partial success. For example, the Army tried to get some new requirements approved, but when it could not resource its requests, the SMDR rejected them. By September the system gave signs of working for Chinese and

Korean, but programmed requirements in Russian for FY 1988 and FY 1989 promised to exceed the 10% upper limit.[36]

The managing of training requirements thus remained a major challenge to the school. These student load fluctuations had an impact throughout the school. When COL Bullard looked back on the problem at the end of his time as commandant, he was able to say, "I don't think we'll ever beat it, but we really have gone a long way on getting that one resolved."[37] He saw the ultimate solution as setting a fixed capacity for the school that the services would have to accommodate. But during 1986 DLI continued to operate under an inefficient system while slowly transitioning to a new one.

1. Letter, COL David A. McNerney to Commander, TRADOC [August, 1985].
2. Monte R. Bullard, *China's Political-Military Evolution: The Party and the Military in the PRC* (Boulder, CO: Westview, 1985).
3. *Defense Language Institute Command & Staff Biographies* (March 1987); Interview with COL Bullard, 14 September 1987.
4. *Globe* (22 October 1985), 3; Letter, COL Bullard to Commander, TRADOC, Subject: Commander's Annual Assessment, 30 January 1986.
5. Letter, Dr. Ray T. Clifford to COL Monte R. Bullard, 5 June 1985; Minutes of Senior Management Planning Seminar, 8 November 1985; Letter, COL Bullard to Commander, TRADOC, Subject: Proposal for a Change to the Current Civil Service System, 7 April 1986.
6. Interview with Col. Robert M. DePhilippis, 24 February 1988; "New Personnel System: Special Assistant Seeks Improvements," *Globe* (August 1, 1986), 1.
7. Letter, DLIFLC, ATFL-RM, Subject: Defense Language Institute (DLI) Team Teaching Concept, 13 Dec 85.
8. *A Strategy for Excellence* (May 1986), v.
9. DLIFLC Memorandum 10-1, 1 December 1984.
10. DLIFLC Memorandum 10-1, 3-2a.
11. DLIFLC Memorandum 10-1, para. 3-26. Biographical details provided by the DLIFLC Public Affairs Office and the *Defense Language Institute Command & Staff Biographies* (March 1987).
12. DLIFLC Memorandum 10-1, 1 December 1984, para. 11-2.
13. DLIFLC Pamphlet 350-10, "Academic Policy and Standards," 1 October 1982.
14. DLIFLC Memorandum 10-1, 1 December 1984, para. 13-3c.
15. DLIFLC Memorandum 10-1, 1 December 1984, para. 13-4.
16. DLIFLC Memorandum 10-1, 1 December 1984, Chapter 15.
17. DLIFLC Memorandum 10-1, 1 December 1984, para. 3-2c.
18. Robert DePhilippis, "Organizational Dynamics: A View From the Outside Looking In," *Globe* (12 December 1986), 8.
19. DLIFLC Memo 10-1, 1 Dec 84, Chapter 5; DLIFLC, *Fiscal Year 1986 Cost Review*, 23 Apr 87; DLI-LNO, *Student Handbook for the Washington, D.C. Area*, 1 January 1987; DLI-LNO, 1986 Annual Historical Summary; *Defense Language Institute Command & Staff Biographies* (March 1987)
20. DLIFLC Memorandum 10-1, 1 December 1984, Chapter 9; telephone interview with Lt.Col. Ellis R. Evans, 12 November 1987; Civilian Personnel Office 1986 Annual Historical Summary.

21. Memorandum, ATFL-D, Defense Foreign Language Program General Officer Steering Committee (GOSC) Summary Report for 25 September 1985, 10 Oct 85.
22. DLIFLC Memo 10-1, 1 December 1984, Chapter 10; interview with LTC John S. Williamson, Commander, San Francisco Branch, 1 October 1987.
23. Memorandum, ATFL-D, Defense Foreign Language Program General Officer Steering Committee (GOSC) Summary Report for 25 September 1985, 10 October 1985.
24. DLI Master Plan, Part II, Nonresident Program (March 1987), 2.
25. DLIFLC Memorandum 10-1, 1 December 1984, para. 13-8; Nonresident Training Division 1986 Annual Historical Summary.
26. DLIFLC Nonresident Training Division, *Command Language Program Newsletter* (October 1986), 2; "Textbook Warehouse Undergoes Massive Move," *Globe* (8 November 1985), 3.
27. Letter, ATFL-CMT, to Commander, TRADOC, Subject: Commander's Annual Assessment, 30 January 1986, 6.
28. *Command Language Program Newsletter* (October 1986), 3; *Defense Language Institute Command and Staff Biographies* (March 1987).
29. *A Strategy for Excellence* (May 1986), para. 6h.
30. Figures taken from DLI *Resident Foreign Language Training Annual Statistical Reports*, FY 1977 through FY 1986. Spanish includes Latin American and Castilian, and Arabic includes all dialects.
31. DLIFLC Memorandum 10-1, 1 December 1984, para. 13-4; Resident Training and Program Management Division, 1986 Annual Historical Input.
32. DLIFLC *Annual Statistical Report FY 1986*.
33. *A Strategy for Excellence* (May 1986), para. 6h.
34. CTSRepDLIFLC, Monthly Activity Report (MAR) for April 1986, 12 May 1986.
35. *A Strategy for Excellence* (May 1986), para. 8c.
36. *A Strategy for Excellence* (May 1986), Tab C-2.
37. Interview with COL Bullard, 14 September 1987, 31.

Chapter Three

Foreign Language Teaching

Faculty as Teachers

Teaching is a very personal enterprise, relying heavily upon the dedication and hard work of each individual teacher. It forms the core of any school. At DLI over eight hundred teachers practised their craft each day in hundreds of small classrooms across the school, each classroom a small world of its own. Their days were measured by lessons taught, tests graded, classes prepared, always caught up in the relentless cycle of new classes and graduations. Their year was not 52 weeks long, but 27, or 34, or 47. The talent they brought with them was a native-born ability in a foreign language and the ability to pass it on to others. Each day they spent three or four periods in classrooms, preparing in between for their next classes, making copies, grading tests, never more than an hour or two away from that confrontation with students, the heart of the process. A Czech teacher spoke for many others, saying, "I love teaching. If I didn't, I wouldn't be able to do my job."[1] The teachers were the backbone of the school, equal in numbers to the faculty of a good-sized state university. Everything else that went on in the school in one way supported, or should have supported, what these men and women did each day, day in and day out, throughout the year.

By the mid-1980's there were numerous signs that all was not well with this diverse group of educators. Their daily work was sometimes overshadowed by concerns over their positions and compensation levels, and over the reorganizations and policy changes that seemed to be a constant fact of life. The high cost of living in the Monterey area forced many to work at second jobs to support their families. It was clear to COL Bullard and Dr. Clifford that only by addressing the problems and concerns of the teaching faculty could they influence the action in the foreign language education business.

The teachers at DLI were as diverse as the languages they taught.[2] Each language, large and small, was taught as a result of a requirement identified somewhere in the Department of Defense, testimony to the range of America's post-World War II national security commitments. Five large groups accounted for two-thirds of the faculty: Russian, Arabic, German, Korean and Spanish. Some one hundred sixty Russian instructors and their families represented almost a quarter of the faculty. While Japanese took pride of place as the first language taught at the school, the Russian department had dominated the school ever since its first class graduated in 1947 at the dawning of the Cold War. Some of the older teachers were the children of those who had fled the Bolshevik Revolution and its aftermath. They tended to be aristocratic and spoke a more literary form of the language. Major Nicholas E. Mitchell and Mr. Alexander Albov, the first two heads of the Russian department, were both exiles from the revolution. Later

groups of instructors came in distinct waves: from those who escaped Stalin's purges and the turmoil of World War II, to the Refuseniks and Jewish emigres of the 1970's. Each new group was gradually assimilated into the DLI faculty. As the number of Russian instructors grew, the four departments grew to six. By the year's end a second Russian school was established in a new general instructional facility on the west end of the post.

Another large group was made up of some sixty-five German teachers. Many had graduate degrees and formal training in foreign language education. Coming from a western nation, most found it relatively easier to adjust to life in America, and found it easier to maintain ties with their home. Two dozen more worked at the San Francisco Branch. Sixty Spanish instructors came from diverse backgrounds reflecting the varied nature of their Latin American homelands. They had the unusual advantage of living in a part of the country where their native tongue was spoken by many. They also had a contingent of two dozen in San Francisco, and the instructors at the Presidio split into two departments in January, 1986. Seventy-five instructors taught Arabic, the language that united the world's six hundred million Muslims. They came from a region in painful change and lived in a country with a fundamentally different religious and cultural heritage. They also suffered from the anti-Arab hatred in America of the last two decades which had been heightened during the Iran crisis of 1979-81, similar in some ways to the anti-Japanese hysteria of World War II. In early 1986 they split into three separate departments.

The instructors in the School of Asian Languages made up nearly twenty percent of the faculty. Ten Japanese instructors were the proud descendants of the World War II Military Intelligence Service Language School, who, starting with no textbooks and makeshift classrooms, graduated over 6,000 students in just four years. Thirteen Vietnamese instructors served as reminders of a similar effort in the 1960's when DLI and civilian contract instructors taught over 4,000 students each year at the height of the Vietnam War. Three dozen Chinese instructors taught the ancient language of the world's largest country, and were honored when one of their graduates returned to become commandant in 1985. The largest group of Asian instructors were the sixty Koreans, who taught at DLI as personal representatives of America's closest Asian ally and front-line state. Another two dozen worked at the San Francisco Branch. Over 50,000 Americans had lost their lives defending the fledgling Republic of Korea, and over 40,000 were permanently stationed there thirty years later.

Dozens of other nationalities were represented among the DLI faculty, and within each department could be found an astonishing variety: retired ambassadors, recent PhD's, nobility and musicians, engineers and former military officers. Some had backgrounds in education, but many did not. They shared a desire to create what Hungarian instructor Steve Koppany once called "a feeling of electricity. I even relate a bit of -- impatience -- to the students so that they know they must perform and be prepared for class. The students are kept on their toes."[3]

The school pushed for more professional development for the faculty, making it a cornerstone of the Demonstration Project. Neil Granoien, appointed chief of the Faculty and Staff Development Division in 1985, reported that "working on the assumption that we were developing career teachers rather than short-term subject matter instructors, we set about designing a program of education and training to raise the professional competence of the faculty."[4] DLI worked out a tailored graduate program with the nearby Monterey Institute of International Studies for a masters program in foreign language teaching (MATFL). The first graduate was Bulgarian instructor Kiril Boyadjieff.[5]

DLI competed for teachers with civilian universities, but even more so with the other federal agencies that were looking for native-born language proficiency, such as the Foreign Service Institute, the National Intelligence College, and the CIA. But DLI remained the largest single collection of foreign language teachers in the Free World.

Supplementing the civilian faculty were some eighty experienced NCO's and petty officers who served as Foreign Language Training NCO's and petty officers (FLTN/P's).[6] The idea of bringing career NCO linguists to DLI as instructors was first initiated by the Army Security Agency in 1967 to bring experienced cryptolinguists directly into the language classrooms as teachers, coaches and role models for the young students. Duty at DLI also allowed these senior linguists to take refresher training and use their language skills. In the school they performed a variety of functions, depending upon the requirements and personalities of each department. They were expected to teach ten hours in the classroom each week, but they also helped in grading tests, monitoring study halls, supervising language labs, and tutoring and counselling students. They were in some ways analogous to graduate teaching assistants in university classrooms. Perhaps their greatest contribution was as individuals who had been in the field. They could tell the new students what they would be doing in subsequent training and in their first assignments. They served as role models and coaches in ways that the civilian instructors could not.

However, the FLTN issue remained a controversial one. The civilian faculty sometimes resented the intrusion of their former students. In 1985 the issue came to a head at the Professional Development Program, where questions were raised about their classroom hours, additional duties, office space, and their use as platoon sergeants. Their qualifications were discussed at length. They often were not as fluent as the faculty would have liked, generally having only a Level 2 listening proficiency ("Limited Working Proficiency"). The DLI goal was to use only Level 3 linguists ("General Professional Proficiency"). DLI tried to handle this by requiring refresher training as needed and COL Bullard made it a project to revamp the FLTN/P program in his Master Plan. In May, 1986, he assigned the FLTN's directly to the department chairmen. Despite these controversies and changes the FLTN's remained in the departments and continued to make valuable contributions to language teaching.

The civilian faculty had many things in common as teachers. Foremost was that they all had to fit their professional work into the structure and confines of an Army-run school. In that sense they shared the experience of their young students. This led to more than the usual sense of skepticism of change and professional frustration that teachers everywhere feel. In a broader sense the faculty shared a common experience of being immigrant scholars in America. No matter how well adjusted they might have been, for the most part they remained outsiders who could observe American society perhaps with amusement, but not without added anxiety and stress. They also watched their children grow up to be Americans and leave their homelands behind. In the classroom they shared the distinctive relationship that springs up between a teacher and his or her students, the mix of pride and despair that changes from hour to hour. At DLI this bond was often special, because it was a bond between foreign scholar and young American student. They shared this role of transmitting their native language and culture to young Americans who had a need to learn it. Many were active in the local community and some held second jobs as language teachers or translators at nearby schools.

When COL Bullard came to DLI in August of 1985, Dr. Clifford had already been closely scrutinizing the work of the faculty. They both decried the system that discouraged excellence rather than fostering it. COL Bullard decided to tackle the major issue first, the status of the faculty, and he let it be known that he was going to make the faculty the focus of his leadership.

The Teaching Process

The teaching methods used by the Army Language School in the 1950's were widely acclaimed. When Sputnik galvanized the nation's educational community after 1957, the "Army Method" for foreign language teaching was adopted everywhere as the "Audiolingual Method."[7] Yet by the 1980's the school's pedagogical preeminence had declined. There was no longer the sense of being a pacesetter of educational methods; academic journals in the field of foreign language teaching and linguistics seldom contained articles by DLI faculty members.

The fundamental approach of the school through the years remained remarkably consistent: year-long courses, during which the students studied a single language six hours per day, five days per week, from native speakers. For many students this intensive learning experience was a crucial first encounter with a foreign culture and people, and many who were first exposed to a foreign language at the Army Language School went on to college-level work in language or area studies. Crucial to this was the experience of the classroom, what the teachers actually did, that enabled the students to communicate in another language.

In the 1980's it was difficult to generalize about the actual process of teaching in each of DLI's hundreds of classrooms. The diversity of teaching methods that reigned in the classrooms resulted from the diverse personalities of the instructors, the varieties of their educational

backgrounds, their differing national styles of teaching, and the traces of past experiments in alternate teaching methods. Some user agencies took an active interest in particular methods. In the 1970's the National Security Agency encouraged the adoption of aural comprehension courses that later had to be abandoned. By the mid-1980's the method was generally described as Progressive Skills Integration. Yet even this remained an umbrella concept.[8]

The diversity was in some ways an encouraging sign of strength, for teachers achieve excellence by developing styles of their own. This was acknowledged in the Master Plan:

> There is no single, most efficient method of language teaching. Teachers must be exposed to and have a working knowledge of a wide variety of instructional theories and methods and selectively use techniques appropriate to the learning task or problem. Teachers are encouraged to be innovative and expand on existing methods or develop new approaches to foreign language teaching.[9]

There were also disturbing signs that many teachers fell into a lock-step reliance on often outdated and flawed textbooks and unimaginative rote classroom methods. The school perpetually seemed to be losing the war to keep instructional materials up to date with contemporary developments in the foreign country, and teachers were given little opportunity or incentive to improve the textbooks and supplementary materials. Coherence was lost by random assignment of teaching hours, making DLI sometimes appear a sort of pool of substitute foreign language teachers. COL Bullard reported to TRADOC in early 1986 that "with the rapid growth of its training load, DLI [had] evolved into a bureaucratic, process-oriented operation, more like a factory than an academic institution. This system [had] undermined teacher morale, led to mediocrity and a lowered sense of pride in our products. . . . We're not even a *good* factory!"[10]

In the fall of 1985 COL Bullard and Dr. Clifford had launched an initiative to revitalize the classroom experience for students and teachers alike. Calling it "team teaching," they announced the formation of six-member teams which would be responsible for 30 students (3 sections) to promote student-teacher "bonding." This concept had been under discussion for several years, but COL Bullard decided to push it, knowing that it would require a heavy commitment of new resources by TRADOC. He estimated it would require 70 new instructors per year for four years and ultimately three times as many GS-11 positions as had existed in 1985.[11]

After discussions with faculty, staff, the TRADOC Management Engineering Activity Team and the union, COL Bullard had his staff prepare an information paper to forward to TRADOC. This concept was approved by the GOSC in January, 1986. The TRADOC Evaluation Team agreed to the six-to-three ratio in April and a TRADOC Manpower Survey validated the four-year growth requirements. The plan was then reviewed at the May Structure and Manning Decision Review Meeting in Washington. By the beginning of

the new fiscal year, the Civilian Personnel Office began to bring on board the first of the new instructors.

By the GOSC meeting in April, 1987, the Provost was able to report that Team Teaching had been tried in four departments: Chinese, Czech, Korean (at the San Francisco Branch) and Arabic. Each of the first four classes showed dramatically improved test scores, doubling or tripling the number of students who scored over the DLI standard of 2/2.[12]

The initial results were impressive and enthusiasm was high, but the school remained constrained by limits on the number of new faculty that could be hired. The larger departments were not able to fully implement Team Teaching. Some experimented with a "modified team teaching," using four or five instructors for every three sections. But many classrooms at DLI remained caught up in the methods of the past, which would have felt very familiar to graduates of the 1950's and 1960's.

Curriculum Development

Curriculum development, an essential component of the foreign language teaching process, had gone in fits and starts through the years. When the Army began Japanese language training in 1941, the novice instructors had to overcome an acute shortage of dictionaries and readers. The few they scraped together were hopelessly out of date and pedagogically primitive. When the Army launched the Army Specialized Training Program in 1943, individual faculty members at dozens of universities were given only weeks to develop course materials for dozens of languages which had never been systematically taught in the U.S. before.

In the post-war era the Army Language School continued this tradition of developing its own courses and materials. Commercially-written textbooks designed for use in high schools and universities simply did not fit the needs of 30-hour a week intensive training, nor the specialized military vocabulary. With native-speaking faculty writing the courses for dozens of rarely-taught languages, and its own illustrators and print plant, the Army Language School was a completely self-contained language school.

As the years went on, the courses aged along with the faculty that taught them. While teaching methodologies evolved, as did the very languages themselves, heavy teaching demands and lack of resources kept many faculty in the classrooms and out of course development. Many faculty fell into the rut of teaching mechanically from rigid courses that dictated exactly what was to be taught each hour of each day for forty-seven weeks, and which they had no hand in designing and no hope of revising. A separate Systems Development Agency was established in 1970 for research and curriculum development, but its functions were once again absorbed into the DLI structure in 1974. Many soldiers who passed through DLI in the 1970's thus worked with reprints of textbooks that had been in use for twenty or more years. COL McNerney, who became commandant in 1981, complained of a system which he said was "bogged down with an endless 'work-in-process' inventory of TD projects which seemed to never get finished."[13]

In 1983 TRADOC abolished the Directorate of Training Development in all Army schools and established in its place the Curriculum Division under the Assistant Dean for Instruction (later renamed the Assistant Dean for Training and Doctrine). Former Persian Department chair and school director Dr. Mahmood Taba Tabai was named its first chief. Under this system the departments detailed instructors as course developers for specific projects. Each school was given a Course Development Department and the instructors were given temporary promotions to GS-11 for the duration of their projects. The role of the Curriculum Division was to "establish . . . policy and quality standards for development of all course materials, advise . . . project officers during the development process, and determine . . . whether material developed conforms to these policies and standards."[14]

Despite this reorganization, curriculum development was still sliding slowly toward a crisis. It remained a point of friction with user agencies who often pushed for their own preferred methods or vocabulary. Points of dissatisfaction from user agencies were often translated into lobbying to modify specific curricula. Course development projects were also sometimes controversial within individual departments as well. As an example the Chinese Basic Course developed during the late 1970's had led to a protracted controversy within the Chinese Department. Overall contract funding declined sharply from $698,000 in FY 1983 (much of which was for the German Headstart Program) to $126,000 in FY 1986. Training Development work years slipped from an FY 1984 peak of 174 to 141 in FY 1986.

The course development situation for nonresident courses was even worse. As the Master Plan put it, "This backlog on the resident course side has severely impacted DLI's ability to devote sufficient resources to the Nonresident program."[15] FLAMRIC materials in a half dozen major languages were so badly out of date that COL Bullard suspended them, only to have some users plead that they were better than nothing.[16]

COL Bullard began to articulate a new approach to course development that called for increased participation by the classroom instructor.[17] He looked forward to the day when course materials would become living documents that teams of instructors could update as they taught by tapping the emerging technology of desktop publishing. He hoped to solve the perennial problem of curriculum development by keeping the instructors involved in every step of the process, keeping materials up to date, and maintaining course flexibility. The school had already begun procuring some Xerox STAR foreign language word processors and this initiative was written into the Master Plan, to "design, get approval for and implement an 'on-line' electronic system for course writing, editing, mastering, and publishing of language textual and supplemental materials."[18]

This was coupled with "an aggressive program" for contracting out course development, which was projected to rise as high as $700,000 per year.[19] While commercially-available materials or those developed under contract could seldom be incorporated directly into DLI's classrooms, and in many low-density languages were seldom to be found, some economies were possible.

Early in 1986 COL Bullard launched a major reorganization of the curriculum development process. Faced with a major increase in student input, he sent all course developers back into the language departments early in the year. While many projects continued, some of the developers returned to teaching duties. In March he abolished the school curriculum development departments. The GS-12 chairs were renamed "Academic Coordinators," and four of the six were reassigned to different schools. Russian course development was completely suspended by early 1986, as was all further nonresident course development by the spring.[20] The disruption was magnified by the simultaneous movement of the Curriculum Division Staff off post into the Lighthouse School, a former elementary school in Pacific Grove, over the 1985 Christmas holidays.

Two major projects continued or began during 1986 despite these changes in direction. Vigorous experimentation was underway in the Arabic Departments under Albert S. Gau, who had been Chief of Nonresident Training from 1978 to 1985. This included purchasing the rights to a commercial Arabic video course, "From the Gulf to the Ocean (GO)," and putting it on interactive video disc.[21] The Arabic Departments were hard at work on developing courses in several regional dialects as well, and in June the Czech Department was given the go ahead to develop a new basic course to replace one that was over thirty-five years old, based on procuring and supplementing commercially-available materials.

By returning course developers to the departments and suspending all nonresident course development, COL Bullard took the risk of a pause in updating and developing new instructional materials. Yet the system he inherited had few supporters, and his reforms promised to stimulate a burst of innovation. But it was too early to tell if new technology and faculty freedom to innovate would be adequate replacements.

Educational Technology

Learning a foreign language is a labor-intensive process for teachers and students alike, so it is not surprising that foreign language teachers have sought help through various forms of educational technology since World War II. Record players, reel-to-reel tape recorders, film projectors, overhead projectors, and later cassette tape players and VCR's were common classroom sights at the Army Language School and the Defense Language Institute. The school had also long boasted of a large sound and film recording studio. But as Dr. Hutchinson, an early advocate of language laboratories, once remarked, he had to disagree with the prediction that "the last FL teacher will have retired by 1995 when all instruction will be done by computer."[22] He felt educational technology would always take second place to the skilled teacher. The school's leaders nevertheless remained interested in new developments in educational technology. The repetitive drills inherent in foreign language teaching and the need for exportable language training materials seemed naturally suited to technological solutions.

At the beginning of the 1980's, DLI had accumulated a large stock of reel-to-reel tape recorders and "a smattering of films and video tapes." In the early 1980's the school had made a major investment to convert all language laboratories to the more convenient cassette tape players, and students were issued portable tape players for homework and review. By the mid-1980's the school had an inventory of "some 186 video cassette players, 25 video cassette recorders, 5 portable color TV monitors, 183 television monitors and other assorted AV equipment," supported by a growing collection of "foreign language news broadcasts, films and language learning products" for use in the classrooms and library.[23] It had also begun to join the microcomputer revolution with the widely-used PLATO system.

In 1981 an Education Technology Division had been established "to undertake studies and develop improved methods of aiding and improving the DLIFLC foreign language training process through the incorporation of new technology."[24] For five years under the leadership of MAJ A. Allen Rowe it oversaw the development and acquisition of a wide variety of equipment and software. Rowe retired in July, 1986, to take a job with Monterey Institute of International Studies. By early 1986 Air Force Lt. Col. William S. McClure supervised a staff of ten (four of whom were instructors detailed for specific projects) in the renamed New Systems Training Division.[25]

When COL Bullard came to DLI, he pushed the development of comprehensive planning for educational technology. He pressed the division's small staff to "find and employ systems which produce quantum leaps in terms of proficiency attained for time on task as well as provide efficient and effective means to deliver sustainment training packages to the field."[26] He was particularly interested in having them develop authoring software systems by which an instructor could easily develop materials in any language. When the Master Plan was published in May, 1986, it laid out the task to "expand the use of advanced educational technology systems (e.g. interactive audio or video, computer assisted instruction (CAI), speech synthesis, speech recognition, artificial intelligence, etc.) in the instructional process."[27] During 1986 the division developed a comprehensive plan for the future of educational technology that attempted to chart a course between DLI's unique needs and broader Army plans.[28]

Yet during 1986 the payoffs seemed remote. German Gateway was available on interactive video disk under the name of VELVET, and a field test of a commercially-produced Arabic course that had been transferred onto video disk was started in August, but these were only the first glimmerings of what many saw as the future of foreign language teaching. Lt. Col. McClure was replaced in July by Lt. Col. Gerald T. O'Guin and the project manager who drafted the master plan left in the fall to take over the Directorate of Information Management.

Several complex, long-term projects were slow in maturing. For example, the division worked on the use of interactive video disk technology. Down the road was the Army's hope for future training, the Electronic Information Delivery System (EIDS), which the division planned to adapt to

foreign language instruction. Late in 1986 the school purchased 61 Sony View 2000 interactive video stations as EIDS prototypes at a cost of about $425,000. While students and teachers continued to make do with the technology of the past, the New Systems Training Division struggled with the complexities of bringing into existence the future of foreign language teaching.[29]

Program Evaluation, Research and Testing

Testing and research have been time-honored parts of modern education. Under TRADOC School Model 83 each Army school had a separate Directorate of Evaluation and Standardization to fill these roles. DLI had unusual responsibilities in two respects: its world-wide language testing mission and the need to conduct research into second language acquisition, which "contrasts greatly with methods used in teaching marksmanship, vehicle maintenance or other such psychomotor skills." Added to this was the requirement to "collect . . . and analyze . . . quantitative and qualitative data and other information to evaluate mission success or deficiencies of all elements of the DFLP."[30]

The position of Assistant Dean for Evaluation and Standardization (ADES) had been left vacant since Dr. Vu Tam Ich became Assistant Dean for Instruction early in 1985. Air Force Maj. Thomas F. Hooten filled in for over a year while an extensive search was conducted for a replacement. Dr. John L. D. Clark was eventually hired in June of 1986. Clark had made his career in the field of language testing with the Educational Testing Service and with the Center for Applied Linguistics. His arrival coincided with the beginnings of extensive change in this aspect of the language teaching process. Symbolic of the changed emphasis was the informal renaming of the directorate to PERT (Program Evaluation, Research and Testing), which more accurately described what it actually did.

The main work load of the department remained the high volume of language testing conducted by dozens of testers. Their duties included not just the testing of resident students, but since the introduction of DLPT III's, the grading of speaking tapes from anywhere in the world, as well as the testing of prospective instructors.

Language testing as a field was undergoing rapid change during the 1980's. After years of effort all government agencies involved in language training came together in 1985 to agree on standard language proficiency level descriptions through the Interagency Language Roundtable. To meet this challenge DLI had recalibrated all its previous DLPT I's and II's from 1981 to 1983 to match the language proficiency scale used by other government agencies. In 1982 they began developing a new generation of tests that included a test of speaking ability, the DLPT III. By 1986 DLI had developed seven of the new tests, covering about 95% of all Department of Defense linguists.[31] The proliferation of microcomputers in the educational world in the early 1980's led the testers to envision a new form of computer-adaptive testing, and a special project was launched in 1986 for a DLPT IV in

Russian. The DLPT III's were subjected to intense scrutiny, and some user agencies were very critical of them. COL Bullard particularly singled out the Chinese DLPT III, which he had taken himself, for criticism. In 1986 he terminated development of new DLPT III's except for a few projects that were fairly well along. In some languages, such as German, work continued on new "C" and "D" forms. But the day-to-day work of the Testing Division continued with the backbreaking work of administering and scoring PAT I, PAT II, DLPT's and oral proficiency interviews and tapes from each resident student and from throughout the Defense Department.

The gap between ideal and real was even wider in the field of research. In the academic world, educational research was a growth industry. Literally thousands of dissertations in education were written each year in the U.S. alone, and hundreds of scholarly journals covered every conceivable aspect of the field. At DLI research into second language acquisition had long been a part of the school's vision. Here was the largest laboratory in the western world for conducting research in foreign language classrooms. The school also had an institutional interest in making the process more effective and efficient. Yet educational research traditionally took a back seat to the more pressing tasks of classroom teaching. During the early 1970's DLI's Systems Development Agency conducted an extensive research program, but when it was absorbed back into the rest of the school in the mid-1970's research fell on hard times. In the early 1980's the school had begun a handful of joint projects with the Army Research Institute, and Dr. Clifford maintained an active interest in research, but funding was seldom available. He lamented, "Disciplined, empirical research has been almost non-existent within the government [language] schools. . . . Most bandwagon teaching methodologies have never been empirically tested, and almost none have been tested across a significant period of instruction."[32]

Only one or two positions remained in the organization to conduct or supervise research, and these researchers often devoted their time to routine records-keeping for the school. The academic library struggled to keep pace with the scholarly literature necessary to support research. The underlying problem was that DLI had no separate line item in its annual budget for conducting research, and the managers at TRADOC headquarters who controlled educational research funds did not appear to be interested in helping.

When COL Bullard arrived he was determined to restore research to a greater position. The Master Plan declared on its first page that "careful documentation and reporting of new methods are essential so that results good or bad, can be quickly shared with all DLI teachers as well as the academic community of foreign language teachers."[33] In early 1986 two in-house research projects were launched. One tested the value of extending the teaching day from six to seven classroom hours in the Asian School. A second study examined the effects of extending a Category IV language from 47 to 60 weeks.[34] The pattern here was similar to that in other areas. Formal recognition was given to the importance of the function by the GOSC, an ambitious master plan was prepared and staffed, pilot studies were

attempted "out of hide," but then the necessary funding was not forthcoming. COL Bullard did succeed in having the research mission added to DLI's formal mission statement. When the revised AR 350-20 appeared in March, 1987, it included for the first time the statement, "The Commandant shall conduct such research and evaluation as is necessary to establish and maintain a data base of . . . foreign language training programs and facilities; training development methodologies, instructional methodologies and techniques [and] computer based training and computer assisted instruction." [35]

One major research project had begun in 1985, a five-year survey of language skill change once students left DLI. This Language Skill Change Project was conducted in conjunction with the Army Research Institute field unit located on the Presidio of Monterey. Data collection from Army students in four major languages began in February, 1986. This sort of research was designed to enable language program managers for the first time to take what the Master Plan called "a life cycle approach to the management of linguist careers."[36] Yet during 1986 the Chief of the Research Division, Dr. John A. Lett, Jr., had to scramble for funding to keep even this project alive.

One potential solution to the research resourcing problem arose in the first half of 1986. A local research office was recommended at the January, 1986, GOSC meeting by Dr. Joseph Kanner of the TRADOC Training Technology Agency. Kanner's staff worked with DLI's research staff to plan a Training Technology Field Activity at DLI, staffed with several senior researchers and funded for research into foreign language education. A Memorandum of Agreement was signed in May, 1986, but in September Kanner withdrew his support for the project and the plan never became a reality.[37] There was controversy as well over where the research function should fall within DLI's structure. TRADOC's TRAMEA team forced DLI to move it out from under ADES and under DOTD and faulted DLI for not staffing it sufficiently.

Program evaluation, the heart of TRADOC's vision for Evaluation and Standardization, had traditionally been considered a separate function under ADES, and here too the resourcing was clearly inadequate to meet the tasks at hand. The Resource Management staff could only do a projection of the resource and manpower requirements which would be needed to expand the internal and external evaluation systems in conjunction with TRADOC Manpower Survey and TRAMEA.

Special questionaires were collected from students at the end of each course (SOQ:IE), and the staff conducted periodic liaison with follow-on schools such as the Goodfellow Technical Training Center, but these did not fulfill the vision of a comprehensive, effective evaluation and feedback system for the Defense Foreign Language Program. Through chronic underfunding and lack of staff, Program Evaluation, like Research and Testing, remained unable to break out of the tyranny of the past.

Educational Administration

No teaching takes place in a vacuum. At DLI teaching took place in thirty-four separate language departments, which were the primary work-groups for instructors and the social and professional focal points of the entire school, in many ways similar to foreign language departments in civilian universities. Most faculty members would spend their entire careers within a single department. These were also the arenas for much of the conflicts and problems that arose in the school. It was there that school-wide policy decisions had to be made to work. Excellence had to begin in each department, or not at all.

Each department was headed by a chairperson (GS-12) and one or two supervisors (GS-11), the only positions that offered instructors the potential for promotion beyond GS-9. The departments served as small administrative offices, supporting the instruction as best they could with secretarial support, classroom scheduling, telephones, photocopy machines, office space, office supplies, and time cards. They were the frontline agencies for supporting the classroom instructors.

COL Bullard was initially critical of the management and supervisory skills of these instructors-turned-administrators. He blamed the chairs and supervisors for all too often failing to be effective leaders and ironing out the minor problems of day-to-day school operations. As he later said, "Part of it was because we were taking excellent teachers, and the only way they could progress, personally, was to be promoted into an administrator. Most of their inclination was to be a teacher, but in order to survive, they had to be promoted by going into administration, and they weren't necessarily good people managers."[38] When Col. DePhilippis arrived in the summer of 1986 he put his management training background to work at once by setting up an ambitious program of "Towards Excellence" leadership development seminars for these middle-level managers.

The six language schools, each headed by a director (GS-13), were coalitions of up to seven different departments. As recently as 1984 there had only been three language "groups," but TRADOC School Model 83 allowed the school to expand to six. These schools controlled their budgets, workyears and course development.[39] All six schools underwent leadership changes in the mid-1980's. During 1984-1985 several senior academic administrators had retired or moved into new positions, including Pierre De Lespinois, Hank Marschik, Antoine Al-Haik, Francis Cartier, and Joseph C. Hutchinson. Three directors were moved into other schools, with the result that when COL Bullard came to DLI, no school director had been in position for more than eight months.[40]

The senior director was Albert S. Gau, who had joined the Army Language School as a French instructor in 1948, after serving under General De Gaulle in World War II. He had managed language training programs for many years in Hawaii, Korea, and Germany. In 1985 he became the Director of the School of Middle East Languages.

Jawdat Y. Yonan was also serving his second tour as a school director when he moved from the School of Middle East Languages, where he had risen from an Arabic instructor in the 1960's, to become Director of the School of East European Languages.

Benjamin De La Selva became the Director of the School of Asian Languages in early 1985. He had first come to DLI as an Army student in the 1960's to study French and Polish and joined the DLI staff in 1972. Since then he had held a wide number of positions as instructor, course developer and administrator.

Dave Olney had been named Director of the School of Romance Languages in 1985, after many years as a Chinese instructor course developer and as chief of Faculty and Staff Development Division. In the spring of 1986 he was sent to the Nonresident Training Division and the school was taken over by Dr. Martha Herzog, who had taught at the DLI English Language Center in the 1970's and came to DLI in 1977 as a testing specialist.

When Dr. Hutchinson became the Assistant Dean for Policy and Liaison, Dr. Alex Vorobiov was moved to head the School of the Russian Language. Vorobiov had nearly twenty years experience in teaching Russian and administering related government and academic programs.

The School of Germanic Languages suffered two retirements in a row in 1984-85, Dr. Cartier and Dr. Al-Haik. After several months, Peter J. Armbrust was named. Armbrust had joined DLI's East Coast Branch in 1972. He came to California in 1974 to become the project officer for the successful German "Headstart" and "Gateway" programs. He came to his new job with six years experience as chairman of German Department B.

Two major changes were made in this administrative superstructure during 1986. Each school for many years had been assigned an officer as Foreign Language Training Advisor (FLTA) to oversee the Foreign Language Training NCO's and Petty Officers (FLTN/PO's). COL Bullard correctly saw this military element as a "state within a state" and in 1986 directed that the FLTN/PO's work directly for the department chairs. He converted the FLTA's into assistants to the school directors. During the year COL Bullard also decided to give the school directors new titles that better corresponded to their duties in academic terms. On October 1 they became deans in their own right, while Dr. Clifford's title was changed to "Provost."[41]

Both COL Bullard and Dr. Clifford were concerned with the span of control exercised by these key administrators. Just as the school had expanded from three language groups to six in 1984, COL Bullard decided to split the Russian School in two by the end of 1986 to accommodate the continued growth in service demands for Russian, together with the scheduled closing of the Lackland Branch and the opening of a new General Instructional Facility on the Presidio. Alex Vorobiov took over the new school, dubbed the School of Russian Studies, in December, 1986. Luba Solgalow, chairperson of the Russian C Department, moved up to become dean of the original Russian School. Solgalow had worked at DLI and the Lackland Branch since 1972 as a Russian instructor, supervisor and course developer.

These schools and departments, administrative focal points for the cross-currents of teaching methodology, personnel management, and administrative support, continued to work in 1986 much as before, making the hard trade-offs, putting policy directives into practice, and fostering excellence. In the mid-1980's educational administration in DLI remained essentially healthy, while growth and change rippled through the school.

Faculty as Personnel

The faculty however were more than professional educators. Seen from another aspect they were "personnel" as well, employees who had to be paid, trained, promoted and eventually retired. Even for professionals, job performance is inseparably connected with the way each member of the organization is "managed" and treated by the institution. The ideal would be for the two roles to be complementary, but they were often in conflict. COL Bullard reported in January, 1986, that

> With the rapid growth of its training load, DLI has evolved into a bureaucratic, process-oriented operation, more like a factory than an academic institute. This system has undermined teacher morale, led to mediocrity and a lowered sense of pride in our products. The teacher is on the low rung of the hierarchy, his work schedule tightly controlled, and his job security dependent on many highly fluctuating external factors. Advancement opportunity, salary, benefit and job security decidedly favor the non-teaching staff.[42]

The school's faculty were managed under the Federal Civil Service System. The faculty's perceptions of how they were treated by this system have been a perennial sore point which at times detracted from the primary task of teaching. These problems were compounded by a "cultural overlay" and a language filter. The complex minutia of personnel policies and routine instructions were often incompletely understood. Many instructors were recent immigrants to the U.S., with limited experience with general bureaucratic ways in America. Expectations and anxieties derived from their experiences with government bureaucracies in their own countries sometimes transferred to their dealings with officialdom at DLI. All faculty were also hired under the provisions of the Excepted Service, which means that they were hired locally without a nation-wide competitive search. In recent years higher-level supervisory and other positions were also reclassified as exempt, eliminating a major cause of frustration for the faculty who felt at a disadvantage in seeking promotion to higher-graded positions. Only about two hundred Competitive Service positions remained, mostly in technical fields.

When the system did not work, or an individual felt slighted, there were many steps he or she could take. Most of these were handled by the supervisors and department chairmen, even though they were not always the sort of experienced people-managers the military leaders would have liked. The school Inspector General received seventy-six civilian requests for action in

1986, and others were handled by the Equal Employment Opportunity Office. Some teachers sought recourse through their union or the court system. At the end of 1986, no fewer than sixteen law suits were pending in the federal courts, some going back several years. The second-ranked civilian employee, Dr. Hutchinson, was holding a non-standard position of "Assistant Dean for Policy and Liaison" as a result of a federal court judgement.

In general, the way the faculty were managed as personnel had great impact on their professional work as educators. During 1986 DLI's managers made impressive gains in moving the school towards a new age of personnel administration. During 1986 the Civilian Personnel Office implemented new job standards and performance appraisals giving each instructor a precise description of his duties. The Army Performance Management System (APMS) replaced the General Performance Appraisal System (GPAS). The instructor's day was measured by another new system, Standard Time and Activity Reporting System (STARS), which required each employee to account for his hours by category of activity. Unlike the situation in a civilian university, the faculty were required to remain on campus during the entire work day. Despite austere and crowded office accomodations, the faculty were required to spend eight hours each day in them. Any work beyond normal working hours was supposed to be paid for as overtime or compensatory time. As civilian employees on a military post they shared recreational facilities such as the snack bars and the gymnasium with their students and the military staff. At other times they were made aware of their differences. They were excluded, for example, from the post exchange and commissary as a matter of public law.

The faculty was divided into civil service grades that did not equate to civilian academic ranks. The most common grade was GS-9. An instructor at this grade with ten years service earned $26,900 per year in 1986. The system was one of rank-in-position, rather than the rank-in-person approach in the academic world or military services. For an instructor to seek promotion to GS-11, he would have to be moved into a non-teaching, supervisory position. As a result the best teachers could be rewarded only by being promoted out of the classroom. Although most faculty had permanent positions, some 10% were still temporary, without health and other benefits or job security.

Responsibility for the overall management of this cumbersome system rested in the Civilian Personnel Officer, Virginia Lamb (GM-13). Within the Civilian Personnel Office there were also several functionally-defined offices: the Recruitment and Placement Branch, Management-Employee Relations Branch, Training and Development Branch, the Position Management and Classification Branch, and the Technical Services Office.[43] In the summer of 1986 a former Civilian Personnel Officer, Robert S. Snow, returned from a five-year tour in West Germany. Snow launched several initiatives to improve faculty perceptions of the personnel management system. He published a 50-page *Civilian Employee Handbook* (DLI Pam 690-2) and started two newsletters, *CP News* and the *DLI Manager*.

Plans for DLI's growth placed a burden on recruitment that was perhaps unequalled since the expansion of the school in the late 1940's. An intensive advertising and search program was instituted in early 1986. Thirteen new employees arrived in July, the first month of the ramp-up.

At the same time the office was handling the planned closure of the Russian branch at Lackland Air Force Base, Texas. Many of the several dozen instructors had moved there from Monterey in 1980 and now were faced with the decision to move back or look for other jobs. After the last class graduated in early December, 1986, most of the remaining instructors were absorbed back in Monterey.

Another part of the civilian employee picture was the faculty union, Local 1263 of the National Federation of Federal Employees. This local had won federal recognition in the 1960's, at a time when the union movement was spreading throughout the federal government, public schools, and higher education. From May until November, 1986, negotiations were underway to renew the three-year contract. The new agreement became effective on November 21, 1986.[44]

From the fall of 1985 until the following spring an intense effort was underway to devise a new system that would change some of the salient features of this system. This Demonstration Project was decided upon in concept by COL Bullard and Dr. Clifford, who decided to do whatever it took to make the changes happen. COL Bullard in particular made it clear that he wanted this to become the crowning achievement of his administration.

The task force arrived at a system of civilian-style academic ranks that would split the DLI faculty off from the Civil Service System. It would allow faculty to hold rank-in-person, so that outstanding teachers could be promoted without leaving the classroom. As an add-on, this would enable DLI to do more to upgrade the professional quality of the faculty by permitting and in some cases even paying for graduate study in foreign language education.

After extensive staff work and soliciting comments and suggestions from the faculty, the package was forwarded to TRADOC in April, 1986, then to the Office of the Secretary of Defense, where it became stalled for more than a year.[45] Faculty reactions ranged from skepticism to hope. When Monterey Congressman Leon E. Panetta met with the faculty at the school on July 2, they freely aired their concerns about job security and pay scales.[46] The faculty however had to acknowledge that DLI's top leaders were working to remove the obstacles to their becoming truly professional foreign language educators. For their effort to be successful, however, all aspects of foreign language teaching had to be addressed: faculty development, teaching methodology, curriculum development, educational technology, research and testing, administration and personnel management.

1. Dagmar Pavlik, quoted in the *Globe* (March 5, 1986), 2.
2. Faculty data provided by the Civilian Personnel Office, December, 1987.
3. *Globe* (November 21, 1986), 2.
4. DF, ATFL-TDF, Subject: Historical Summary, 24 April 1987.
5. *Globe* (June 20, 1986), 2.
6. ATFL-DTA, Information Paper, Subject: Foreign Language Training Advisors, 4 October 1985. See also DA Form 140-4, Manpower Survey Report-Schedule X- Manpower and Workload Data, Directorate of Training, Foreign Language Training Division (1981).
7. Jack C. Richards and Theodore S. Rodgers, *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching: A Description and Analysis* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 44-48.
8. DLIFLC Pamphlet 350-10, Academic Policy and Standards, 1 October 1982: *Basic Instructor Training Workshop Handbook* (1985).
9. *A Strategy for Excellence* (May 1986), para. 4c.
10. Letter, COL Bullard to TRADOC Commander, Subject: Commander's Annual Assessment, 30 January 1986. These parallel the criticisms of foreign language teaching in American secondary schools in Marlies Mueller, "The Tower of Babel in Libertyville," *Daedalus*, 112, 3 (Summer 1983), 229-47.
11. DLIFLC, Minutes of Senior Management Planning Seminar, 8 November 1985; Letter, ATFL-RM, to MG Jonnie H. Corns, DCS-T, TRADOC, Subject: Defense Language Institute (DLI) Team Teaching Concept, 13 December 1985, with enclosure, "DLI Team Teaching -- A Concept Paper;" Minutes, Union/Management Meeting Team Teaching, 23 January 1986; CTSRepDLIFLC Monthly Activities Report (April 1986); ATFL-D, Subject: Provost Academic Policy Letter #1-87, "Team Teaching Policy," 5 January 1987; Interview with COL Bullard, 14 September 1987, 11-13.
12. Information Paper, ATFL-P, Subject: Recent Initiatives to Improve Instruction, 11 March 1987.
13. Letter, COL McNerney to GEN William R. Richardson, TRADOC Commander, n.d [August 1985], Appendix A, 2.
14. DLIFLC Memorandum 10-1, 1 December 1984, para. 13-5.
15. *A Strategy for Excellence* (May 1986), para. 6i.
16. CTSRepDLIFLC Monthly Activities Report (March 1986).
17. Interview with COL Bullard, 14 September 1987, 31.
18. *A Strategy for Excellence* (May 1986), Tab D-8.
19. *A Strategy for Excellence* (May 1986), Tab D-9.
20. CTSRepDLIFLC Monthly Report (January 1986).
21. Nonresident Training Division 1986 Historical Summary.
22. Joseph C. Hutchinson, "The History of Foreign Language Education and the Use of Technology in the U.S.A.," unpublished paper, 1981, 23.
23. *A Strategy for Excellence* (May 1986), para. 6l.
24. Letter, ATFL-IRM-M, Subject: Organizational Establishment, 3 November 1981. See also Lt. Col. Gerald O'Guin, "Educational Technology at DLI," Paper presented at BILC Conference, Monterey, CA (June 1986).
25. DLIFLC Memorandum 10-1, 1 December 1984, para. 13-7.
26. *A Strategy for Excellence* (May 1986), para. 6l (2).
27. *A Strategy for Excellence* (May 1986), Tab D-7. See also the interview with COL Bullard, 14 September 1987, 25-27.
28. DLI Educational Technology Master Plan, 2 June 1986.

29. Educational Technology Division 1986 Annual Historical Summary. See also Ray T. Clifford, "The Status of Computer-Assisted Language Instruction," *CALICO Journal*, 4, 4 (June 1987), 9-16.
30. *A Strategy for Excellence* (May 1986), para. 4a.; DLIFLC Memorandum 10-1, 1 Dec 84, Chapter 12. See also Directorate of Program Evaluation, Research and Testing (Evaluation and Standardization) Annual Historical Summary - CY87.
31. *A Strategy for Excellence* (May 1986), para. 6m.
322. Ray T. Clifford, "Language Teaching in the Federal Government: A Personal Perspective," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences*, 490 (March 1987), 144.
33. *A Strategy for Excellence* (May 1986), para. 4d.
34. *A Strategy for Excellence* (May 1986), Tabs D-1 and D-2; Rochelle Aldinger, "60 Weeks: Korean Course Length Extends for 18 Students in Class," *Globe* (12 February 1986), 4; Jeannie Crans, "Class Hours Extended for Some Korean Students," *Globe* (11 April 1986), 4.
35. Army Regulation 350-20, Management of the Defense Foreign Language Program, 15 March 1987, para. 2-1d.
36. CTSRepDLIFLC Monthly Activity Report (September 1985); Joi Estep, "DLI, Army Research Institute Study Language Skills Changes," *Globe* (20 June 1986), 5; *A Strategy for Excellence* (May 1986), para. 4h.
37. PERT Annual Historical Summary - CY87, 12-13.
38. Interview with COL Bullard, 14 September 1987, 2.
39. DLIFLC Memorandum 10-1, 1 December 1984, Chapter 14; Interview with COL Monte R. Bullard, 14 September 1987, 2; Interview with Col. Robert M. DePhilippis, 24 February 1988.
40. Biographical details are taken from ATFL-PAO, *Defense Language Institute Command & Staff Biographies* (March 1987).
41. These changes were reflected in the revised DLIFLC Memorandum 10-1, 1 January 1987, Chapter 14.
42. Letter, COL Bullard to Commander, TRADOC, Subject: Commander's Annual Assessment, 30 January 1986, 2; Civilian Personnel Office Annual Historical Summary 1986; Interview with Robert S. Snow, 9 December 1987; and a useful discussion of the issues in DLIFLC, *Accreditation Self-Study Report* (August 1983), Chapter 4.
43. DLIFLC Memorandum 10-1, 1 December 1984, Chapter 7.
44. Negotiated Agreement Between Defense Language Institute, Presidio of Monterey, CA, and National Federation of Federal Employees Local 1263, 21 November 1986.
45. Minutes of Senior Management Planning Seminar, 8 November 1985; "Demonstration Project Redresses Long-Standing Personnel Problems," *Globe* (October 22, 1985), 1; "Demonstration Project Moves Ahead," *Globe* (November 25, 1985), 1; Letter, ATFL-CMT, to Commander, TRADOC, Subject: Proposal for a Change to the Current Civil Service System, 7 April 1986; Interview with COL Bullard, 14 September 1987, 1-4, 9-11.
46. *Globe* (11 July 1986), 2.

Chapter Four

Foreign Language Learning

Students as Foreign Language Learners

The single most important factor in foreign language learning is the student. The model described in the Master Plan recognized this by placing "quality of students" first among four factors affecting graduate proficiency (para. 7a). Yet none of the thirty-nine initiatives it proposed addressed this. The student at DLI remained the least understood component of the educational process.[1]

Two general categories of students came to DLI in the 1980's. Junior enlisted personnel were in the majority. These young soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines, who averaged 20 years old, came to DLI immediately after basic training, the cream of the services' successful recruiting efforts of the mid-1980's. Many had enlisted specifically for language training, which also entitled them to a $8,000 bonus upon completion of all their training. Each had scored well on the Defense Language Aptitude Battery (DLAB).

The other students were a mixture of officers, noncommissioned officers, and civilians who were generally older and often had college degrees. The officers and NCO's came to DLI after several years of service. Some were returning to DLI for advanced training or second languages. The officers were generally college graduates and were often destined for duty or schooling in an allied country. The NCO's generally brought years of field experience in cryptologic assignments.

Not all the students fit into these general categories. Some spouses attended classes on a space-available basis by long-standing policy. A handful of students from allied countries and other agencies within the federal government were also to be found. Senior officers occasionally came for Headstart or other special programs. But as learners they all had much in common. Most found the instructional environment to be more intense than in any previous school experience. For the young students the military environment was still a new experience. These aspects caused a double culture shock for many.

Language study for most young students followed four years in America's public high schools, which were under heavy attack in the early 1980's for their lack of academic rigor. Some students had even begun college-level work. Basic military training took two or three months, which was barely enough time for them to begin the initial socialization process into the military and to think of themselves as soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines. Few of them had ever studied foreign languages, and even fewer of these were assigned to the same language they had studied. The foreign languages taught in American schools, colleges and universities were seldom those needed by the armed services.

Once students arrived in Monterey and were housed and inprocessed, they were ready to begin classes. Those who were billeted on post were usually assigned two-person rooms together by language. For the larger languages, entire platoons or flights were composed of students all studying the same language. First term students remained under strict supervision during their first weeks at the school. The officers and NCO's assigned to take care of them were linguists themselves and maintained active counselling and study-hall programs.

Each student also received the basic tools of the trade: the textbooks, dictionaries, and cassette tapes with which he or she would become very familiar during the course. The textbooks formed the core of each course. How well they were written, and how well the instructors used them, were a central element of the entire process. For the student they became both road-maps and sometimes crutches as they struggled to navigate the rapidly-paced courses. For several hours each week students sat in the language laboratories and strained to understand and rehearse the spoken materials. Each student was issued a tape recorder and spent many evening and early morning hours listening to supplementary tapes. When these instructional materials were inadequate, obsolete, or mismatched, students were quick to complain, and teachers worked to supplement the courses to keep their students interested.

The key ingredient in the educational process was the chemistry between teacher and student. At DLI this presented some special challenges. For many young students this was their first direct contact with someone from another culture. Their new instructors did not always behave as their high school teachers had. Up to six hours each day a succession of teachers lectured, questioned and coaxed the students in a relentless march through the course. As one Russian student put it, "This is the only place I've ever been where teachers scream at you for getting something wrong. Teachers just cope with you in high school.... Here, they're on top of you a lot."[2]

Most students used enthusiasm and self-discipline to make it through the course. Many became enthusiastic converts and threw themselves into the language and culture they studied. Others found the succession of instructors and tests too demanding or too boring to keep up their interest. Most students reached a plateau somewhere in mid-course, and their instructors and NCO's had to be alert to keep them at their tasks. Homework varied from course to course and student to student, but many complained that the dormitories were not always quiet places to study. A collection of humorous cartoons published in 1984 testified to a wide range of distractions and frustrations endured by students at the school. Most pointed to needless stress and ultimate disillusionment during the average student's stay.[3] In fact, some 10-15% of all students were academically attrited out of their courses and in the more difficult languages like Korean and Russian the figures approached 20%.[4] In the final result, learning a foreign language is an educational process, not a training process. As Dr. Clifford once put it, "Language is the most complex of observable human behaviors, and language instruction is, by its very nature, an educational discipline."[5]

Students as Military Personnel

Army Language School graduates of the 1950's who visited DLI in the 1980's would have been surprised at how student life had changed. Gone were the wooden barracks and Saturday morning inspections. Instead of the drab uniforms of the past, students wore the uniforms of all four services and enjoyed the benefits of the post-Vietnam volunteer armed forces. Pay was higher, the barracks resembled college dormitories, and students were free to own automobiles, motorcycles, TV's and stereos.

The visitors should not have been deceived. The students were still placed under academic pressure, and they still had to work on the dual objectives of language learning and military skills. The mission of DLI was still to train linguists who were *military* linguists. Much attention has been focused on the academic environment at DLI, but the non-academic environment the students lived in for the other 18 hours each day was an equally powerful influence on the foreign language learning process. The most obvious example of this was the administrative attrition rate. In FY 1986, 4.7% of all students failed to complete training for a variety of non-academic reasons, such as injuries, disciplinary matters, illnesses or pregnancies, or even sometimes selection for officer training.[6]

The management of the students as military personnel was the most important difference between DLI and civilian colleges and universities. Most students were sent to DLI by their services immediately upon the completion of basic training. Others were career officers and NCO's. For all of these DLI provided a structured military environment of expectations and support that went far beyond the language classroom. This was particularly true for those students who came to DLI directly from basic training, who had often not yet been in uniform for three full months.

Each service had a separate command structure for its students. Army students belonged to Troop Command under LTC Betty J. Harris, who also served as the coordinator of all four services' troop units at DLI. In June she was replaced by LTC James L. Gildersleeve. During FY 1986 an average of 1,472 Army enlisted and 247 officer students were in training at any given time. Headquarters Company provided administrative and logistic support and the students were assigned to six line companies.[7] Troop Command's leaders ensured that the Army students continued their military development with Common Task Testing, common skills training and a broad "soldierization" program. Platoon sergeants served as counsellors and role models for the young soldiers. Each company had a regional focus: A Company was for East European students, B Company for Middle Eastern, C Company for Russian, D Company for German and Romance, and F Company for Russian and Romance. The large number of students forced Troop Command to permit several hundred soldiers to live in off-post rental housing, and Company F was temporarily housed at Fort Ord, linked to the school by a shuttle bus.

The next largest contingent was the Air Force students assigned to the 3483rd Student Squadron, whose commander reported directly to the Air Training Command.[8] In the early 1980's the Air Force sent over eight hundred students for language training each year. One-third trained at Lackland, while the number of airmen training at the Presidio of Monterey declined from an average of 746 in FY 1981 to an average of 465 in FY 1986. Since 1983 the squadron had been commanded by Lt. Col. Everett R. Sharp. In 1986 he was replaced by Maj. Robert C. Nethery, who came to DLI after three years on the staff of the Goodfellow Technical Training Center. The squadron had six officers and sixteen enlisted permanent party to supervise these students. Personnel administration and finance were taken care of by a satellite personnel activity under Mather Air Force Base, over which the squadron exercised operational control. The students were organized into flights under their own NCO's. When new dormitories opened in the "Russian Village" in 1986 the squadron organized two new flights, G and H Flights, composed entirely of Russian language students.

A smaller number of Navy students came to DLI for language training. These were assigned to the Naval Security Group Detachment, commanded by Lt. Cdr. Thomas W. Hanneke.[9] The detachment commander reported directly to the Commander, Naval Security Group Command, in Washington, DC, and was responsible for an average of 52 officers and 297 enlisted students during FY 1986. For this the detachment had two officers and fourteen enlisted personnel. The administrative and financial work for the students was handled in large part by the nearby Naval Postgraduate School. Navy students were billeted in three divisions, each under a division petty officer. In the spring of 1986 the detachment also moved its students into new dormitories.

The Marine Corps contingent had an average of 16 officer and 90 enlisted students during FY 1986. The Marine Corps Administrative Detachment, commanded by Cpt. James V. Aldrich, had only about five permanent party staff. They maintained personnel and financial records not only on the students at DLI but also the hundred or so Marine officer students attending the Naval Postgraduate School at any given time. During 1986 Capt. Aldrich was replaced by Maj. James Rickard, a 1981 graduate of the Russian Basic Course at DLI and a former translator for the Moscow-Washington Hotline. The Marine students had generally higher DLAB scores and consequently lower academic attrition at DLI. The enlisted students were billeted in a separate wing of the Army's Troop Command headquarters building and platoon sergeants were selected from among the students themselves. They fully lived up to their reputation of excellence and esprit de corps.

The listing of the four services hardly begins to account for the diversity of the student body. As all services opened their ranks to more women in the years after the end of the draft, more came to DLI as students. By the mid-1980's about one-third were female. Unlike the situation that lasted into the 1970's, when female students were housed in the WAC barracks at Fort Ord, they were fully integrated into the units and classes. The Army had women

as company commanders at DLIFLC for nearly ten years, and from 1984 to 1986, as commander of Troop Command.[10]

The services were less successful in sending minority personnel to DLI as students. In 1987 Troop Command reported only 3% of the Army students were black, 1.5% Hispanic and 0.5% Asian. This underrepresentation resulted from a variety of factors that affected which individuals were sent to the school, such as the generally lower test scores of minority recruits, the lack of an aggressive effort to recruit minorities for language training, and "competition with other high visibility requirements, e.g., Airborne, Ranger and aviation programs." However 34% of the Army permanent party were minorities, including CSM Jimmy L. Dalton, who became Command Sergeant Major of Troop Command in 1986.[11]

Other groups that did not fit the student mold included the 15% who were officers, who lived off post with their families or in the BOQ. Many officers came to DLI at the midpoint of their careers. They often had extensive backgrounds in prior military and civilian schooling. Their status within the military, and significantly higher pay, set them apart from their young enlisted classmates. Some were quite senior, headed for high-level overseas assignments. Some 3% of the students were military spouses, accomodated on a space-available basis. The services had always considered this a sound investment for personnel going overseas. Several hundred of the students were reservists or national guardsmen on active duty for language training. This group was supported by a Reserve Forces Advisor, LTC Alfonso Troche. In 1986 LTC Troche gained an assistant, SGM Frank Moreno, Jr., and the linguist proponency functions were taken over by CW3 David J. Kralik.

The young enlisted students, had far more in common that transcended their service or class. They maintained an active athletic program to supplement their service-directed physical readiness training. Intramural teams abounded that would have been the pride of any civilian university. Many excelled in individual sports: marathons, weightlifting, diving and tennis. A small medical and dental clinic on post served them and their dependents, and sports injuries were commonly seen. A significant number of pregnancies also occurred, leading to delays in training, or in many cases medical discharges. In 1986 the services began routine HIV testing at DLI, although no cases were reported among the students.

Off duty the students enjoyed a variety of activities. A staff of chaplains provided religious activities for the students and staff. A large portion of their support consisted of extensive counselling of the soldiers and their families. Homework accounted for one or two hours each weeknight. The dormitories could be as active and noisy as any college dormitory, but there were few other places to study after hours. The Monterey Pennisula offered a wide variety of recreation. The climate and Pacific Coast location made an assignment to DLI a memorable one.

While student life may have changed drastically since the days of the Army Language School, much remained the same. The need to balance military and academic requirements continued much as before. The need to

provide military leadership and administrative support continued as well. Each service treated its students slightly differently in accordance with its own traditions and practices. The challenge to students and leaders of all four services was to maintain the balance necessary to produce effective military linguists.

1. Useful background discussion of issues relating to the student experience at DLI can be found in Chapter 5, *Accreditation Self-Study Report* (August 1983), 122-38.
2. Steve Hara, "Not Foreign to Them," *Soldiers*, 42, 12 (December 1986), 11.
3. Anonymous, *Defense Language Institute: The Inside Story* (Monterey, CA: Angel Press, 1984).
4. *DLI Annual Program Review* (26 January 1988).
5. *Globe* (12 December 1986), 7.
6. *DLI Annual Program Review* (26 January 1988).
7. DLIFLC Memorandum 10-1, 1 December 1984, Chapter 15. See also 1986 Annual Historical Summary, Troop Command, 5 May 1987.
8. 3483rd Student Squadron (ATC), Historical Summary for 1986, 8 April 1987.
9. NAVSECGRUDET Monterey Command History for 1986, 25 February 1987.
10. For a general survey of this DoD-wide trend, see Martin Binkin and Mark J. Eitelberg, "Women and Minorities in the All-Volunteer Force," in William Bowan, Roger Little and G. Thomas Sicilia, eds., *The All-Volunteer Force After a Decade: Retrospect and Prospect* (New York: Pergamon-Brassey's, 1986).
11. ATFL-TPC, Information Paper, Subject: Army Ethnicity Mix at DLI, 2 September 1987.

Chapter Five

Supporting Foreign Language Education

Logistics and Services

Logistic support was as vital to DLI in 1986 as ever before. The School Secretary, first Lt. Col. Jean Lesieutre, USAF, and then Lt. Col. Edward M. Wyraz, supervised these complex operations. Some forms of support were provided directly by DLI employees, others by Fort Ord, the FORSCOM agency that controlled the installation, and yet others provided by civilian contractors.

The Logistics Division and Frederick W. Koch, who had been its chief since 1977, struggled to support the school despite great handicaps. Widely separated facilities forced logistics personnel to shuttle among seven separate buildings at DLI and Fort Ord. The new logistics facility, which had been in the construction plans for several years, was only started in 1986, so they had to make do with what they had. As an interim measure Koch established a temporary Self Service Supply Center in Bldg. 339 to reduce the need to drive to Fort Ord for common supplies.[1]

David F. Curran, Jr., the DLI Property Book Officer, controlled about $11 million in government property, which had to be accounted for, inventoried, serviced, repaired, and eventually replaced. It was spread throughout the school on over 100 hand receipts.

The Logistics Division also monitored over $3 million in contracts during FY 1986, most of which were let through the contracting office at Fort Ord, including printing costs at the Presidio's own print plant and the Defense Audiovisual Agency, which added up to over $900,000 during FY 1986. (The Washington Liaison Office contracted directly with the Foreign Service Institute and several private language schools in the Washington, DC, area and the Educational Technology Division arranged contracts directly through the TRADOC Contracting Activity-East). Over $2.5 million in supplies and equipment was received in the school in FY 1986, including 160 microcomputers and word processors at a cost of over $850,000, about $200,000 worth of office and classroom furniture, and 3,000 cassette recorder-players at a cost of $210,000. At the same time the school turned in an estimated $65,000 of salvageable property to Fort Ord.

Less visible was the day-to-day base operations support provided by Fort Ord. These activities were supervised by the Garrison Commander, COL Rowlands, from his offices in Bldg. 272. This included a wide variety of services, from building and grounds maintenance to the cleaning contractors and security guards. During 1986 Fort Ord paid for reroofing several of the family quarters and other older buildings on the Presidio. The family quarters and two BOQ's were maintained and scheduled by Fort Ord authorities. Medical and dental care were provided by a small clinic at the Presidio from the Silas B. Hayes Army Community Hospital. Other kinds of support

were obtained directly from surrounding communities, such as fire, ambulance, water, gas, sewage and electricity. The children of the military personnel attended local schools in Monterey and Pacific Grove. Other support functions, following a government-wide trend, were shifting to civilian contractors. In November of 1985, all food service support was taken over by a civilian contractor.

Logistic Support continued to be complex and costly in 1986. A handful of dedicated support personnel worked to keep the school running despite outmoded facilities and the expansion of the school. Help was coming, although slowly. For example, a $16,000 computerized parcel shipping system was purchased under the QRIP program that saved the equivalent of one fulltime position, which had previously been devoted to shipping nonresident training materials. The support of foreign language education remained a challenge, but one that was being effectively met in the mid-1980's.

Facilities

DLI has been put in a variety of second-hand facilities since its founding in 1941: an aircraft hanger, a CCC camp, a SAC base and a hospital. When the MISLS moved to the Presidio of Monterey in 1946, the tiny Army post was built almost exclusively of temporary wood frame structures, some built by soldiers returning from the Philippines in 1903 to house infantry and cavalry units, and most of the rest built during World War II, when the post served as a reception center for inductees. From the 1950's to the early 1980's another two dozen permanent buildings had been added, bringing the total to over fifty. More than half were of World War II vintage or before. Through painful experience the school's leaders had learned that a language school requires facilities quite different from most other types of military schools. The students needed small classrooms, numerous language laboratories, an audio-visual studio, a print plant, and a large textbook warehouse, for example.[2]

As projections of student input rose in the late 1970's, DLI had mapped out a comprehensive program of over $100 million in new construction. Then when construction was delayed, DLI was forced to open temporary branches at the Air Force basic training center at Lackland Air Force Base in 1981 and at the Presidio of San Francisco in 1982. By the middle of the 1980's the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (C3I) had intervened to provide DoD Title IV funding, and several key projects were underway.

Space nevertheless remained tight throughout the school. A company of students was housed at Fort Ord, two nearby elementary schools were leased, logistics functions were divided up among seven buildings at the Presidio and Fort Ord, the faculty was shoehorned into tiny offices, and there was insufficient housing for permanent party personnel. Facilities on the Presidio were strained to the breaking point. Public utilities were antiquated and sometimes unreliable. The electrical power system was subject to frequent interruptions that wreaked havoc with the school's growing

inventory of computer equipment. The telephone system, over forty years old and a source of years of frustration, was upgraded in 1986 with a new switch board. Parking spaces were in short supply as the faculty doubled within a few years and ever more students brought their own automobiles.

Facilities management for the school was as complex a challenge for the school's leaders as logistics. A single facilities manager, Jerry Abeyta, coordinated these complex issues. DLI was considered a "tenant activity" on the installation, which was operated by Fort Ord. Thus the facilities engineers on post were controlled by Fort Ord under a garrison commander. Family quarters and the BOQ's were not assigned by the school. The large construction program was overseen by neither Fort Ord nor the school, but by a U.S. Army Corps of Engineers representative from the Sacramento District.

During 1986 several major projects were completed, including a $1,853,000 child care center. A dining facility was completely renovated at a cost of $979,000, and the largest available auditorium, the Tin Barn (Bldg. 518) which had been built in 1935, was renovated at a cost of $217,000. Other projects neared completion in 1986: a large general instructional facility for the new Russian School, a state-of-the-art fitness center, an academic library, more dormitories, a post exchange mini-mall and a huge logistics facility designed to bring all school logistics operations under one roof for the first time. In the mid-1980's the challenge in school facilities proved to be twofold: to protect programmed construction such as an academic auditorium, a military personnel center, a third general instructional facility, and a print plant, and to manage the process of bringing the new facilities into service with minimum disruptions to essential functions.[3]

Information Management

DLI was not receiving the office automation support it deserved in the mid-1980's. Initial hopes for a new age of "information management," in which modern computers would aid administrators, teachers and the support staff, remained unfulfilled. The DLI Information Systems Plan that was developed in 1982 had been neither funded nor followed. The school had used an IBM mainframe in the 1960's, a Harris 500 in the 1970's and a Harris 800, installed in 1981, to handle routine administrative work. In the early 1980's a flood of microcomputers had arrived at the school, $165,000 worth in FY 1985, rising to $850,000 worth in FY 1986.

Some were purchased or leased by the Director of Automation and Information Management, but many were specially provided by an outside agency to support particular tasks or reporting systems (the "stovepipe" systems, so called because they could not work with other systems at the school, but could only be used with similar systems outside the school). When Dr. Clifford welcomed COL Bullard in the spring of 1985, he wrote "our biggest problem in procuring equipment has to do with word processing and ADP equipment in general. We are making progress, but the administrative hurdles in this area are horrendous."[4]

The new age of information management continued to elude the school in 1986. When Mr. Fargo, the Director of Automation and Information Management, retired early in 1986, factors far beyond his control had left the entire area in shambles. While COL Offan struggled to provide day to day support to the school, deeply-rooted problems lay just below the surface that threatened to swamp the boat. An extensive IG inspection of information management in the school in November, 1986 rated "Primary Mission Accomplishment" as unsatisfactory.[5] Uncertainty and conflicting guidance throughout the defense information management community was a major problem. The automation division and instructional media center were both under commercial activities reviews.

This led directly to another major problem, the worst personnel situation in the entire school. The commercial activities reviews drove employees to seek permanent jobs elsewhere, and government salaries were inadequate to attract or retain qualified replacements. This imbroglio could not have come at a worse time, for there was in 1986 both too much aging equipment and too much new equipment. The staff was simply unable to use and maintain the old equipment while assimilating the new. The Army initiated a commercial activities review of the Automation Division in 1985 and the staff began to melt away. "Existing in the shadow of Silicon Valley just 70 miles distant places the Government at a competitive disadvantage for the most talented computer systems personnel who command private sector salaries double what our GS 9/11 programmers can aspire to here."[6] Through the end of 1986 three supervisors and ten others left, and the search for replacements was frustrating and laborious. The rest of the school learned to endure intermittent downtime and lingering problems with the mainframe. The microcomputers that proliferated throughout the school often lacked software, training, or maintenance support.

The Instructional Media Center, which in the 1950's and 1960's had been the national pace setter in foreign language teaching technology, had likewise fallen into neglect. Its extensive audiovisual studio and reproduction facilities were outmoded and in poor repair. The director of information management wrote that it "should have been replaced five years ago." A handful of maintenance technicians worked to keep the 1,400 language lab stations in working order. TRADOC had initiated a commercial activities review of the center in October 1983, and since then the staff had slowly melted away from there also. Three of the top four supervisors, with many years of experience, retired or left for other jobs in 1986. The decision to go commercial in the spring of 1987 was finally announced in December, 1986. The director then had to manage the transition process, including taking care of 23 government employees whose jobs were thereby eliminated.

The print plant, which had been continuously operating since 1943, was one of the world's largest producers of foreign language instructional materials. Yet it, too, was a source of concern to the school. A special TRADOC inspection uncovered serious problems there as well, and in mid-1986 a production coordination officer was empowered to try "to coordinate the many aspects of instructional materials production and delivery." Much

of the printing work load was contracted out: $681,000 in FY 1986 alone to the 1352nd AVS/ACB, Norton Air Force Base (formerly DAVA) or to commercial printers.

In late October COL Bullard put David J. Shoemaker in charge of the entire information management area with instructions to bring order out of the chaos. Shoemaker, a former Army officer and intelligence analyst, had extensive experience in key positions at the school, as well as having been a DLI language student himself. He plunged into the work, putting out fires, working with CPO on recruitment, and struggling to maintain a barely adequate level of essential services in each area. In his 1986 historical summary, written in April 1987, he listed no less than 14 "challenges" with which he was "grappling on a priority basis." Yet it was clear that the neglect of these vital functions over a period of years, coupled with a six-month leadership vacuum, could not be repaired in a few months' time. But by the end of the year the rebuilding process had clearly begun.

1. DLIFLC Logistics Division, Organizational Historical Summary, Calendar Year 1986; Interview with David F. Curran, 6 August 1987; DLIFLC Memorandum 10-1, 1 December 1984, para. 8-2d; DLIFLC *Fiscal Year 1986 Cost Review.*
2. DLIFLC, Accreditation Self Study Report (August, 1983), 144-58.
3. DLIFLC, Office of the School Secretary, Preparation of Organizational Historical Summaries, 26 February 1987; DLIFLC/SS Fact Sheet, Subject: DLIFLC Construction Program, 15 August 1985; OASD (C3I) Briefing to GOSC, Subject: Proposed DLI Military Construction Program, April 1987.
4. Letter, Dr. Clifford to COL Bullard, 5 June 1985; Historical Summary, Information Management Office (IMO), 24 April 1987. Compare Chapter 6, Directorate of Automation and Information Management, DLIFLC Memorandum 10-1, 1 December 1984, with Chapter 6. Information Management Office, DLIFLC Memorandum 10-1, 1 January 1987.
5. DLIFLC Command Inspection of Information Management Office (21-26 November 1986).
6. Historical Summary, Information Management Office (IMO), 24 April 1987, 4.

Glossary

AAC	Academic Advisory Council
ACE	American Council on Education
ACTFL	American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages
ADES	Assistant Dean for Evaluation and Standardization
AFSC	Air Force Specialty Code
AIMS	Automated Instructional Management System
AIT	Advanced Individual Training
ALS	Army Language School (1947-1963)
APR	Annual Program Review
ARI	Army Research Institute
ARPRINT	Army Program of Individual Training
ASVAB	Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery
ATC	Air Training Command
ATRRS	Army Training Requirements and Resources System
BASOPS	Base Operations
BCEP	Basic Course Enrichment Program
BILC	Bureau for International Language Coordination
BITW	Basic Instructor Training Workshop
CAI	Computer Assisted Instruction
CALICO	Computer Assisted Language Learning & Instruction Consortium
CALL	Computer Assisted Language Learning
Cat. I through IV	Categories of language difficulty
COB	Command Operating Budget
Competitive Service	Civil Service category of employees
CPO	Civilian Personnel Office
CRI	Criterion-Referenced Instruction
CRT	Criterion-Referenced Test
CSS	Central Security Service; the military component of NSA
CTI	Cryptologic Technician Interpretive (Navy)
CTS	Cryptologic Training System
CTSRep	CTS Representative
CTM	Cryptologic Training Manager
DA	Department of the Army
DAS	School of Asian Languages
DCSOPS	U.S. Army Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations and Planning, sometimes given as ODCSOPS for "Office of the DCSOPS"
DEA	Drug Enforcement Agency
D'ECOLE	Defense Executive Committee on Language Efforts
DEE	School of East European Languages

DEH	Department of Engineers and Housing
DES	Directorate of Evaluation and Standardization
DFLP	Defense Foreign Language Program
DGE	School of Germanic Languages
DIA	Defense Intelligence Agency
DLAB	Defense Language Aptitude Battery, designed to measure a student's ability to learn a foreign language
DLAT	Defense Language Aptitude Test, replaced by DLAB
DLI	Defense Language Institute
DLIFLC	Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center
DLPT	Defense Language Proficiency Test
DME	School of Middle East Languages
DoD	Department of Defense
DOIM	Directorate of Information Management
DRO	School of Romance Languages
DRU	School of the Russian Languages, now RU1
DTM	DIA Training Manager
EEO	Equal Employment Opportunity
EIDS	Electronic Information Delivery System
ES	Evaluation and Standardization
ESC	U.S. Air Force Electronic Security Command, the Air Force major command that supports NSA/CSS
EST	Tests and Standards Division
Excepted Service	Civil Service category of employee
FAO	Foreign Area Officer (Army)
FASTRAC	Faculty and Staff Rooms Accounting Report
FL	Foreign Language
FLAMRIC	Foreign Language Maintenance Refresher and Improvement Course
FLP	Foreign Language Program
FLTA	Foreign Language Training Advisor
FLTCE	Foreign Language Training Center Europe
FLTN/PO	Foreign Language Training NCO/Petty Officer
FSI	Foreign Service Institute
FY	Fiscal Year, 1 October to 30 September
Gateway	Language orientation for non-linguists
GOSC	General Officer Steering Committee, oversees the DFLP since 1981
GPAS	General Performance Appraisal System
GTTC	Goodfellow Technical Training Center, San Angelo, Texas
GS	General Schedule, covers professional, administrative, technical and clerical positions
Headstart	A language orientation course for non-linguists
HUMINT	Human Intelligence
ICC	Instructor Certification Course
ICH	Instructor Contact Hours
ILR	Interagency Language Roundtable

IM	Directorate of Information Management
IMP	Information Management Plan
INSCOM	U.S. Army Intelligence and Security Command, the Army major command that supports NSA/CSS
IPA	Intergovernmental Personnel Agreement
IPISD	Interservice Procedures for Instructional Systems Development
ISA	1. Interservice Support Agreement; 2. Instructional Systems Audit
ISD	Instructional Systems Development
ISP	Information Systems Plan
IT	Instructional Technology
IVD	Interactive Video Disk
JOREMA	Job Related Maintenance Material
Le Fox	An advanced Russian course for selected cryptologic students
LOD	Lackland Operating Detachment (1980-87)
LPO	Language Proponency Office, now Language Program Coordination Office
LSCP	Language Skill Change Project
MAG	Management Advisory Group
MARSUPBN	Marine Support Battalion, the Marine element that supports NSA/CSS
MATFL	Master of Arts Teaching Foreign Language
MCA	Major Construction Army, a federal budget category
MCAD	Marine Corps Administrative Detachment
MI	Military Intelligence, a branch for Army officers
MIIS	Monterey Institute of International Studies
MISLS	Military Intelligence Service Language School (1941-47)
MLA	Modern Language Association
MOLINK	Moscow-Washington Direct Communication Link; the famous "Hotline"
MOS	Military Occupational Specialty
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MTT	Mobile Training Team
NAVSECGRUCOM	Naval Security Group Command, the naval element that supports NSA/CSS
NEC	Navy Enlisted Classifications
NFFE Local 1263	National Federation of Federal Employees, DLI faculty union
NPS	New Personnel System, a system proposed by DLI in 1986
NSA	National Security Agency
NSGD	Naval Security Group Detachment
OMA	Operations and Maintenance Army, a federal budget category
OPA	Other Procurement Army, a federal budget category
OSD	Office of the Secretary of Defense

PAO	Public Affairs Office
PAT	Proficiency Advancement Test
PDP	Professional Development Program, a type of nonresident course
PDPEC	PDP Extension Course
PEP	Personnel Exchange Program
PERT	Program Evaluation, Research and Testing, another title for DES
POM	Presidio of Monterey
PSF	Presidio of San Francisco
PSI	Progressive Skill Integration
QRA	Quarterly Review and Analysis
QRIP	Quick Return on Investment Program
RAC	Resource Advisory Committee
RASC	Resource Advisory Subcommittee
RIF	Reduction-in-force, a formal procedure used to layoff government employees
RM	Directorate of Resource Management
SES	Senior Executive Service
SIGINT	Signals Intelligence
SMDR	Structure and Manning Decision Review
SME	Subject Matter Expert
SOQ:IE	Student Opinion Questionnaire: Instructional Effectiveness
SPIRIT	Systematic Productivity Review in TRADOC
SPM	Service Program Manager
SS	School Secretary
SSRS	Standardized Student Record System
STARS	Standard Time and Activity Reporting System
TCC	Technology Coordinating Council
TD	Directorate of Training Development
TDA	Table of Distribution and Allowances; the official Army authorization document for personnel and equipment
TL	Target Language
TLO	Terminal Learning Objective
TOA	Total Obligation Authority
TPC	U.S. Army Troop Command
TRADOC	U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command
TRAMEA	TRADOC Management Engineering Activity
TRAMIS	TRADOC Management Information System
TRAS	Training Requirements Analysis System
UFR	Unfinanced Requirement
VELVET	Video Enhanced Learning Video Enhanced Testing
WASC	Western Association of Schools and Colleges, accrediting agency
WG	Wage Grade, a category of government employee
WY	Workyear

Document List

1. Army Regulation 350-20, Management of the Defense Language Program, 15 July 1978.
2. Foreign Language GOSC, 25 September 1985, Summary Report.
3. Defense Foreign Language Program GOSC, 30 January 1986, draft minutes.
4. Defense Foreign Language Program (DFLP) GOSC, 2 October 1986. Summary Report.
5. DLIFLC Memorandum 10-1, Organization and Functions: Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center, 1 December 1984.
6. DLIFLC Table of Distribution and Allowances, Updated FY86 0286TDA, 30 July 1985.
7. DLIFLC, Minutes of Senior Management Planning Seminar, 8 November 1985.
8. DLIFLC Poster 22, Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center and Presidio of Monterey, 1 February 1984.
9. Letter, ATFL-RM to Commander, TRADOC, Subject: Defense Language Institute (DLI) Team Teaching Concept, 13 December 1985.
10. Letter, COL Monte R. Bullard to Commander, TRADOC, Subject: Commander's Annual Assessment, 30 January 1986.
11. Letter, COL Monte R. Bullard to Commander, TRADOC, Subject: Proposal for a Change to the Current Civil Service System, 7 April 1986.
12. DLI, *A Strategy for Excellence: DLI Master Plan for the Defense Language Program* (May 1986) (Extracts).
13. DLI, *Resident Foreign Language Training: Annual Statistical Report, Fiscal Year 1986*, 30 Septemer 1986.
14. DLIFLC, *Fiscal Year 1986 Cost Review*, 23 April 1987.
15. DLIFLC Pamphlet 350-10, Academic Policy and Standards, 1 October 1982.
16. DLIFLC Pamphlet 350-8, General Catalog, April 1986.
17. Negotiated Agreement Between Defense Language Institute, Presidio of Monterey, CA, and National Federation of Federal Employees Local 1263, 21 November 1986.
18. DLI Staff Directory, September 1986.

Note: The above listed documents are published in a separate volume, which is available for review in the historical office.