

DEFENSE LANGUAGE INSTITUTE  
FOREIGN LANGUAGE CENTER  
ANNUAL COMMAND HISTORY

(RCS CSHIS-6 [R3])

1 January - 31 December 1987

by  
James C. McNaughton  
Command Historian

June 1989  
Presidio of Monterey, California



## Contents

|         |  |     |
|---------|--|-----|
| Preface | .....  | iii |
| One     | The Defense Foreign Language Program in 1987 .....                               | 1   |
|         | Military Linguists and National Security .....                                   | 1   |
|         | Defense Foreign Language Program .....   | 2   |
|         | Criticisms and New Initiatives .....   | 3   |
| Two     | Managing the Defense Language Institute Foreign Language<br>Center in 1987 ..... | 11  |
|         | Crisis in Command .....  | 12  |
|         | Presidio of San Francisco .....  | 13  |
|         | Budget Crisis .....  | 14  |
|         | Change of Command .....  | 15  |
| Three   | Foreign Language Teaching in 1987 .....  | 19  |
|         | The Faculty Ramp-Up and Team Teaching .....                                      | 19  |
|         | Military Language Instructors .....  | 21  |
|         | Other Academic Areas .....   | 22  |
|         | DLIFLC Washington Office .....   | 23  |
|         | Supporting Military Linguists in the Field .....                                 | 24  |
|         | Curriculum Development .....   | 24  |
|         | Educational Technology: The Promise Continued .....                              | 25  |
|         | Program Evaluation, Research and Testing .....                                   | 26  |
|         | Educational Administration: Coping with Growth .....                             | 28  |
|         | Teachers as Personnel .....  | 29  |
| Four    | Foreign Language Learning in 1987 .....  | 33  |
|         | US Army Troop Command .....  | 34  |
|         | San Francisco Branch .....   | 34  |
|         | US Air Force 3483rd Student Squadron .....                                       | 35  |
|         | US Naval Security Group Detachment .....   | 36  |
|         | US Marine Corps Administrative Detachment .....                                  | 36  |
| Five    | Supporting Foreign Language Education in 1987 .....                              | 39  |
|         | Support Staff .....  | 39  |
|         | Logistics .....  | 41  |
|         | Facilities .....   | 42  |
|         | Information Management .....   | 43  |

## *Table of Contents*

|                      |       |    |
|----------------------|-------|----|
| <b>Conclusion</b>    | ..... | 47 |
| <b>Notes</b>         | ..... | 49 |
| <b>Glossary</b>      | ..... | 59 |
| <b>Document List</b> | ..... | 63 |
| <b>Index</b>         | ..... | 65 |

## Preface

The following work was written to give the interested reader a broad overview of the Defense Foreign Language Program (DFLP) and the Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center (DLIFLC) during 1987. My intention was that it could serve as a guide to all those who manage, teach within, or support the DFLP.

I have once again used a five-part model to analyze the educational process: an overall policy and resource environment (Chapter One), within which can be found managers (Chapter Two), teachers (Chapter Three), and students (Chapter Four), and all of which rests upon an administrative and logistical support base (Chapter Five).

When the institute and the DFLP are examined in this way, it becomes obvious that during 1987 each of these areas was in flux. Leadership changes, shifting student load, and budget difficulties were only the most obvious examples. Old and new existed side by side in many areas, probably more so than at any other time in the institute's history. The single most pressing challenge faced by everyone was the skillful management of these changes, from the individual classroom up to the highest policy levels.

My intent in this work was to give as clear an account as I could of these changes for the institute and the DFLP. I have been unable to include every detail of this complex story. My goal instead was to provide a meaningful overview of the highlights of the year. Readers interested in specific details or more background can look to my 1986 annual history, the sources I cite in the endnotes, the documentary supplement (available in the historical office), or the individual historical summaries prepared by each school and staff office.

Although this is an official history, I have enjoyed a free hand in the choice of topics, selection of materials, and interpretation. I therefore take sole responsibility for the final product. I also benefited from comments by readers of my first such annual history (covering calendar year 1986) published in August 1988. The present volume was first drafted between September and December 1988. Captain John A. Moore, USN, Lieutenant Colonel Peter W. Kozumplik, USA, Lieutenant Colonel Horst Marschall, USAF, and the staffs of the Resource Management Directorate and Language Program Coordination Office were especially helpful in commenting on the earlier drafts.

*James C. McNaughton  
Presidio of Monterey, California  
June 1, 1989*



Chapter One  
The Defense Foreign Language Program  
in 1987

The 1980s was a decade of great challenge and opportunity for the United States. Providing for national security in this "increasingly complex, dangerous, and ever-changing" world, as the official Army posture statement called it, demanded greater foreign language capabilities than ever before.<sup>1</sup> The contributions of thousands of military linguists only rarely received national attention, yet their jobs were more vital than ever.

*Military Linguists and National Security*

Two little-noticed events during 1987 served as painful reminders of the importance and perils of this work. The first came on the night of January 25, when a Navy EA-3B crashed onto the flight deck of the aircraft carrier USS *Nimitz*, slid over the edge, and plunged into in the inky waters of the Mediterranean near Greece, killing all seven aircrewmen. The EA-3B, nicknamed "The Whale" by aviators, was an electronic reconnaissance platform from Fleet Air Reconnaissance Squadron Two (VQ-2), based in Rota, Spain. Among the sailors lost in the accident were two military linguists, 20-year-old Craig R. Rudolf, and 28-year-old Patrick R. Price. They had learned Arabic and Russian, respectively, at the Department of Defense's primary foreign language training facility, the Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center (DLIFLC) at the Presidio of Monterey, California.<sup>2</sup>

Two months later another group of military linguists gathered on the Presidio of Monterey to commemorate an earlier incident, the death of Army Major Arthur D. Nicholson, Jr., who had been shot by a Soviet sentry in East Germany on March 24, 1985. Then serving on the US Military Liaison Mission, Nicholson had graduated from the DLIFLC Russian Basic Course in 1980. Two years after his death the institute dedicated its newest classroom building as Nicholson Hall for a new Russian School. The guest speaker was Brigadier General Roland LaJoie, USA, Defense Attache in Paris, who later that year was selected to organize and lead the first-ever US effort to conduct on-site arms control verification inside the borders of the Soviet Union.<sup>3</sup>

These brave military linguists stood in a long tradition of service to the nation's defense. In the fall of 1987 the institute celebrated the contributions made by military linguists of an earlier era on the forty-sixth anniversary of its founding. On October 30 a major photo exhibit was dedicated in the Asian School depicting the contributions of the World War II Japanese-American military linguists, or Nisei, who had turned the tide of war in the Pacific. On that day dozens of veterans of the Military Intelligence Service Language School (MISLS) returned to the school, which had changed much since their student days. Their stories of valor and hardship underscored the nation's

continuing need for interpreters, translators, interrogators, and cryptolinguists who could use their language skills as critical combat multipliers.<sup>4</sup>

Challenges no less critical continued to face military linguists in the 1980s. The national security establishment still had urgent, world-wide requirements for language-qualified personnel. As in the past, the fundamental problem was that American schools and universities were simply not producing enough graduates who could communicate with the rest of the world in any language other than English. This crippling deficiency continued to manifest itself in trade, diplomacy, and national security. As Congressman Leon E. Panetta (D-Monterey) wrote in 1986, "It is vitally important that we focus Congressional and national attention on the integral role of foreign language skills in our national security and economic well-being in this increasingly interdependent world."<sup>5</sup>

### *Defense Foreign Language Program*

The Department of Defense was more aware of this than most other government agencies, and so continued to strengthen its foreign language training. The organizational structure it had used since 1963 to carry this mission out was the Defense Foreign Language Program (DFLP), under the supervision of the US Army Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations and Plans (DCSOPS) as "Executive Agent". The demands placed on this system were greater than ever, but by 1987 it became clear that this training would have to be provided within ever-tighter budget constraints.

The structure of the DFLP in 1987 remained essentially unchanged. A revised joint service regulation governing the Defense Foreign Language Program was published on March 15, 1987, and the DFLP General Officer Steering Committee (GOSC) approved a revision of DoD Directive 5160.41 (although it was not published until the spring of 1988).<sup>6</sup> These two documents left the basic structure of the DFLP unaltered. Founded since the previous editions were written, the GOSC was incorporated into both documents for the first time, using the language of its 1981 charter. The revised joint service regulation endorsed the separation of the English Language Program from the Foreign Language Program, which had actually taken place some ten years before. It incorporated for the first time the Interagency Language Roundtable (ILR) Language Skill Level Descriptions, and it appended the charter documents of the Cryptologic (DoD Dir. 5210.70) and General Intelligence (DoD Dir. 3305.2) Training Systems. This juxtaposition of intelligence training directives thus invited training managers at all levels to consider the three overlapping systems as an interacting whole.<sup>7</sup>

One significant change in the revised regulations involved a strengthening of the role of the Cryptologic Training Manager (CTM), who was the management authority of the Cryptologic Training System (CTS), which covered all cryptologic and cryptologic-related training. He was also the Assistant Director for Training, National Security Agency/Central Security Service (NSA/CSS). The Executive Agents for the Foreign Language Center and English Language Center were tasked to "solicit skill requirements and



final learning objectives from the principal mission sponsors requiring language skills and, through the commandants, [and] periodically inform them as to curriculum content and major course changes." It stated clearly however that "commandants shall have final authority for course structure to meet these requirements and objectives."<sup>8</sup> According to the joint service regulation, the CTM had the authority to "establish learning objectives for foreign language training of all DoD cryptologic personnel"<sup>9</sup> and he was authorized to provide DLIFLC "results of cryptologic mission performance evaluations that reveal specific training deficiencies which require resolution".<sup>10</sup> Non-DLIFLC language training programs "for internal use or special missions for which the Agency or DoD Component maintains operational responsibility" were specifically exempted from the "technical control" exercised by the DLIFLC commandant.<sup>11</sup>

The commandant was also directed to "establish and maintain a direct technical link with the Commandant, National Cryptologic School."<sup>12</sup> A new CTS representative to DLIFLC, James H. Painter, arrived in December 1986 from the staff of the Language Department of the National Cryptologic School. The former Navy cryptolinguist and Russian instructor had held the same position from 1978 until 1984. His knowledge of the institute's programs and of language training in general was reflected in his comprehensive monthly activities reports that kept the entire defense foreign language training community informed about the institute's programs.<sup>13</sup>

#### *Criticisms and New Initiatives*

New regulations, however, did little to address some of the persistent problems that DFLP managers had repeatedly faced. Some of these were brought to light in the spring of the year, when the US Army Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC) Inspector General's office issued a report on the Army Foreign Language Program, and by implication, on the entire DFLP. The report was sharply critical of the lack of properly trained linguists in the field: "Basically stated, the field does not have language trained soldiers with the required foreign language skills (e.g., job-specific) to execute the mission critical tasks on the modern battlefield." It laid the blame for this on the lack of coordination among the various agencies involved in the language training process. "All the programs were not being systematically developed to accomplish a common goal." The report pointed in particular to the difference between "general" and "job-specific" language proficiency, which caused problems in designing training programs and measuring the results. "The current program is lacking a concept, the identification and analysis of deficiencies, the systematic development of the appropriate corrective actions and a plan to implement these actions." Measured against TRADOC's Concept Based Requirements System, the report concluded that the Defense Foreign Language Program was ill-prepared to address the problems in the field.<sup>14</sup>

In reply, the DLIFLC provost, Dr. Ray T. Clifford, agreed with the report's finding that the problems were systemic, rather than specific to the

institute. He noted that "DLIFLC alone cannot fix systemic problems if the DFLP is so fragmented that it can only be called an 'environment' rather than a system. . . . The report's findings make it clear that unless a joint approach to solving systemic problems is adopted, the absence of a linguist training system will prevent resolution of these decade old problems in the future just as it has in the past. The greatest contribution of the report is its recognition that all the players in the Defense Foreign Language Program must cooperate if we are to fix the systemic problems it has identified." He endorsed the concept of providing "bridge" training at DLIFLC to fill the gap between foundation language training and technical job skills and concluded his response with a call for cooperation, noting that "none of us can do it alone."<sup>15</sup>

Such criticisms of long-standing problems within the DFLP were symptomatic of an underlying lack of confidence in DLIFLC by many individuals in the services and user agencies. This dissatisfaction was summed up in an article in *Army Magazine* the following year, which charged that "millions of dollars are spent each year to train new linguists at the Defense Language Institute, Foreign Language Center (DLIFLC). Still, we do not have a pool of fully qualified linguists to meet our mission requirements."<sup>16</sup> However these critics of the DFLP tended to overlook substantial progress that was being made during 1987 on a wide range of specific issues.

The year also witnessed a turn over in the top leadership responsible for meeting these problems. Major General James B. Allen, Jr., served as DFLP manager and GOSC chairman in his capacity as Director of Training, ODCSOPS, until November, when he was succeeded by Colonel Larry G. Lehowicz. Colonel Lehowicz had served three years as an infantry brigade commander in Germany, followed by eighteen months in ODCSOPS. Whitney E. Reed had come on board as CTM in August of 1986 after four years as chief of a major NSA field element in Germany. Lieutenant Colonel Howard K. "Tip" Hansen replaced Lieutenant Colonel Nick O'Dawe as Executive Agent staff action officer in September. TRADOC, which had administrative responsibility for DLIFLC, experienced two key leadership changes that year: General Maxwell R. Thurman replaced General Carl E. Vuono as TRADOC commander that summer, and Brigadier General Steven L. Arnold replaced the Assistant Deputy Chief of Staff for Training, Brigadier General Bobby F. Brashears, in December. Lieutenant Colonel Alan Meyer also joined the TRADOC staff as the staff action officer responsible for DLIFLC. Several other staff positions changed hands during the year. For example, the DLIFLC liaison officer in Washington, Lieutenant Colonel Kenneth C. Keating, was replaced in July by Lieutenant Colonel Peter W. Kozumplik, who quickly forged a close working relationship with Hansen at ODCSOPS and Meyer at TRADOC.

Most importantly, the top military leadership at DLIFLC itself was replaced in the fall. Colonel Todd Robert Poch succeeded Colonel Monte R. Bullard as commandant, and Colonel Ronald I. Cowger, USAF, replaced Colonel Edward M. Wyras, USAF, as assistant commandant in October. This complete turn over in leadership for the institute is discussed in the following chapter.



**The GOSC.** *This photograph taken at the January 28, 1988, meeting at DLIFLC, reflects the new membership that joined the GOSC during 1987. Front row from left: Whitney E. Reed, SES V (ADIRNSA), Colonel Todd Robert Poch (Commandant), Brigadier General Larry G. Lehowicz (Director of Training, ODCSOPS), Colonel Steven L. Arnold (DCST, TRADOC), Major General Clyde F. Autio, USAF (OACSI); second row: Sally J. Schwartzkopf, SES II (NCS), Colonel Ronald I. Cowger, USAF (Assistant Commandant), John J. Guenther, SES IV (Director of Intelligence, USMC), William E. Manning, SES IV (OASA[MRA]), Robert E. Martin, GS-15 (DTM), Craig L. Wilson, GS-15 (OASD [C3I]), Dr. Ray T. Clifford, GS-15 (Provost), Colonel Robert M. DePhilippis, USAF (Chief of Staff), Colonel Richard J. Powers, Jr. (ODCSINT), Captain Daniel L. Currie, USN (NAVSECGRUCOM).*

The agencies that used military linguists to accomplish their missions continued to be concerned about the proficiency of graduates from DLIFLC basic courses. After the Army and National Security Agency conducted formal Language Needs Assessments, the September 1985 GOSC had endorsed a graduation requirement for basic course students that set L-2, R-2, and S-1 proficiencies as "a CTS job requirement and a DLI training goal," beginning in October 1987. As the provost later put it, "Level 2 proficiency is the

minimum level of ability needed to accurately extract essential elements of information from extended narrative and discourse." DLIFLC interpreted this requirement to be "level 2 proficiency in listening comprehension and one other skill, with no skill lower than level one."<sup>17</sup> The provost briefed the implementation of the 2/2 standard as the first item on the October 1986 GOSC agenda. By the time it was implemented for classes that began after 1 October 1987, DLIFLC had established a new graduation policy under which only those students who met the new standard were given diplomas; all others received certificates of completion or attendance.<sup>18</sup>

Army staff officers also took a renewed interest in language training during 1987. They met several times during the spring and summer to conduct a thorough review of the Army Language Program (ALP). Under the leadership of Lieutenant General Sidney T. Weinstein and his action officer, Colonel Richard J. Powers, Jr., the ALP Review Committee began to develop an updated ALP Action Plan based on the previous plan, written in 1985.<sup>19</sup>

In addition to establishing basic course graduation standards, a joint CTS-TRADOC-Air Training Command (ATC) task force was established in August 1987 "to analyze systemic problems within the linguist training system." Earlier in the summer, the DLIFLC Language Proponency Office developed a military terminology training module. The joint task force, however, went one step further and developed a lengthy set of "final learning objectives" for cryptologic students, as authorized in the revised DoD Directive 5160.41. These FLOs, as they were named, were modeled on the Terminal Learning Objectives (TLOs) that had been used at DLIFLC in the 1970s. They were officially transmitted to the Executive Agent on November 25, 1987, and were discussed at the January 1988 GOSC meeting. Shortly thereafter DLIFLC began a trial using "Military Activities Modules" in the Basic Spanish course, and other departments began developing similar programs. The FLOs were intended to "sharpen the focus" for cryptologic students during basic language courses to prepare them better for further technical training.<sup>20</sup>

The FLO issue touched on some sensitive areas within the DFLP, such as the proper role of the Military Language Instructors (MLIs) and Colonel Bullard's vision of DLIFLC as an educational institution for general language proficiency, rather than purely as a training institution. During 1986 the role of the MLIs had been substantially reshaped by Colonel Bullard, who had abolished the formerly independent Foreign Language Training Division and placed them directly under the departmental chairmen, as will be further described in Chapter Three. During 1987 the MLIs were still working out their new organizational relationships and responsibilities.

By the end of 1987, most DFLP managers felt confident that an effective strategy had been developed whereby such job-specific requirements could be used to enhance foundation language instruction provided cryptologic students. Therefore the Defense Intelligence Agency Training Manager began the following year to develop parallel FLOs emphasizing different skills for non-cryptologic students. Although Colonel Bullard remained critical of the way in which the FLOs had been developed by a user agency, his

successor, Colonel Poch, was willing to accept guidance on the "product", while continuing to insist, as had his predecessor, that the school be given a free hand in the "process."<sup>21</sup>

Another way of addressing the systemic problems within the DFLP was to improve communication between DLIFLC and the training centers to which most of its graduates subsequently reported. In the spring of 1987, the CTM arranged for an evaluation feedback conference at the Goodfellow Technical Training Center. When the meeting was finally held August 10-14, Goodfellow agreed to provide substantial feedback on recent graduates. DLIFLC agreed to consider shifting the emphasis in its basic courses towards certain military and job-specific skills. The overarching purpose for revitalizing communication between the two schools was so that they together "could best analyze and structure their respective programs so as to insure that the field linguist -- the end product of a joint DLI/Goodfellow instructional sequence -- would have the necessary foundation language, job relevant/job-related language instruction, and technical MOS training to be able to do the best possible job in his or her duty assignment."<sup>22</sup>

The services also took note that another important aspect of the linguist problem was poor retention rates. Major General Allen tasked the service program managers at the October 1986 GOSC meeting to take a close look at their individual strategies to hold on to trained military linguists, who were precious, hard-to-replace assets. At the March 1987 GOSC meeting the four services presented information papers on their retention of their linguists, in which all claimed improved in-service language training and utilization programs and two mentioned bonus programs. But a new incentive was coming on-line that many hoped would make a difference: foreign language proficiency pay.<sup>23</sup>

As early as 1985 the services had prepared proposals for proficiency pay for military linguists to encourage language proficiency maintenance by the individual linguist. This had been sent to the Office of the Secretary of Defense by the summer of 1985 and Congress appropriated \$7.3 million to implement it during FY 1987. However the services could not agree on the first draft of a single implementation plan, so they drafted individual implementation plans to meet the DoD-directed implementation date of April 15, 1987. In common to all plans, linguists were to be tested annually and payments ranged from \$25 per month for Category I languages at lower ratings up to \$100 per month for higher proficiency in more difficult languages. The services began making payments late in calendar year 1987, retroactive to April 15, 1987. The impact of these incentive payments on language maintenance, linguist retention and the administrative side effects of a larger volume of language testing would need even more time to assess.<sup>24</sup>

Another critical problem facing the services was maintenance and refresher training in the field. The March 1987 GOSC endorsed a master plan for nonresident training that had been drawn up by a DoD task force chaired by Nonresident Training Division Chief Charles D. Olney. This plan called for a more active role for DLIFLC's Nonresident Training Division. It established a new joint DLIFLC/Service Program Manager/User Agency Nonresid-

ent Training Advisory Team, directed development of new courses, and called for increased exploitation of emerging technologies. A more active outreach program of mobile training teams, needs analysis studies and program evaluations were also included. Despite the efforts of the task force, their ambitious plan remained unfunded during FY 1987, as Colonel Bullard shifted resources to cover dramatically rising personnel costs for resident instruction.<sup>25</sup>

In conjunction with a DoD-wide reorganization of Special Operations Forces (SOF) launched earlier in the decade, 1987 also saw revival of interest in language instruction to meet their needs. The US Special Operations Command was activated in April 1987, but as early as January 1986 the GOSC had discussed a proposal for DLIFLC to play a stronger role in Special Forces language training. In the spring of 1987 Forces Command proposed that DLIFLC take over the operation of foreign language training programs at Fort Bragg that had traditionally supported the Army Special Forces. In September the Army service program manager for language issues hosted an in-progress review of the SOF language program that discussed a proposal from the John F. Kennedy Special Warfare Center to expand its program of basic language training. The agreement to study the issue between DLIFLC and the Special Warfare Center was formalized the following spring.<sup>26</sup>

During 1987 the managers of the DFLP worked intensively to address these and other issues facing the program. Their sense of purpose was driven by a common recognition of the urgency and importance of their task. During the fall, as the new leadership began to take over the reins, they worked to identify which problems they had to tackle first, then to fix the threatening budgetary troubles for DLIFLC discussed in the following chapter, and finally to make the entire system work more smoothly. They hoped thereby to restore service and user agency confidence in the system as a whole.

In this process the leaders were reminded that each component of the system had a separate role to play. Within weeks of taking command in October, Colonel Poch visited each member of the GOSC to strengthen cooperative working relationships within the DFLP. He carried with him a simple message to define the differing roles of DLIFLC and the user agencies: "I made clear to all user agencies that there is a distinct difference between the product i.e., the skills which DLI imparts to its students and the process, the means by which the Institute achieves the acquisition of those skills. . . . The latter is a pedagogical question and is by expertise and structure the rightful domain of the Institute." A new spirit of cooperation with the services and user agencies was evident by the end of the year.<sup>27</sup>

By personal contacts such as these, and active use of his Washington Liaison Office, Colonel Poch moved aggressively through the remainder of the year to make the system work more efficiently. He continually reminded other actors within the system of DLIFLC's proper role and of their own responsibilities. A major part of this education process was to remind user agencies that DLIFLC could accept no requirements without resources.

Therefore all requirements had to be approved by the DFLP manager in ODCSOPS, who provided those resources.<sup>28</sup>

The events of 1987 demonstrated once again that the complex system designed to fill these vital national requirements could only operate with what the Cryptologic Training Manager, speaking before the January 1988 GOSC, called "an alliance of professionalism and friendship."<sup>29</sup> As 1988 approached, new challenges began to appear on the horizon for the DFLP. Events in Central America, the Persian Gulf, and elsewhere were pointing to increased requirements for language-qualified personnel. Even America's strategic relationship with the Soviet Union began to show dramatic movement on several key issues that had long separated the two countries.





## Chapter Two

### Managing the Defense Language Institute

#### Foreign Language Center in 1987

The primary mission of the Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center (DLIFLC) during 1987 continued to be resident foreign language instruction for the Department of Defense. However, for the institute's top leadership, it was a year of rapid change. At the beginning of the year DLIFLC was led by Colonel Monte R. Bullard, USA, commandant since August 1985, and Colonel Jack A. Martines, USAF, assistant commandant since May 1986. Before year's end, both were gone. In their places were two new men, Colonel Todd Robert Poch, USA, as commandant and Colonel Ronald I. Cowger, USAF, as assistant commandant. Before he left, Colonel Bullard had also expanded the command group by creating a chief of staff position, first filled by Colonel Robert M. DePhilippis, USAF. An unusual number of challenges confronted both the old and new leadership during the year that in many ways represented a turning point in the history of the institute.<sup>1</sup>

The momentum of Colonel Bullard's first full year in command continued into 1987. New faculty hiring continued its rapid pace and team teaching gradually spread into department after department. A facilities expansion program brought a new building to completion almost every other month, and the institute won TRADOC's Installation of Excellence Award. Colonel Bullard's masterplan, *A Strategy for Excellence*, was updated in March and October. He also published a ten-year long-range plan that showed how faculty professionalization, new technology, and better management could be integrated to achieve ever higher levels of language proficiency. Separate masterplans were drafted for nonresident training, research, and educational technology. Major Ron Cochran, the former adjutant, published "DLI 2000," a speculative look at what the school might become in the future. Most importantly, DLPT scores for graduates began to show a substantial rise in several languages.<sup>2</sup>

In the wings, a major addition to the institute's management structure was slowly approaching reality. In 1986 Colonel Bullard had recommended the establishment of a board of visitors for DLIFLC similar to that of several other high-level DoD schools. He hoped that this board of distinguished civilian overseers from outside DoD and the DFLP would bolster his efforts to have DLIFLC recognized as an academic institution fundamentally different from other US Army Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC) schools. The proposal won approval at TRADOC, the Department of the Army (DA), the General Officer Steering Committee (GOSC), and the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD). It was approved by the Office of Management and Budget early in 1987. However, nomination and confirmation of the board's first members was not completed until September 1988.<sup>3</sup>

These positive developments were obscured by a snowballing of problems within DLIFLC and the DFLP. A significant contributing factor was the budget downturn from the Gramm-Rudman Bill that rippled through the entire Defense Department during 1987 and threatened to halt plans to modernize and expand the institute. The secretary of defense who had overseen the large-scale military expansion and modernization during the 1980s, Caspar W. Weinberger, stepped down late in the year. Service forecasts of language training requirements also shifted, with attendant impact on DLIFLC's future plans. User agencies were simultaneously stepping up their pressure to improve the quality of military linguists.

Within DLIFLC, many staff and faculty members felt that too much was changing too fast. No one doubted that the institute, like the services in general, were riding on a wave of changes, some minor, but many major. Most of DLIFLC's administrative publications were rewritten in the fall and winter of 1986-87. Ever-growing numbers of the faculty were newcomers, and the largest faculty group, the Russian instructors, had just been divided into two separate schools. More than two hundred supervisors and managers attended "Leadership Effectiveness Seminars" during the same period to spread the message that they had to do a better job of managing their subordinates. Many Military Language Instructors strongly disagreed with Colonel Bullard's new policy of assigning them directly to the departments. Frustrating delays were encountered in key areas, including construction projects, team teaching, Electronic Information Delivery System (EIDS) and publication of the professional journal. For the teachers, there were new standard job descriptions, a new union contract, a new retirement system, and delays in winning approval for the New Personnel System.

### *Crisis in Command*

By early 1987 fundamental differences had emerged between Colonel Bullard and Colonel Martines that seriously marred the start of the new year. After half a year as assistant commandant, Colonel Martines had developed strong reservations about how Colonel Bullard was implementing some of his reforms. In mid-January Colonel Bullard returned from a trip to the East Coast and summarily relieved Colonel Martines, charging that he had been undercutting the commandant's authority. This unprecedented move drew high-level attention from the Army Staff, Air Staff, and the GOSC, and focused attention on Colonel Bullard's reforms and management style.

In the weeks that followed, DLIFLC was visited by Brigadier General Bobby F. Brashears, the TRADOC Assistant Deputy Chief of Staff for Training, and a team from the Army Inspector General's Office to examine the controversy in detail. Brigadier General Brashears also returned in April and again in July for the Quarterly Review and Analysis presentations. In the end, Colonel Bullard's command prerogative was upheld, while Colonel Martines was reassigned in May to command of a military airlift support group in the Pacific.



*Colonel Monte R. Bullard,  
Commandant, DLIFLC,  
1985 - 1987.*

Colonel Edward M. Wyras, USAF, recently promoted to colonel, took over as acting assistant commandant. Navy Commander Sydney D. Thornton, the institute's executive officer, succeeded Colonel Wyras as school secretary. In May, Colonel Bullard moved to improve his staff's coordination by creating the position of chief of staff. As its first incumbent, he named Colonel Robert M. DePhilippis, USAF, who had worked as his special assistant for the New Personnel System and staff development training since his assignment to DLIFLC in 1986.<sup>4</sup>

#### *Presidio of San Francisco*

As this leadership crisis was being resolved, another problem arose from an unexpected direction. Operating quietly in a decommissioned Public Health Service Hospital building on the Presidio of San Francisco, the DLIFLC San Francisco Branch had taught German, Spanish, and Korean to Army enlisted students since it had been opened in 1982 as a temporary response to overcrowding at the Presidio of Monterey. The GOSC had already agreed in the fall of 1985 to the branch's eventual closure. But the institute's leaders were pleased with its results. In April 1987 a fourth department, Russian, was added, and by the end of the year, three classes of thirty students each were studying Russian. The branch's commander, Lieutenant Colonel

## *Chapter Two*

William S. Devine, was promoted to colonel in April and was redesignated assistant commandant for the branch.

During these same years a major public health crisis was erupting in San Francisco, the AIDS epidemic. As medical authorities scrambled to deal with this devastating disease, California's congressional delegation began to consider reconverting the building, which had closed down as a hospital in 1981, into a regional AIDS treatment facility. On March 13, 1987, San Francisco *Chronicle* reporter Randy Shilts published a report that the city Department of Public Health was negotiating to take it over. Within days, San Francisco's two major daily newspapers published several additional articles and editorials supporting the takeover.<sup>5</sup> At the initiative of two California Representatives, Barbara Boxer (D-San Francisco/Marin) and Ron Dellums (D-Oakland), the House Armed Services Committee Subcommittee on Military Facilities gave its approval on April 2. On April 13 Senator Pete Wilson (D-California) and San Francisco Mayor Dianne Feinstein toured the facility and lent their support to the project, but they admitted that it would take \$10 to \$15 million in federal dollars to convert it.

Colonel Devine and his small staff labored to produce the necessary contingency plans and impact statements during the rest of the year, as various options were considered. TRADOC and FORSCOM headquarters, and the DA and OSD staff were actively involved. Alternatives considered included other facilities at the Presidio of San Francisco, Oakland Army Base, and Fort Ord, among others. Funding was a major uncertainty. The Department of Defense opposed the whole idea, as did some medical authorities in San Francisco. Finally in late September the Senate approved the conversion, with final details being resolved later in the year by a House-Senate conference committee. Questions of timing, funding and the fate of the hundred or more instructors spilled over into the following year.<sup>6</sup>

### *Budget Crisis*

Resourcing issues moved to center stage a few months later. At stake was the preservation of the institute's recent advances and continued growth in the face of anticipated fiscal austerity. For DLIFLC, the last months of FY 1987 and the first few of FY 1988 were among the most financially troubled in memory. TRADOC had initially provided slightly lower levels of funding in FY 1987 than the institute had used the previous year. By the spring of 1987 it became clear that the increased costs of the instructor ramp-up, as well as the 3.0% federal pay raise would require additional funding before the end of the year. By that time, a Defense Department-wide spending slowdown had left financial managers at DLIFLC and TRADOC little flexibility. The end-of-year shortfall came as an unpleasant surprise. Even after the institute's leaders instituted short-term austerity measures and took a hard look at all their programs, they still had to turn to TRADOC for an additional \$1.38 million to close out the year. The civilian work force eventually grew 13% to 1232, but non-personnel spending declined nearly 20%, mostly in supplies, equipment, and the printing of nonresident training materials.<sup>7</sup>

The prospect for the next fiscal year was even less promising. Beginning in early 1987, the DLIFLC Resource Management Directorate warned the TRADOC staff that the funding in the FY 1988 Budget and Manning Guidance was inadequate even to maintain current levels of operation. TRADOC was then in transition to a new resource management system, and the institute's GOSC-approved initiatives were not factored into the budget planning process. The Command Operating Budget submitted in May identified \$15.3 million in unfinanced requirements, over half of which were merely to maintain current levels of operation.<sup>8</sup>

To make matters worse, some of the services were hitting historic lows in student fill rates in the first few months of FY 1987. The services had earlier projected continued growth in training requirements, but were unable to deliver the promised number of students out of their respective training pipelines. The Director of Resource Management presented figures to the March GOSC that showed that the Air Force fill rate for the first four months of FY 1987 had dropped from 87% in FY 1986 to 60% and the Navy's rate had dropped from 91% to 69% in the same period. The exact numbers were disputed by the services, but unusually low rates continued for the rest of the year. Although the Air Force fill rate crept up to a year-end average of 65%, the Army fill rate slipped from 82% to 78%. The overall student fill rate slipped from 83.5% in FY 1986 to 75% in FY 1987. Adding to these uncertainties were chronic problems with the student data base and scheduling systems, caused in part by the Army-wide transition to the new automated Army Training Requirements and Resources System (ATRRS).<sup>9</sup>

### *Change of Command*

Following this controversy-strewn winter and spring, Colonel Bullard announced he was stepping down after only two years in command. In a final interview with the institute's newspaper, he summed up his tenure as commandant: "We have worked hard to improve [the reputation of the institute] . . . by examining ourselves to see if there aren't ways that we can improve our teaching methods, . . . and that has to do with the movement to make DLI a more professional academic organization. The key now is to assure continuity of the programs that we've begun in the last two years." He had worked hard to initiate the transformation of the institute into something more in line with his vision of what a quality academic institution ought to look like. This vision of academic excellence would become his most lasting legacy to the institute. On October 15, Bullard handed over command of the institute to Colonel Todd Robert Poch.<sup>10</sup>

Colonel Poch called his assignment to DLIFLC a homecoming, for he had been to the institute as a student no less than four times during his career. In his first few months he also frequently remarked that this was his third command assignment in just two years. His most recent assignments had been as commander of the New York Area Command and Fort Hamilton, New York, and an ROTC brigade. He was a three-time Bronze Star winner in Vietnam, had done some graduate work at Harvard and Tufts in international



*Colonel Todd Robert Poch,  
Commandant, DLIFLC,  
15 October 1987.*

affairs, developmental economics and international law. He was also a foreign area officer certified in two regions, Western Europe and Southeast Asia, where he had served on the Joint Thai-US Military Commission.<sup>11</sup>

Colonel Poch declared his deepest admiration for what DLIFLC had already achieved, and he assured everyone that he would not permit the institute's temporary budget problems to result in a "degradation of quality." As he later put it in an address to the faculty, "Resourcing is required for quality. . . . There will be no compromise on quality." He later told his staff that the TRADOC Commanding General had sent him to DLIFLC with a twofold mission. The first was to "take command." The second was to take a close look at the school, and if it was "turning out a quality product," to "project it into the international arena." To meet these goals and the challenges he faced would call upon all the leadership and resource management skills he had developed throughout his career.<sup>12</sup>

For assistant commandant the Air Force chose Colonel Ronald I. Cowger. Although he was not a linguist, when he came on October 22 he brought to the institute the management skills he had sharpened in his assignment as base commander of Chanute Air Force Base, Illinois, for the two previous years. He was also a Bronze Star winner in Vietnam, together with the Distinguished Flying Cross. From the first day he joined Colonel Poch, they were both plunged into a battle to restore full funding to the

institute's programs. Overnight, Colonel Cowger became the commandant's budget expert.<sup>13</sup>

Throughout the fall Poch and Cowger labored to fend off the budget threats to the institute's programs which they felt imperiled the recent improvements and cut to the heart of its excellence. For weeks on end they worked closely and intensively with the resource management staff, the Executive Agent staff officer, Lieutenant Colonel Howard K. Hansen, Jr., at ODCSOPS, and Lieutenant Colonel Peter W. Kozumplik at the DLIFLC Washington Liaison Office.

National events in the fall formed an ominous backdrop to these budgetary problems. On October 19 the New York Stock Exchange was shocked when the Dow Jones Industrial Average plunged over 500 points, raising new concerns about the underlying stability of the nation's entire financial system. The federal budget for Fiscal Year 1988 was not enacted into law until December 22, 1987. In November, Caspar Weinberger, who as President Reagan's first Secretary of Defense had presided over the largest peacetime military expansion in US history, stepped down after six years in office.

Colonel Poch and his staff briefed Colonel Lehowicz, the Director of Training, ODCSOPS, on November 25 on the institute's projected funding shortfall, and received top-level endorsement for avoiding cutbacks. After repeated trips, messages and high-level discussions, the key funding issues were finally resolved by the Executive Agent in late January 1988. The result was an overwhelming endorsement of the institute's programs and a firm vote for quality rather than quantity. The Installation Contract for FY 1988 was signed by Colonel Poch and the TRADOC Commanding General, General Maxwell R. Thurman, on February 17, 1988. The institute emerged from this intense scrutiny of its programs and resource management procedures in a far stronger position than ever before, especially since the Army faced serious cuts in other important programs in the years ahead.<sup>14</sup>

By the end of 1987 DLIFLC had undergone a complete turnover in top leadership and had successfully surmounted a major funding crisis. Both old and new leaders had faced challenges unequalled since the reorganization of the mid-1970s. The institute was clearly at another turning point in its history, but not until well into the following year would it become clear which way it would turn. An extensive program of academic and administrative reforms had been articulated and set in motion by two successive commandants. What remained to be done was the implementation of those reforms to enable the institute to achieve true excellence. However, some of the significant gains that were made during 1987 were obscured by crises of the moment that did not serve the institute well.





Chapter Three  
Foreign Language Teaching  
in 1987

The primary mission of the Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center was the teaching of over thirty foreign languages. It was unique among all the schools in the US Army Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC) for the diversity of subjects taught and the diversity of its faculty. During 1987 nearly eight hundred instructors worked hard to hold firm to their reputation for excellence, while moving on to new challenges.

Their reputation for teaching excellence was exemplified by the seven teachers selected as "Instructors of the Year" for 1987. These model teachers, one from each school, and each with a distinctly different classroom style, represented the best in language teaching. Together they demonstrated that foreign language teaching was a profession, not just an occupation. Vladimir Zeltser of the School of the Russian Language spoke for all when he said, "I like my job -- it's my hobby, my life, everything for me." His advice to others was simple: "If a teacher knows what to teach, how to teach it and likes this profession, that teacher will be successful." Gisela Taeuber of German Department B echoed his remarks: "I still enjoy teaching. If you like to teach, there's always something new in the wings for you -- new challenges, new tasks."<sup>1</sup>

This academic excellence received further recognition in August when the American Council on Education sent an evaluation team for a periodic review of the institute's curriculum and teaching. They renewed their long-standing recommendation that colleges and universities grant academic credit for language courses taken at DLIFLC.<sup>2</sup>

*The Faculty Ramp-Up and Team Teaching*

Two developments will be remembered as pivotal to the teaching process at DLIFLC during 1987: the influx of newly hired instructors and the spread of Team Teaching. These two changes caused a sense of ferment and anticipation within the institute.

More teachers were hired during 1987 than in any previous year for decades, as 163 new instructors joined the teaching staff. About half these newcomers were hired to teach Russian.<sup>3</sup> Some departments nevertheless saw a sharp contraction in training requirements, which presented troubling questions about the future. The Czech Department, for example, taught barely half the number of students in FY 1987 as in the year before.<sup>4</sup>

Closely tied with the expansion in faculty was the spread of Team Teaching, the most significant innovation during the year. Developed by Colonel Bullard and the provost, Dr. Clifford, during 1985-86, Team Teaching was a management strategy that promised to tap the latent energy of teachers

and students by increasing bonding and a sense of responsibility. As the provost explained:

The concept is based on a commitment at all levels of the organization to building trust and a sense of personal involvement among faculty and staff, and thereby, to create an environment in which teachers are allowed to reach their full professional potential. Team Teaching will foster initiative and innovation by stimulating faculty creativity, by encouraging faculty responsiveness to institutional needs, and by providing broad flexibility of action.<sup>5</sup>

The concept was built on a ratio of six teachers for every three ten-student sections (6:3), which would allow for a sharing of administrative duties, coaching, and substitutions to cover for illnesses and other absences. Team-building was fostered by special workshops by the Faculty and Staff Development Division trainers. Initial tests of team teaching in the Czech and Arabic Departments resulted in large increases in test scores, and teams were quickly formed in other departments. Departments that did not have adequate staffing for full Team Teaching formed modified teams of four or five members in an attempt to reap at least some of the hoped-for benefits.

The first increment of seventy workyears necessary to begin implementing the process were taken from the training development account in FY 1986. During FY 1987 all major languages except Russian approached the desired staffing ratio, as did a dozen of the smaller departments. This level of manning was a significant departure from the past, and was closely monitored by the TRADOC staff. The overall ratio of instructors to sections school-wide climbed from 1.52 in FY 1985 to 1.82 in FY 1987.<sup>6</sup>

The GOSC was supportive of Team Teaching. At the March 1987 meeting the chairman declared that "although the data is limited, Team Teaching results are very positive and that it is the correct approach for improving the quality of instruction at DLIFLC." A TRADOC Training Evaluation Team endorsed the concept in May.<sup>7</sup>

Perhaps the strongest argument for Team Teaching came from rising test scores. These showed a dramatic rise in several languages. Students meeting the 2/2 standard in Arabic jumped from 2% to 20% from FY 1986 to FY 1987, in German from 30% to 42%, in Czech from 33% to 48%, in Spanish from 48% to 70% and in Polish from 33% to 44%.<sup>8</sup>

One innovative concept that was used during the transition to full team teaching was the naming of one member of each team a "mentor," or team coordinator, at the GS-11 level. This represented a major change in the numbers and duties of GS-11 supervisors in the schools. In July a task force put together a formal listing of knowledge, skills and abilities (KSAs), and some mentor positions were provisionally introduced using temporary promotions.<sup>9</sup>

The Faculty and Staff Development Division also worked on faculty professional development to increase their knowledge base and teaching skills. The TRADOC Evaluation Team praised the division's work in May, saying that it had "expanded its program to meet the needs of DLIFLC." They



*Nicholson Hall. Completed in 1986, this general instructional facility was the home of the School of Russian Studies. It was dedicated in March 1987 to Major Arthur D. Nicholson, Jr., USA, a Foreign Area Officer and DLIFLC Russian Basic Course graduate who was killed in the line of duty.*

added, "This is particularly noteworthy in view of austere staffing which has not significantly improved since the last evaluation." This in-house professional development was supplemented by other, off-campus programs. Nearly eighty instructors enrolled in foreign language teacher training programs at the Monterey Institute of International Studies. Almost as many attended English as a Second Language classes at Monterey Peninsula College. Hundreds more attended in-house professional development workshops and classes. Classes were also given in the use of microcomputers in the classroom and course development.<sup>10</sup>

#### *Military Language Instructors*

A special feature of language teaching at DLIFLC was the use of experienced noncommissioned officers and petty officers. About sixty-five of these Military Language Instructors (MLIs) (formerly called Foreign Language Training NCO/Petty Officers, or FLTN/POs), were spread throughout the institute, about twenty-five each from the Army and Air Force, and lesser numbers from the Navy and Marines. They made a wide range of contributions to the school, and were a national asset in their own right. Some were

called on to support exercises and training missions around the world during the year. Five were selected for the Post-Graduate Intelligence Program at the Defense Intelligence College for the 1987-88 school year, and four were selected for appointment to warrant officer. Fully 33 achieved the required 3/3 proficiency level that qualified them for teaching duty.<sup>11</sup>

The proper role of the MLIs was the subject of much discussion during 1987 as a result of Colonel Bullard's 1986 decision to abolish the Foreign Language Training Division and integrate them directly into the separate language departments. According to Colonel DePhilippis, who helped implement the new system, the thrust of the change was "to have the MLIs working in the departments for the department chair, so they all have an ownership in the language education and the needs of the students as a school, not as a fifth column coming through the military chain." The discussion focused on topics such as their specific duties in the departments, their qualifications as instructors, and how they should be counted against TRADOC's staffing formulas.

When the new commandant, Colonel Poch, held his first meetings with the GOSC principals in the fall of the year, he made a point of discussing the "MLI problem" with several of them. After extensive staffing with the Service Program Managers, a new policy on MLIs was approved by the January 1988 GOSC and published as DLIFLC Memorandum 600-2, "Management of the Military Language Instructor Program," 7 January 1988. This new policy listed twenty duties of the MLIs, including the all-inclusive: "Perform other duties within the language department as directed by the Department Chair or Deputy Assistant Dean."<sup>12</sup>

#### *Other Academic Areas*

The Area Studies Office also supported classroom instruction. The inclusion of subjects and materials other than language in the classroom had always varied according to the department and the individual instructor. This office sponsored musical groups such as the PanCultural Orchestra and occasional guest lectures. In November the Area Studies chief, Chaplain (Lieutenant Colonel) Joseph L. Guerra, sponsored a day-long seminar with several outside academics to discuss the role of area studies in the foreign language classroom. Despite theoretical arguments for the importance of a cultural component to foreign language learning, there were hard resource constraints of time, dollars and personnel in the departments and the Area Studies Office.<sup>13</sup>

Another important academic area showed signs of trouble during 1987. The academic library had served for decades as a major repository for foreign language materials in dozens of languages. After years of planning, a new library building was substantially finished in the fall of 1987. Unfortunately, the furniture orders had gone astray earlier in the year, and together with last-minute problems with the construction, it stood empty for another half a year. Funding problems also plagued the library and eventually caused a major interruption in subscriptions to foreign periodicals early in the follow-

ing year. A chronically high turnover rate for library personnel also left the librarian with untrained or nonexistent staff.<sup>14</sup>

*DLIFLC Washington Office*

The DLIFLC Washington Liaison Office continued to manage its diverse language instruction programs in the Washington, DC, area. This small office performed all scheduling, quality control, and resource management functions under the DFLP's Contract Foreign Language Training Program (CFLTP). Instruction was provided to cover all language training requirements for the Defense Attache System, as well as instruction in other languages required by the services for which annual requirements were too small to warrant permanent staffing. During the calendar year the office managed language instruction for 391 students, about half of whom were field grade officers headed for attache duty. The others ranged in rank from private to lieutenant general. Actual instruction was provided by the Foreign Service Institute's School of Foreign Languages, and by five commercial language schools in the Washington metropolitan area.<sup>15</sup>

The Washington Office's MOLINK Branch continued to provide advanced Russian instruction for staffers of the Washington-Moscow Direct Communications Link, the famous "hot line." Staffed by two of the government's leading translator-interpreters, this branch also completely revised the ten-volume MOLINK basic course, evaluated and taught several "hot line" translators, and provided top-level Russian translations for several government agencies.

When Lieutenant Colonel Peter W. Kozumplik, USA, took over the office in July from Lieutenant Colonel Kenneth C. Keating, USA, program costs were seriously over what had been anticipated back in Monterey, and as FY 1988 began it remained very seriously underfunded. Given the importance of the instruction provided to the Defense Attache System, Kozumplik worked closely with the DLIFLC directorate of resource management to develop and emplace new procedures that would enable accurate forecasting and tracking of CFLTP expenditures.

Kozumplik became more active in policy issues than his predecessor had been. He actively supported the DFLP Executive Agent on a host of issues, including the selection process for a new commandant during the summer of 1987 and the determination of requirements to support the US-USSR Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range Nuclear Weapons signed in December. He became the DLIFLC interface with the DFLP and the GOSC, as well as the DLIFLC representative on the management committee of the Interagency Language Roundtable and the Foreign Language Committee of the Intelligence Community Staff. He was particularly active in developing more active cooperation DLIFLC and the National Cryptologic System and in assisting the institute in overcoming its budgetary problems in the summer and fall of the year. He assisted the new commandant in three separate visits to Washington late in the year.

## *Chapter Three*

### *Supporting Military Linguists in the Field*

The Nonresident Training Division continued to lay plans for the future during 1987 under the leadership of Dave Olney and Lieutenant Colonel Jack Golphene. In March the GOSC approved the nonresident masterplan that spelled out an ambitious program to expand DLIFLC's support to command language programs world-wide, which until then had been "essentially a logistics function" for shipping training materials to the field.<sup>16</sup>

The masterplan addressed nine initiatives that dealt with content ("develop new programs and materials"), process ("facilitate closer communication and coordination") and organizational requirements ("build an effective organization") for upgrading the program. Some parts of the plan were "quick fixes," such as purchasing telephone answering machines for twenty-four hour customer service. Others, such as expanding the division to 40-50 personnel, were vastly more expensive and remained unfunded.<sup>17</sup>

The division was particularly hard hit by the funding problems of the summer and fall. As Olney later reported, "This year, for the first time in memory, we lacked sufficient funds even to reproduce and ship training materials. There are now so many courses out of stock that there will be severe shortages well into CY 1988." On October 1 they even began charging soldiers headed overseas a fee for copies of Headstart course materials.<sup>18</sup>

Despite these hurdles the division's eleven staffers worked incessantly to support the field and plan for future operations. They answered an estimated 11,000 telephone queries and 17,000 pieces of correspondence. They took orders for over 10,000 sets of Headstart materials and nearly 3,000 sets of other courses. They arranged for three Instructor Training Workshops for field linguists and thirty-three staff assistance visits to the field. A completely redesigned DLIFLC Training Pamphlet 350-5, "Catalog of Instructional Materials," was published in October.

Through all this the division was plagued with a high turn-over rate in junior clerical personnel, who averaged only six months on the job before they left for other positions.<sup>19</sup> The hopes for future improvements in DLIFLC's support to the field language training programs rested in an improved resource picture and a new steering committee, the Nonresident Training Advisory Team, formed in April of field representatives and several DLIFLC division chiefs. Olney also organized an internal transition team to start the extensive staff work to begin the redesign and expansion of the division.

### *Curriculum Development*

Few completely new courses were introduced into the institute's classrooms in 1987, but much effort was expended to revise existing courses. This was in line with Colonel Bullard's approach to curriculum development, which put the responsibility back on the teachers who were actually using the course materials in the classroom. Training development workyears were being cut back overall. A new Italian basic course was introduced, and the Russian Schools began a major review of the Russian basic course. A new

eight-week Slovak course was field tested as an add-on to basic Czech in response to requirements of the Cryptologic Training System. Other departments were able to boast of a lengthy list of smaller course development items, ranging from revisions of segments of courses, to rewritten tests and updated supplementary materials.<sup>20</sup>

The TRADOC Training Evaluation Team praised the division in the spring for its "exemplary design effort" in three projects then underway. Although they criticized the institute for failing to use TRADOC's official Systems Approach to Training (SAT) methodology, they admitted that the institute's approach "closely parallels the analysis, design, and development phases of SAT," and recommended only that it be expanded "to include Implementation and Evaluation phases (internal and external)."<sup>21</sup>

DLIFLC had been shifting more toward contracting-out of course development in recent years. For example, the Curriculum Division worked with Special Operations Forces (SOF) representatives in 1987 to design a generic SOF language course with an English content core and guidelines for commercial contractors to write different versions in several languages. Plans were also laid to contract out development of the Greek, Hungarian, Persian, and Serbo-Croatian basic courses. Only in Czech and Russian were the basic courses being rewritten in-house. One result of this was that more of the courses were shifting away from purely military requirements. For example, the German basic course, adopted several years before, was based on commercial textbooks with no specifically military content.

#### *Educational Technology: The Promise Continued*

Civilian educators and top military leaders continued to be fascinated with educational technology as a way to revolutionize the study of foreign languages. DLIFLC was widely seen as being the national leader in the field. The "DLI 2000" concept paper speculated about technological breakthroughs that would radically transform the teaching and utilization of foreign languages, such as computer translations, interactive videos, live interactive-video satellite transmissions and computer-adaptive testing. During 1987 the institute hosted the annual conference of the major academic association in the field, CALICO (Computer Assisted Language Instruction Consortium). Throughout the year an endless stream of visitors came to see the future in action.<sup>22</sup>

Despite this high level of interest, the Educational Technology Division suffered from a lack of continuity in top leadership during the critical period 1986-87. Major A. Allen Rowe, USAF, the division's first leader, had retired in 1986. He was followed by Lieutenant Colonel William S. McClure, USAF, then later in the same year by Lieutenant Colonel Gerald T. O'Guin, USAF. When O'Guin left in May of 1987, the division was left without a chief until October, when Major Helen A. Brainerd, USAF, arrived. A civilian chief position at the GS-13 level was created early in 1987, but it remained unfilled for more than a year.<sup>23</sup>

Delays were also encountered in the arrival of the Army's long-awaited Electronic Information Delivery System (EIDS) and the acquisition of satellite dish antennas. These systems were intended to allow the widespread use of interactive video materials in classrooms and study areas and live television broadcasts from abroad, two technologies with exciting potential for foreign language instruction. But the complexities and long leadtimes inherent in government contracting and procurement made it difficult to keep up with a field that was expanding at a dizzying pace. For the time being, only German Gateway (VELVET) was available in an interactive video format. The Modern Standard Arabic basic course also used some video materials, known as "Gulf to Ocean," that had been mastered onto video discs.

Despite these frustrations, significant progress was made in preparing for the future. The Comprehensive Authoring Template System (CATS) for use on EIDS was rewritten to support interactive video course writing in six languages, a prerequisite for any further course development. A Foreign Language Character Generator was written by a contractor for creating character fonts in several languages. Sample interactive audio drills in Spanish and Korean were prepared on laser discs with help from the National Security Agency. Extensive planning and staffing was done for development of interactive video courses in another five languages (Greek, Italian, Korean, Spanish and Turkish), but funding problems put even these in doubt.

When it came to educational technology, the institute's leaders were finding that pushing ahead required more than just high hopes. To make any headway, trails had to be blazed through technical, theoretical, and bureaucratic entanglements. One possible move in the right direction was the establishment in July of a large Technology Coordinating Council.<sup>24</sup>

### *Program Evaluation, Research and Testing*

Program evaluation, research and testing also showed forward movement during the year. The Directorate of Evaluation and Standardization, which performed these vital functions, was busy laying the foundations for how the school would go about its business in the future. The directorate was reorganized during the year and given restated missions, which were reflected in the revised DLIFLC Memorandum 10-1 published February 1, 1988. Under Dr. John L.D. Clark, it was also an important point of contact with the outside world, within the academic, government and military foreign language education community. Clark was the chair of the Testing Committee of the Interagency Language Roundtable (ILR), and the Research Division chief, Dr. John A. Lett, Jr., was the chair of the Research Subcommittee of the Defense Exchange Committee on the Coordination of Language Efforts (D'ECOLE).<sup>25</sup>

Foreign language testing had long made up the bulk of the directorate's workload, but the chief of the Testing Division was reassigned early in 1987 and was not replaced for over a year. Major Thomas F. Hooten, USAF, the assistant dean, filled in during this crucial period. The third generation of military language tests, phased in since the early 1980s, the DLPT IIIs, had included a speaking component for the first time. These required a more



labor-intensive scoring process than purely written tests. The services were also gearing up to begin foreign language proficiency pay based on the DLPT's, whose spoken component was not gradeable in the field. When Lieutenant Colonel Russell J. Webster, USAF, arrived in September to take over as assistant dean, there was a backlog of eight hundred tapes from the field waiting to be scored. Through intensive management this was reduced to almost zero by the end of the year.

Test development also continued, although at a reduced pace. Two Defense Language Proficiency Test (DLPT) IIIs were validated during the year, and alternate test forms were written for four high-density languages. All other DLPT III development had been halted, except for one still under contract. Work began instead on the first three of a new kind of test, dubbed the DLPT IV, which incorporated "certain evolutionary changes in the overall format and question types used." One innovation was to provide context-setting "heads-up" information with each question. Another was to use a single, generic item type throughout the test to avoid the confusion students had often experienced when confronted with several different question formats within a single test.<sup>26</sup> Work began on Russian, Arabic and Turkish DLPT IVs. The Russian team went one step further. Their project was designed for eventual use as a computer-adaptive test on EIDS, which would automatically select test items from a large pool to zero in on a student's proficiency level more precisely by eliminating questions that were too easy or too hard.

Dr. Lett formed a separate Research Division in January, 1987 with a small staff. They continued to work on basic research, despite the disappointment of losing the TRADOC Training Technology Field Activity the previous year. With considerable staff work, several key research projects were kept alive that promised to show the value of educational research for enhancing the institute's programs. Funding was continued for two long-term projects, the Language Skill Change Project and the Educational Technology Needs Assessment.<sup>27</sup>

In-house research also began to show some dividends. Two small-scale pilot projects were conducted to study the effect of increasing course lengths from 47 to 60 weeks and increasing the length of the school day from six to seven hours. These had significant DFLP-wide policy and resource implications. Lett also developed a Research Master Plan and a set of "Guidelines in Support of Faculty Research." By the end of the year his vision of research appeared to be moving closer to reality: "responsible and professional educators engaged in disciplined, systematic inquiry into how people learn and how they can be helped to do so most effectively and efficiently."<sup>28</sup>

The institute's self-evaluation procedures were subjected to close scrutiny during the year as well. The TRADOC Training Evaluation Team criticized the school for failing to have a feedback system from the separate schools or from the field to Evaluation and Standardization that would allow the "tracking" of problems and issues once they had been identified.<sup>29</sup> The directorate's leaders were busy during the year responding to these shortcomings. An issue-tracking system was formally established. New, closer

coordination with the follow-on school for cryptologic students, the Goodfellow Technical Training Center, was established, starting with a major meeting at Goodfellow Air Force Base in August. Discussions were also initiated with the US Army Intelligence Center and School at Fort Huachuca, Arizona, the second largest follow-on school for DLIFLC's graduates.<sup>30</sup>

Other initiatives during the year included a complete overhaul of the traditional end-of-course student questionnaire (SOQ:IE) and the design of a new questionnaire for overall program effectiveness (SOQ:PE). The directorate also helped design an academic review procedure that would be used during the following year by the separate schools to conduct an extensive self-evaluation of their programs. These sorts of initiatives showed the direction of change that the directorate and institute would be taking in future years, one in which teachers and managers would become progressively better at their jobs and make sounder, better informed decisions based on a solid foundation of testing, research and program evaluation.

*Educational Administration: Coping with Growth*

Improving the administration of the seven separate language schools and dozens of departments continued to be a top concern of the institute's leaders in 1987. Over two hundred supervisors and chairpersons attended "Leadership Effectiveness" seminars during 1986 and 1987 in an attempt to overcome the perceived shortcomings of these middle level managers in communications and leadership skills. The chief of staff, Colonel DePhilippis, had begun this effort, which he hoped would result in better people-management, fewer complaints of mismanagement, and a reduction in the counter-productive "rumor mill" that seemed to dog the steps of the top-level leadership on all sorts of issues.<sup>31</sup>

The institute's expansion in the mid-1980s prompted another major change during 1987, the splitting of the Russian School. The completion of a new general instructional facility and student dormitories during 1986, together with the projected rise in service requirements for the basic Russian course, presented DLIFLC with the opportunity. Alex Vorobiov took half the Russian instructors in December of 1986 to form the School of Russian Studies in the new building (named Nicholson Hall in March, 1987). Classes began on December 15, 1986. The school taught basic Russian, the LeFox extended basic course, the FAO course, and special refresher programs.<sup>32</sup>

The chair of the Russian C Department, Luba Solgalow, took over the remainder of the original Russian School and reorganized the remaining 87 instructors into five new departments. This school, renamed the School of the Russian Language continued to occupy the wooden cavalry barracks, originally constructed in 1903, which had been in continuous use for Russian language training since 1946. Solgalow herself had joined DLIFLC as a Russian instructor in 1972 after earning a master's degree in Slavic Languages at Indiana University. She had been the implementation control officer for the new Russian basic course introduced in the early 1980s. She thus became the first woman promoted to a deanship from within the ranks any of

the language schools in the history of the institute. Her school was given the mission of continuing to teach the basic course, as well as intermediate, advanced and refresher courses.<sup>33</sup>

Both of the Russian schools faced enormous challenges, the greatest of which was the hiring and training of new instructors. Of the dozens of new Russian instructors hired during 1987, only a handful had any previous teaching experience. Despite this, student test scores on the Russian DLPT III continued to rise. Only 8% had reached Level 2/2 in FY 1985, then 23% in FY 1986. The first basic course graduates from the new School of Russian Studies scored a remarkable 47% at or above Level 2/2. The old school hovered at 28% in FY 1987, with the scores only beginning to rise during the first quarters of FY 1988. The chronically low staffing ratio of about 1.6 instructors per section delayed the implementation of Team Teaching until late in the year. The School of the Russian Language also launched an intensive reexamination of the Russian basic course and its associated tests and supplementary materials.<sup>34</sup>

Other schools moved to combine smaller departments into multi-language departments, giving the provost more flexibility in managing the institute's overall grade level structure. The Asian School combined Indonesian, Japanese, Tagalog and Thai, the East European School combined Bulgarian, Hungarian and Serbo-Croatian, and the Middle East School combined Afghani, Hebrew and Turkish. The provost also placed some new chairpersons over other departments on the basis of their managerial abilities rather than skill in the particular language involved.

The separate schools also worked to improve their facilities. The Asian School built new display facilities for the faculty's cultural artifacts and decorated a new faculty lounge, winning an award from the TRADOC Installation of Excellence inspection team. The Germanic School invested funds received from the previous year's award into a major rehabilitation of their twenty-year-old cinderblock building.<sup>35</sup>

### *Teachers as Personnel*

The institute's civilian staff continued to work under the federal civil service system. The New Personnel System proposal, developed during 1985-86 to remedy some of the recognized shortcomings of the civil service system, had reached the office of the primary functional sponsor of the DFLP (ASD[C3I]) by early 1987, but little further progress was visible during the rest of the year.<sup>36</sup> An across-the-board federal pay raise of 3.1% on the first of the year kept most instructors even with inflation, but did not solve the perennial problem of what many felt to be unrealistically low salaries. Starting salary for a GS-9 instructor remained at \$22,458. An instructor with ten years of classroom experience thus earned \$26,952, roughly equivalent to a sergeant first class (E-7) with an equal number of years of service.

New instructors were added to the faculty in large numbers during the year, but on the whole the overall social and demographic characteristics remained little changed. Many instructors were long-term federal employees,

and the majority was over the age of fifty. Some departments felt this more acutely than others. In the Chinese Department, for example, fully 55% of the instructors were eligible for retirement at any time.<sup>37</sup>

Local 1263 of the National Federation of Federal Employees, which represented the instructors, was cool to the New Personnel System proposal. The union leadership, headed by Arabic instructor Alfie Khalil, who won election as president on April 16, 1987, pushed instead for reforms within the civil service system. They negotiated over Team Teaching and mentor positions. They also lobbied for reclassification of instructor positions from GS-9 to GS-11, locality pay, the full elimination of temporary positions and more extensive union involvement in institute decision-making under the terms of the 1986 labor agreement.<sup>38</sup>

The union leadership was also active in a number of other issues affecting individual faculty members. They met with management on the relocation of the San Francisco Branch, bilingual clerks, the reorganization of small departments, Team Teaching, mentors and occupational health and safety issues. At the end of the year they claimed to have resolved "28 cases of grievance and dispute in favor of the Union."<sup>39</sup>

Change was also in the wind for the faculty retirement system. Since the institute's beginnings, the faculty had been eligible for civil service retirement, although the generally youthful faculty rarely made use of it until the 1970s. Since then it had become an important part of their sense of security and stability at the institute. In 1987 the federal government instituted a new retirement system, the Federal Employees Retirement System (FERS), for all new employees. FERS, a partially contributory system, was more closely patterned on retirement plans in effect in other sectors of the American economy. It allowed individual employees to contribute up to 10% of their salaries with partial matching from the government. The new plan was automatic for all new employees after the beginning of the year and optional for all others. An active campaign of information and briefings encouraged all civilians to switch to the new system during the open season from July 1 to December 31. Eighteen percent of the eligible employees finally switched over, but most chose to stick with the old system, preferring the security of the known.<sup>40</sup>

The overall quality of teaching at DLIFLC continued to receive the greatest emphasis from the institute's leaders during the year. Most of the administrative effort of the institute -- hiring, promotions, scheduling, curriculum development, testing, faculty development, evaluations -- was directly related to the teaching function. Colonel Bullard continually advocated the "professionalization" of the faculty and sought to increase their independence at every opportunity. His successor, Colonel Poch, also praised teachers and paid frequent visits to classrooms throughout the institute. The provost, Dr. Clifford, worked hard on personnel issues and the department-by-department implementation of Team Teaching. All three acknowledged that teachers and their classrooms were the heart of the institute. Team Teaching, renewed emphasis on faculty development, and the influx of new instructors brought a

sense of excitement into the classroom, but all acknowledged that much remained to be done. During 1987 there was a general recognition that the ultimate success of the institute depended on its civilian faculty, and that they must be encouraged -- and permitted -- to strive for excellence.



## Chapter Four

### Foreign Language Learning

in 1987

By the end of 1987 the evidence was in, and it was solid. The institute's graduates were scoring better than ever before on end-of-course proficiency tests. Measured by the new generation of DLPT IIIs, the proportion of basic course graduates reaching the 2/2 standard in Category I languages, such as French and Spanish, jumped from 47.6% to 65.0% between FY 1985 to FY 1987. In more difficult Category IV languages, such as Arabic, Chinese and Korean, it more than doubled from 11.4% to 24.0%. The percentage of students achieving the 2/2 standard in all languages rose from 29.0% in FY 1985 to 41.7% in FY 1987.<sup>1</sup>

These students were much like previous year groups: bright, well-motivated first-termers, with a sprinkling of more seasoned officers and non-commissioned officers. Average scores on the Defense Language Aptitude Battery (DLAB) held steady. But a combination of factors long in the making was beginning to pay off. Foremost was the increased teacher-to-section ratio the school had achieved, from 1.51 in FY 1985 to 1.82 in FY 1987. This advance was reinforced by the introduction of new courses, redesigned since the 1970s, in a number of key languages, including Russian, German, and Korean. Most students now also lived and studied in more modern facilities than their predecessors, as buildings on the drawing boards since the early 1980s came into use. Increased proficiency resulted when factors such as these came together to make each individual student a more effective foreign language learner than ever before.

Noticeably fewer students came to DLIFLC in 1987 than in the recent past, as the services fell unusually short of their projections. Total student input slipped from a post-Vietnam peak of 4,909 students during FY 1986 to 4,460 in FY 1987. Total student input in Monterey had climbed from 3,588 in FY 1984, to 3,839 in FY 1985, and 4,032 in FY 1986, then slid back to 3,603 in FY 1987.<sup>2</sup>

The distribution among languages was shifting as well to meet changing user agency requirements. In the two years from FY 1985 to FY 1987 only one major language saw rising input: Russian (up 8%). Most other languages experienced declining enrollment: Spanish (down 11%), Korean (down 17%), Arabic (down 22%), Chinese (down 28%), and Czech (down 45%).<sup>3</sup>

When not in the classroom, students kept up an active schedule of military training, athletic competition and community service activities. Intramural sports and other athletic competitions supplemented the active physical fitness training programs conducted by the troop units. In July the Army's largest and most modern fitness complex opened on the Presidio at a cost of \$7.28 million. The 31,000 square-foot, fully-equipped facility dwarfed the fifty-year-old gymnasium it replaced. An example of community service

## *Chapter Four*

came in September, when four hundred students and staff assisted as volunteers for a Papal visit by Pope John Paul II that was coordinated locally by Colonel David A. McNerney, USA, who had been commandant of DLIFLC from 1981 until 1985 and had settled on the Monterey Peninsula after his retirement. Other community events included the traveling Vietnam Memorial Exhibit, the local Special Olympics, and various marathon races and other sporting and civic events.

The students continued to receive medical and dental care from a branch clinic of the main facility on Fort Ord. During 1987 routine screening for HIV infection began, but the student population fortunately remained remarkably healthy, as the military population in general experienced an infection rate far below comparable rates for the population at large.

### *US Army Troop Command*

During FY 1987 about 2,185 Army students came to the Presidio of Monterey. For several years these figures had held steady between 2,300 and 2,500. Of these, four out of five were enlisted, and most of these came directly from basic combat training. Three quarters of the Army enlisted students were preparing for cryptologic assignments, while most of the others were directed toward other intelligence duties as interrogators or with the Special Operations Forces. These students were assigned to Troop Command, under the leadership of Lieutenant Colonel James L. Gildersleeve and Sergeant Major Clarence E. Ringo, and were organized into six student companies.<sup>4</sup>

Gildersleeve and his officers and NCOs began a major push during the year to improve military and physical fitness training for the students. Responsibility for Common Skills Training was placed on the student companies, and the Troop Command S-3 administered quarterly tests. Monthly "Commander's Runs" and semiannual five-mile runs were begun, as were several new athletic competitions. In this way Troop Command met its responsibility to further the "soldierization" of the young enlisted soldiers who had come to DLIFLC immediately following Basic Combat Training. A TRADOC Training Evaluation Team that visited Monterey in May reported that the Army students had shown substantial improvement in these areas since the previous year's report.<sup>5</sup>

Gildersleeve formed a new company in June to improve his span of control and align the student companies with the separate schools. This was provisionally designated G Company and was filled with all soldiers studying German and other Germanic languages. (It was later redesignated I Company so as not to be confused with the student company at the Presidio of San Francisco Branch.)<sup>6</sup>

### *San Francisco Branch*

The Army continued to use a former Public Health Service Hospital at the Presidio of San Francisco to accommodate the overflow of students while new dormitories and classrooms were under construction in Monterey. The





***Student Dormitories.*** *These enlisted barracks on the Presidio of Monterey were completed in 1987 to house Army and Air Force students of Russian. They won the 1988 DoD Award for Facility Design Excellence.*

branch's leadership remained stable, with Colonel William S. Devine as assistant commandant, Lieutenant Colonel John S. Williamson as commander, and Sergeant First Class Willie L. Gorsby as sergeant major. The number of students sent there remained level at 438 during FY 1987. Despite the uncertainties about the branch's future discussed in Chapter Two, the students continued to study hard. Of the Korean graduates during FY 1987, 39% achieved the 2/2 goal during the year, compared to 23% in Monterey. The other departments achieved results that were comparable to those at Monterey.<sup>7</sup>

#### *US Air Force 3483rd Student Squadron*

Since the early 1980s the Air Force had sent steadily declining numbers of students for language training. The peak had been in FY 1981, when 1,399 airmen began training. A special Air Force branch had been opened at Lackland Air Force Base in 1981. In Monterey in 1986 Lieutenant Colonel Everett

R. Sharp was followed as commander of the 3483rd Student Squadron (Air Training Command) by a major, Major Robert C. Nethery. In January 1987 the Lackland Branch was closed.

By FY 1987 the number of Air Force students slipped to 125 officers and 687 enlisted airmen. Virtually all the enlisted airmen were destined for cryptologic assignments with the US Air Force Electronic Security Command. During 1987 many of the students moved with the squadron administrative offices into newly-completed buildings in the Russian Village. The student squadron, together with dozens of other Air Force personnel assigned to other activities on the Monterey Peninsula, continued to be supported by Operating Location A of the 323rd Air Base Group (Air Training Command).<sup>8</sup>

#### *US Naval Security Group Detachment*

During FY 1987, 79 Navy officers and 377 enlisted sailors started language training at DLIFLC. Over ninety percent of the enlisted students were destined for cryptologic billets with the Naval Security Group Command. Of these, two thirds were studying just two languages: Russian and Spanish.<sup>9</sup>

The Naval Security Group Detachment was headed by Lieutenant Commander Thomas W. Hanneke (since July 1985). CTICS Richard J. Coffin (since April 1985) was replaced as Command Senior Chief by CTICS Ronald L. Clemens in July. Early in the year the detachment began a new program for enlisted sailors, entitled the Professional Indoctrination and Development (PRIDE) Program, designed to foster esprit de corps and build upon recruit training, and modeled after the CNET Integrated Training Battalion concept.<sup>10</sup>

During the year the detachment received much attention and many accolades. The Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Carlisle A.H. Trost, and the Master Chief Petty Officer of the Navy, William H. Plackett, both visited the Monterey Peninsula in April. The detachment also successfully completed two major triennial inspections in the spring, the NAVOSH Inspection by CNGS and the CNGS immediate superior in command triennial IG inspection.

#### *US Marine Corps Administrative Detachment*

The Marine Corps sent 190 Marines to DLIFLC for language training during 1987. They were assigned to the Marine Corps Administrative Detachment under the command of Major James Rickard and Master Gunnery Sergeant Willie Curry (who was followed by Master Gunnery Sergeant Richard Byrd during the year). Virtually all Marine enlisted students were headed for cryptologic assignments. An average of 140 Marine officer students at the nearby Naval Postgraduate School were also administratively assigned to the detachment.<sup>11</sup>

The Marine Corps, the smallest service at DLIFLC, enjoyed the highest fill rate and the lowest attrition rates of any of the services.<sup>12</sup> This was attributable in part to their success in selecting students with DLAB scores at

least five points higher than recommended. The Marine Corps was different in another respect as well. Unlike the other services, the Marines used NCO students as platoon sergeants. The Marines made their mark outside the classroom as well by excelling in intramural athletics and community service activities, such as installing a new ParCours exercise trail on the Presidio.

Student proficiency at DLIFLC set new records during 1987. Yet somehow they had become better language learners than their predecessors had been. Much of the credit, of course, went to the students themselves. Somehow the academic and nonacademic sides of the total student experience worked in much better harmony than in past years. Much of the credit for that achievement belonged to the officers and NCOs of the troop units in Monterey and San Francisco.



Chapter Five  
Supporting Foreign Language Education  
in 1987

The unsung heroes of the Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center (DLIFLC) were the employees who gave administrative and logistic support to the foreign language instruction in the classrooms. The changes that were transforming the face of the institute in the 1980s were posing new challenges to the support staff even more than to the institute's top managers. Their successes in meeting these challenges were translated in a thousand ways into improvements to the quality and effectiveness of instruction.

Providing support to foreign language instruction had many unusual aspects. The foreign-born faculty posed special problems for the supporting staff at all levels. Foreign language classrooms call for a different mix of textbooks, supplementary materials, audiovisual equipment, and educational technology from that of most other military classrooms, more like one of the service academies than an Army branch school or an Air Force technical training school.

The expansion of the institute's operations since the late 1970s, coupled with new technologies and new facilities, were peaking by 1987. For the institute's logistics and administrative personnel, this challenge was similar to the force modernization challenge facing the services at large, to manage these changes without interrupting day-to-day operations.

*Support Staff*

These tasks fell primarily to the nonacademic staff, who numbered about 270 civilian employees (counting individuals in nonteaching positions or those that did not require foreign language ability).<sup>1</sup> They worked side-by-side with several dozen military permanent party personnel from all four services. Many other civilian employees, while not assigned directly to DLIFLC, worked full time to support the school as garrison staff, contractor personnel, or post exchange and morale, welfare and recreation personnel.

The efforts of these support personnel were coordinated by the school secretary. Lieutenant Colonel Edward M. Wyras, Jr., USAF, served in this position from May 1986 until the spring of 1987, when he became acting assistant commandant. Commander Sydney D. Thornton, USN, who had been the institute's executive officer since May 1986, took over his duties. The school secretary directly controlled the Administrative Support, Security, Facilities Management and Logistics Divisions. (Three other functions: Printing Division, Learning Resources Division and Instructional Media Center, were removed from the direct control of the School Secretary on January 1, 1987.)<sup>2</sup> Other major supporting elements reported to the

commandant separately, including the Civilian Personnel Office, Resource Management, and Information Management. The garrison commander reported directly to the commanding general of Fort Ord.

The Civilian Personnel Office, headed by Robert S. Snow, handled the myriad details of managing DLIFLC's unusual civilian workforce. During the year, 292 new personnel were recruited and hired. There were thousands of individual personnel and finance actions, each of which had to be handled quickly and professionally. The entire workforce was converted to a new performance appraisal system, the Performance Management System, which included rewriting performance standards and an extensive supervisor and employee training program. A new retirement system was implemented, the Federal Employee's Retirement System (FERS), which also involved widespread training and counseling. In the end, 141 of 792 eligible employees transferred to FERS (17.8%), an unusually high percentage compared to other government agencies nation-wide.<sup>3</sup>

The Equal Employment Opportunity Office under F. Kathryne Burwell continued to provide excellent service to the entire DLIFLC community, despite a high staff turnover. Her office was commended by TRADOC and the Department of the Army for its effectiveness. The year brought to a successful close the 1981-87 Multi-Year Affirmative Action Plan, which showed substantial progress. However for most of its civilian positions, which had "positive foreign language requirements," the institute had a blanket waiver for hiring goals. The only exception was for women in the grades of GS-11 and above, and this had shown substantial progress over the previous five years. For example, two women had been selected for language school deans in 1986.

In non-positive foreign language requirement positions, Hispanics continued to be underrepresented as compared to the general labor force in Monterey County. However the institute had submitted a request for an exemption to this measure, on the grounds that most of the county's centers of Hispanic population lay at some distance from the Presidio, for Monterey County covered three times the land area of Rhode Island.<sup>4</sup>

The discrimination complaint system was also an important part of the personnel management process. Twenty-four inquiries were made into allegations of discrimination during 1987, of which nine went formal. Twelve investigations were conducted by the US Army Civilian Appellate Review Agency in Sacramento, and two on-site hearings were conducted by administrative judges from the EEO Commission in San Francisco. Ten other individuals filed civil suits against the institute in federal court alleging discrimination.<sup>5</sup>

The Office of the Inspector General also worked to improve the efficiency and fairness of the institute. Lieutenant Colonel Ralph R. Schneider, who departed in August, and then Major Robert C. Kramer, who served for three months (September through December), aided by Master Sergeant James H. Allen, "inquired into and reported on matters 'affecting the performance of mission and the state of economy, efficiency, morale, and discipline of the command.'"<sup>6</sup> The office received and acted upon 177 General Action Requests during the year, reflecting a sharp drop in civilians using this

channel. The IG also conducted several formal inspections of individual schools and assisted in the change-of-command transition in the fall.

Other smaller support elements provided a wide range of services during the year. The Security Division handled everything from security clearances to vehicle registration. The Protocol Office arranged for dozens of official visitors each month, ranging from former graduates, to foreign ambassadors and the Secretary of Defense, and everything in between. The Public Affairs Office handled innumerable public events, fielded inquiries from the public and the media, and published the biweekly *Globe*, the institute's primary means of internal communication.

A DLIFLC Historical Office was activated in June, when Dr. James C. McNaughton reported on board as the institute's first professional historian. In years past, a succession of staff officers had assembled historical reports and collected historical records in the public affairs office, security office, or adjutant's office. The new historian opened up shop, began to publish a DLIFLC *Monthly Activities Report*, and began work on the 1986 annual command history.<sup>7</sup>

A small garrison staff also supported the institute in a number of ways. Colonel Gerard Landry served as garrison commander during most of the year. In November he was followed by Colonel Bruce E. Wilson. Other forms of support came from the staff of the US Post Office on the Presidio, the Scheduled Airline Travel Office, the Monterey Federal Credit Union, the Federal Police Force and the facilities engineers. The coordination of all these functions required daily attention and cooperation among the various responsible agencies and offices.

### *Logistics*

A major breakthrough in logistic support operations came in February, when the chief of the Logistics Division, Frederic W. Koch, consolidated the scattered operations of his division into a state-of-the-art 46,000 square foot logistics facility, built at a cost of \$2.8 million. The extensive textbook inventory that had been temporarily housed in a grossly inadequate leased former elementary school in Pacific Grove was brought under one roof. Five storage and administrative buildings on Fort Ord were also vacated, and when a self-service supply center was opened in the new building, frequent trips across town for routine supply actions were virtually ended. These changes, together with a major revision of the logistics SOP (published 30 January 1987), amounted to a leap forward in the quality of logistic support to the institute.<sup>8</sup>

Temporary funding problems later in the spring cast a shadow over these hopeful developments. As the end of FY 1987 neared, government-wide funding cuts began to impact on the institute as well. By then, funds for civilian pay, contracts and travel had been largely obligated. Funding for supplies and equipment, which had reached \$2,537,000 in FY 1986, eventually slumped to \$978,600 in FY 1987.<sup>9</sup> Training materials and technical equipment were affected most. No mission-essential operations were halted by



**Logistics Facility.** This 46,000 ft<sup>2</sup> facility, completed in 1987, was the first new logistics building to be added to the Presidio since World War II. To the left can be seen the Monterey Bay and Sloat Monument commemorating the American seizure of Monterey in 1846.

the austerity measures, but especially as the new fiscal year began under continuing resolution authority and with the funding uncertainties discussed in Chapter Two above, supply economy was closely monitored through the end of the year.

### *Facilities*

The ambitious facilities expansion program launched by former commandant Colonel McNerney in the early 1980s moved into high gear during 1986 and 1987. By then, only two of the institute's seven schools remained in buildings that predated the 1950s. During 1987 alone over \$20 million worth of new construction was completed and turned over by the Corps of Engineers-Sacramento District.<sup>10</sup> The logistics facility mentioned above was only the beginning. The extensive Russian Village complex, consisting of dormitories



and a large classroom building, was augmented with two company administrative/supply buildings.

Also completed was a physical fitness center at a cost of \$7.429 million, boasting a 30,929 square foot gymnasium with three basketball courts, a three-lane track and seating for 2,000. It also had seven racketball courts, a squash court and other modern facilities. A small enlisted recreation center was also completed, together with a \$7.748 million road and utility upgrade package designed primarily to support the new Russian Village. Ground was broken on the first new dining facility to be built on the Presidio since 1970, a 13,000 square foot academic library, and a military personnel center. Near the top of the Presidio knoll, AAFES opened a new "mini-mall" post exchange facility with a snack bar and barber shop.

The institute also put substantial sums of money into renovating its older facilities under the supervision of the facilities manager, Jerry J. Abeyta. Nisei Hall, built in 1965 and housing the Germanic School, underwent a major interior renovation with Installation of Excellence and Fort Ord funding, including carpeting, paneling and ceiling tiles. The wooden eighty-year-old East European School buildings were treated to a \$45,000 interior renovation. Steel barriers were also installed at all entrances to the post as part of an Army-wide enhanced security program. In the summer the TRADOC Installation of Excellence Team awarded the institute top honors in the category of TRADOC activities on a non-TRADOC installation.<sup>11</sup> New construction, coupled with imaginative use of older facilities, was finally allowing the institute to overcome the constraints of run-down and inappropriate facilities under which it had operated for decades.

### *Information Management*

In the worlds of American business, government and education in the 1980s, information management was the single greatest challenge facing top-level managers. At DLIFLC the situation was no different. Since the 1970s over forty separate computer systems had sprung up throughout the institute. Twenty-three were local systems, most of them based on the institute's Harris 800 mainframe. Another eighteen were "stovepipe" systems based on free-standing hardware, often provided by an outside agency. Despite this proliferation, administrators endured chronic frustrations in trying to extract timely, accurate information out of the databases.<sup>12</sup>

In the mid-1980s this influx of equipment and software was accelerating even further. A command inspection conducted late in 1986 revealed that the institute was hardly keeping its head above water, and rated information management as unsatisfactory in three key areas of primary mission accomplishment: customer service, workflow management and planning.<sup>13</sup> Acute personnel shortages combined with fluctuating and sometimes contradictory Army-level guidance to produce a poor level of service to the school.<sup>14</sup>

David J. Shoemaker was named chief of Information Management in October 1986 and took up the challenge of turning the situation around. Each



## Notes

### *Chapter One: The Defense Foreign Language Program in 1987*

1. *The United States Army Posture Statement FY88*, 1.
2. Jim Stewart, "The Doomed Flight of the Whale," Cox News Service (April?, 1987). In the spring of 1988 the Naval Security Group Detachment at DLIFLC nominated Price's name for the new fitness center on the Presidio. While a student at DLIFLC from November, 1984, until December, 1985, he had excelled in athletics and community service activities. The dedication ceremony took place on January 25, 1989, the second anniversary of his death.
3. "Nicholson Hall Dedicated in a Moving Ceremony," *Globe* (April 3, 1987), 1; for additional details see also the newspaper columns by Jack Anderson and Dale Van Atta, January 11, January 13, May 18, and June 27, 1988.
4. *Globe* (October 30, 1987).
5. *Dialog on Language Instruction*, 4, 1 (January 1987), 87. For the most recent independent assessment of national requirements see Kurt E. Mueller, *Language Competence: Implications for National Security*, The Washington Papers/119 (New York: Praeger, 1986), which originated as a student thesis at the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College. Mueller was executive vice president of the National Council on Foreign Language and International Studies.
6. AR 350-20/OPNAVINST 1550.7B/AFR 50-40/MCO 1550.4D, Management of the Defense Foreign Language Program, 15 March 1987, and DoD Directive 5160.41, Defense Language Program (DLP), April 7, 1988. The new DoD Directive was approved by the GOSC on March 27, 1987.
7. The DLIFLC commandant also gained a charter to conduct foreign language research that had been lacking in previous guidance. DoD Dir 5160.41, April 7, 1988, para. C6h.
8. DoD Dir 5160-41, para. C5i.
9. AR 350-20, para. 1-7e.
10. AR 350-20, para. 1-5a(7).
11. DoD Dir. 5160.41, para. D.
12. AR 350-20, para. 1-5. c. (11)

## Notes

13. CTSRepDLIFLC, Monthly Activities Report, December 1986.
14. Executive Summary, TRADOC IG General Inspection, Defense Language Institute, Foreign Language Center, June 1987.
15. Memorandum, ATFL-CMT to ATIG, Headquarters TRADOC, Subject: TRADOC IG Inspection - Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center (DLIFLC), September 4, 1987. See also ATTG-I, TRADOC Action Plan for Foreign Language Training, [3 September 1987], for comments on the detailed findings.
16. COL Wesley A. Groesbeck, "Our Burgeoning Linguistics Gap," *Army Magazine* (December, 1988), 22.
17. Foreign Language GOSC, 25 September 1985, Summary Report, 4-6; Memorandum, ATFL-CMT to ATIG, Headquarters TRADOC, Subject: TRADOC IG Inspection - Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center (DLIFLC), September 4, 1987; "New Graduation Requirements Explained," *Globe* (March 14, 1988), 5. *A Strategy for Excellence*, DLI Master Plan (March 1987), 2. At the insistence of the CTM this wording was changed in the October 1987 edition of the master plan to read "and one other skill to be determined by user agencies." In the April 1988 edition this was changed back to the original wording, with the comment that student records would be annotated to indicate whether or not they had met user-specific requirements.
18. Defense Foreign Language Program (DFLP) GOSC, 2 October 1986, Summary Report, 1. The exact definition of the new standard was the subject of extensive discussions at the action-officer level during 1987. See LTC Kozumplik, Briefing for Colonel (P) Lehowicz, 16 September 1987, and Message, DAMO-TRI, Subject: 22 Sept 87 Defense Foreign Language Program (DFLP) Action Officers (AO) Meeting, 012142Z Oct 87.
19. Message, DAMI-ISI, Subject: Army Language Program Review Committee (ALPRC) After Action Report, 201300Z May 87; see also the Army Language Program Action Plan, Action Officer Coordination Draft, 29 July 1988.
20. Memorandum, Cryptologic Training Manager to DCSOPS (DAMO-TR), Subject: Skill Requirements and Final Learning Objectives for Military Cryptolinguists, 25 November 1987, with indorsements by ODCSOPS (DAMO-TRO), 5 January 1988, and TRADOC (ATTG-I), 11 January 1988. For military terminology, see *Globe* (July 24, 1987) and the LPO 1987 historical summary.
21. Letter, COL Bullard to BG Brashears, TRADOC DCST, October 6, 1987; Interview with COL Monte R. Bullard, September 14, 1987, 33-34; Memorandum for Record, COL Poch, Subject: The Commandant's Initial Visit to DLI User Agencies, 5 November 1987; *A Strategy for Excellence* (April 1988), Tabs F-1 and F-2. These two tabs, together with Tab F-7, "Develop a contextual Military Vocabulary List in English," replaced the original Tab F-1, "Survey user needs for job-related and dialect course modules and develop a flexible elective program, . . ." which had appeared in the first edition of the master plan in April of 1986 and all subsequent updates.

22. Defense Language Institute Directorate of Program Evaluation, Research and Testing (Evaluation and Standardization) Annual Historical Summary - CY87, 16-17; CTSRep-DLIFLC Monthly Activity Report, August 1987, 1-2; and Information Paper, ATFL-ESE, Subject: DLIFLC-GAFB Feedback Loop, 11 January 1988, included as Tab J to GOSC Briefing Book, 28 January 1988. This was also summarized in DLIFLC's annual report to the BILC Conference, July, 1988, 5.
23. Defense Foreign Language Program (DFLP) GOSC, 2 October 1986, Summary Report, 3, and GOSC 26 March 1987 Briefing Book, Tabs F, G, H and I.
24. Foreign Language GOSC, 25 September 1985, Summary Report, 13; Defense Foreign Language Program (DFLP) General Officer Steering Committee (GOSC) Summary Report for 26 March 1987; DoD Directive 7280.3, 15 April 1987; and the materials from the four services included as Tab N to the GOSC Briefing Book, 28 January 1988.
25. Defense Foreign Language Program (DFLP) General Officer Steering Committee (GOSC) Summary Report for 26 March 1987; *A Strategy for Excellence* (April 1988), Part II (Appendix I), Nonresident Program; and Nonresident Training Division FY87 End-of-Year Report. The revised and renumbered Appendix N to the April, 1988, edition of the master plan detailed the wide range of initiatives to improve nonresident training that were initiated or completed in 1987. DLIFLC presented a "strawman" for the nonresident training program at the 12 January 1987 DFLP action officers meeting in anticipation of the task force's first meeting at Fort Monroe, Virginia, February 3-4, 1987.
26. Defense Foreign Language Program (DFLP) GOSC, 2 October 1986, Summary Report; CTSRepDLIFLC Monthly Activity Report, April 1987; Message, DCSINT (DAMI-ISI), Subject: Special Operations Forces (SOF) Language Program In-Progress Review, 312015Z Jul 87.
27. Memorandum for Record, COL Poch, Subject: The Commandant's Initial Visit to DLI User Agencies, 5 November 1987; COL Poch, presentation to GOSC, January 28, 1988.
28. Annual Historical Summary, DLI Washington Office, 29 April 1988.
29. Whitney E. Reed, presentation to GOSC, 28 January 1988.

### *Chapter Two:*

#### *Managing the Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center in 1987*

1. DLI Memorandum 10-1, Organization and Functions, 1 January 1987. This was superseded by DLIFLC Memorandum 10-1, 1 February 1988, which was less than half the average "life expectancy" of this key organizational manual. See also the Defense Language Institute Staff Directory, March, 1987, and Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center Directory, September 1987, which was published in a confusing new format.

## Notes

2. These accomplishments were highlighted in the TRADOC Goals Assessment, memorandum, COL Monte R. Bullard to Commanding General, TRADOC, 6 October 1987; DLIFLC FY 87-FY 88 Long Range Plan; "DLI 2000." The Installation of Excellence award was in the category of seven TRADOC activities on non-TRADOC installations. The rise in graduate proficiency is discussed in Chapter Three below.
3. Interview with Colonel Monte R. Bullard, September 14, 1987, 5-6; Defense Foreign Language Program (DFLP) General Officer Steering Committee (GOSC) Summary Report for 26 March 1987; DLIFLC Master Plan, *A Strategy for Excellence* (April 1988), Tab A-9.
4. "New Chief of Staff Focuses on Team Effort Throughout DLI," *Globe* (June 26, 1987), 1, 5. Interview with Colonel Robert M. DePhilippis, USAF, 24 February 1988. The chief of staff position was designed to be filled eventually by a Navy captain, who would also command the Navy element at DLIFLC. DLIFLC Memorandum 10-1, 1 February 1988, para. 3-2c., called for the incumbent to "serve as the Commandant's principal assistant for support and coordinations," much as the assistant commandant was tasked to oversee the troop units, and the provost, academic affairs.
5. Randy Shilts, "S.F. Negotiating to Acquire Old Hospital as AIDS Center," *San Francisco Chronicle* (March 13, 1987), 1; Editorial, "Public Health Hospital Needed," *San Francisco Chronicle* (March 14, 1987); Editorial, "Open an AIDS Treatment Center," *San Francisco Examiner* (March 23, 1987). Shilts had just published the first book-length study of the AIDS crisis, *And the Band Played On: Politics, People and the AIDS Epidemic* (New York: St. Martins, 1987).
6. "Proposal for AIDS Center in S.F. Gets First OK," *San Francisco Chronicle* (April 3, 1987), 23; "Senate Approves Giving S.F. Old Hospital for AIDS Center," *San Francisco Chronicle* (September 30, 1987); "S.F. AIDS Center OK'd By House-Senate Panel," *San Francisco Chronicle* (December 5, 1987[?]); "5 Hospitals Oppose New S.F. AIDS Center," *San Francisco Chronicle* (December 10, 1987), A19. Memorandum, ATFL-PSF, to DEH, Subject: Relocation of DLI-PSF (Cost Information), 16 April 1987; Memorandum, ATFL-PSF, to Commandant, DLI, Subject: Oakland Army Base Option, 25 July 1987; Letter, Charles A. Hawkins, Jr., Assistant Secretary of Defense (Intelligence), to Senator Sam Nunn, Chairman, Senate Armed Services Committee, 23 September 1987; Memorandum, ATFL-PSF, to COL Poch, Subject: Contingency Plans for Closing DLI-SF, 7 Nov 87.
7. ATFL-RMB, FY 1987 Cost Review, 4 March 1988; Interview with MAJ Randy R. Beckman, Director of Resource Management, 25 August 1988.
8. DLIFLC, Command Operating Budget Fiscal Year 88, 18 May 1987. See also LTC Kozumplik, Briefing for Colonel(P) Lehowicz, 16 Sep 87.
9. ATFL-RM, Briefing to GOSC, Subject: Resource Analysis of Programmed and Actual Student Loads (Structure Load/Schedule), 26 March 1987, slides included in GOSC Briefing Book; DLI Annual Program Review, 26 January 1988, slides included in briefing book, Tab

K, Scheduling Update. See also DAMO-TRO, Msg, Subject: DLIFLC Cost Growth, 292331Z Dec 87, included in GOSC Briefing Book, 28 Jan 88, Tab G.

10. "Bullard Reflects on DLI," *Globe* (October 16, 1987), 5.

11. "DLI Changes Commandants," *Globe* (October 16, 1987), 1.

12. Remarks by COL Poch at Commandant's Staff Call, October 20, 1987; Transition Workshop, December 1, 1987; Faculty Seminar, December 21, 1987; and Annual Program Review, 26 January 1988.

13. "New Asst. Commandant to Arrive Oct. 22," *Globe* (October 16, 1987), 1.

14. Memorandum, ATFL-RM, to Commander, TRADOC, Attn: ATTG (BG Brashears), Subject: FY 88 Resource Shortfall, 28 September 1987; Message, DLIFLC, Attn: ATFL-RM, to Commander, TRADOC, Attn: ATRM-BF, Subject: FY 88 Installation Contract Funding, 072100Z Oct 87; Briefing Slides, DLIFLC Directorate of Resource Management, presented to Director of Training, ODCSOPS, 25 November 1987; Message, Commandant, DLI, to Commander, TRADOC, Attn: ATTG/ATRM, Subject: FY 87 DLI Funding Shortfall, 012100Z Dec 87.

### *Chapter Three: Foreign Language Teaching in 1987*

1. *Globe* (March 14, 1988), 4. The Instructors of the Year for 1987 were Elvira L. Coffin (Spanish), Rock Suk Han (Korean), Eva S. Kucekova (Czech/Slovak), Sophia Rappoport (Russian II), Nagib Z. Sedrak (Arabic), Gisela Tauerer (German), and Vladimir Zeltser (Russian I).

2. "ACE Team Evaluates Language Courses for College Credits," *Globe* (September 11, 1987), 1. These credit recommendations are published in periodically revised editions of *Guide to the Evaluation of Educational Experiences in the Armed Services* (Washington, DC: American Council on Education).

3. *Globe* (June 26, 1987).

4. New instructor numbers provided by CPO, 22 May 1989; School of East European Languages, Historical Summary 1987, 2.

5. Provost Academic Policy Letter #1-87, 5 January 1987.

6. Interview with Col. DePhilippis, 24 Feb 88; Program Management Division, 1987 Historical Report; 1987 BILC Report; Briefing presented by COL Poch to GOSC Meeting, January 28, 1988. The Russian ratio rose to 1.6 by year's end.

## Notes

7. Defense Foreign Language Program (DFLP) General Officer Steering Committee (GOSC) 26 March 1987 Summary Report, para. 3c6. TRADOC, ATTG-E, Subject: Training Evaluation Report, 8 May 1987. The results are summarized in CTSRepDLIFLC Monthly Activity Report for May 1987, 8 June 1987, para. 5.
8. These figures are estimates only. The 1986 figures are from *A Strategy for Excellence*, DLI Masterplan (March 1987). The 1987 percentages are from the FY 1987 Annual Program Review, 24 January 1989. Database problems during 1987 caused these figures to vary slightly according to when they were calculated. Only nondependent basic course graduates were counted.
9. "Task Force Defines Ideal Mentor," *Globe* (August 21, 1987), 2; Ray T. Clifford, Mentor Position Status Report, 17 August 1987.
10. TRADOC, Training Evaluation Report, 17-18; Faculty and Staff Development Division, Historical Summary for 1987.
11. Linguist Proponency Office, 1987 Historical Report.
12. DLIFLC Memorandum 600-2, Management of the Military Language Instructor Program, 7 January 1988; Message, DAMO-TRO, Subject: 15 Dec 87 and 5 Jan 88 Defense Foreign Language Program (DFLP) Action Officer (AO) Meetings, 151217Z Jan 88; COL Poch, Memorandum for Record, Subject: The Commandant's Initial Visit to DLI User Agencies, 5 Nov 87. See also staff papers, Subject: Proposed Military Instructor Requirements for FY 89 and Beyond, 15 July 1987, with attachments, and interview with Col. DePhilippis, 24 Feb 88.
13. Area Studies Office, Annual Historical Study, 24 March 1988.
14. Historical Report, Learning Resources Division, 1987.
15. DLIFLC Washington Liaison Office, 1987 Annual Historical Summary; Interview with LTC Kozumplik and Ivy S. Gibian, 29 Dec 87. In 1988 the office dropped the word "liaison" from its title to better reflect its actual functions.
16. *A Strategy for Excellence*, DLI Masterplan, Part II, Nonresident Program (March 1987), 1.
17. Nonresident Training Program, CY 87 Historical Report; DFLP GOSC Summary Report for 26 March 1987, para.4. For a detailed update on follow-up actions taken after the March 1987 GOSC approval of the masterplan, see *A Strategy for Excellence*, DLI Masterplan, Part II, Nonresident Program (April 1988), 1. GOSC Briefing Book, 26 Mar 87, Tab C.
18. Nonresident Training Program, CY 87 Historical Report, 1.
19. See the extensive discussion in "Focus on Customer Service," *DLIFLC Nonresident Language Program Newsletter* (July 1987), 1-3.



20. Curriculum Division, Annual Historical Summary for 1987; School of East European Languages, Historical Summary 1987, 2; CTSRepDLIFLC Monthly Activity Report for September 1986, para. 2. See also interview with COL Bullard, 14 September 1987, and interview with Col. DePhilippis, 24 February 1988.
21. TRADOC, Training Evaluation Report, 8 May 1987, 10, 19.
22. "DLI 2000," [February 1987]; Educational Technology Division, 1987 Historical Summary, [Master Plan]
23. Educational Technology Division, Annual Historical Summaries for 1986 and 1987. (The New Systems Training Division reverted to its original name in January of 1987.)
24. Educational Technology Division, Annual Historical Summary for 1987; DF, ATFL-IM, Subject: Technology Coordinating Council (TCC) Meeting [July 16, 1987].
25. Directorate of Program Evaluation, Research and Testing (Evaluation and Standardization), Annual Historical Summary - CY87.
26. *Ibid.*, 6. A useful summary of the evolution from DLPT III's to DLPT IV's can be found in the DLI Master Plan (April, 1988), 9-11.
27. *Dialog on Language Instruction*, 4, 1 (January 1987), 46-54; James C. McNaughton, *Defense Language Institute Annual Command History 1986* (August, 1988), 40.
28. See the summary results of these two projects included in the DLI Master Plan (April, 1988), as Tabs D-1 and D-2. DLI, 4, 1 (January 1987), 46.
29. TRADOC, Training Evaluation Report, 8 May 1987, 12-16.
30. See Chapter One above.
31. Interview with Col. DePhilippis, 24 Feb 88.
32. DRS Annual Historical Summary (for Calender Year 1987).
33. RU1 Annual Historical Summary (1987); "Dean Named to Russian School," *Globe* (January 9, 1987), 1; ATFL-PAO, Defense Language Institute Command & Staff Biographies (March 1987).
34. DRS and RU1 Annual Historical Summaries for 1987.
35. School of Asian Languages - Annual Historical Report - 1987; School of Germanic Languages, 1987 Annual Historical Summary.
36. Interview with Col. DePhilippis, 24 Feb 88.

## Notes

37. Briefing presented by COL Poch to GOSC Meeting, January 28, 1988.
38. "Union Elects New Officials," *Globe* (June 22, 1987), 7; editorial, *The Presidian* (June, 1988); Negotiated Agreement Between Defense Language Institute, Presidio of Monterey, CA, and National Federation of Federal Employees Local 1263, 21 November 1986.
39. "NFFE Local 1263 Union Accomplishments for 1987," *The Presidian* (February 1988).
40. "Employees to Have Choice in Retirement," *Globe* (May 15, 1987), 1; "FERS or CSRS: Choose the Right Option," *Globe* (June 12, 1987). This was substantially higher than the overall rate for the federal civilian workforce as a whole, which was reported to have been only 1.5%. "Federal Workers Shun New Pension System," *Washington Post* (December 30, 1987).

## Chapter Four: *Foreign Language Learning in 1987*

1. DLI Annual Program Review, 24 January 1989, Tab B.
2. Preliminary figures for FY 1987 provided by Program Management Division in January and February 1989 from SSRS data. Data for FY 1985 and FY 1986 taken from *DLI Resident Foreign Language Training Annual Statistical Reports* for those years. Figures given refer to nondependent enrollment for all training facilities, unless otherwise stated.
3. *Ibid.*
4. Troop Command Annual Historical Summaries, 30 March 1988, and note 2 above.
5. TRADOC, ATTG-E, Subject: Training Evaluation Report, 8 May 1987.
6. Company G (Provisional) Historical Summary, 15 March 1988.
7. DLI-SF, Annual Historical Summary (1987); DLIFLC Annual Program Review, 26 January 1988, Tab J.
8. 3483rd Student Squadron (ATC), Historical Summary for 1987, 26 February 1988.
9. See note 2 above.
10. NSGD Monterey Command History for 1987, 9 March 1988.
11. MCAD Annual Historical Summary, 18 March 1988, and note 2 above.
12. DLIFLC Annual Program Review, 26 January 1988, Tab B.

*Chapter Five:  
Supporting Foreign Language Education in 1987*

1. DLIFLC Multi-Year Affirmative Employment Program Plan 1988-1992
2. DLI Memorandum 10-1, 1 January 1987, Chapter 8.
3. Technical Services Division, input to 1987 annual report.
4. DLIFLC Multi-Year Affirmative Employment Program Plan 1988-1992,
5. Equal Employment Opportunity Office, 1987 Historical Report, 2.
6. Office of the Inspector General, 1987 Historical Report, 1.
7. The *DLIFLC Monthly Activities Report* began publication in September 1987. The first annual command history, covering calendar year 1986, was published in June 1988. It was reprinted in a revised edition in August 1988.
8. Logistics Division, Annual Historical Summary, 15 December 1987.
9. ATFL-RMB, FY 1987 Cost Review, 4 March 1988, 36-51.
10. Facilities Branch: Annual Historical Summary 1988. The dormitories in the Russian Village were later awarded the 1988 DoD Award for Facility Design Excellence.
11. *Globe* (December 16, 1987), 1, 3-5.
12. *DLIFLC Information Systems Plan for Strategic Alignment* (July 1988).
13. Command Inspection of Information Management Office (21-26 November 1986).
14. For this entire section, see the Information Management 1987 Annual Historical Summary.
15. See for example the problems described in the Resident Training and Program Management Division, 1986 Annual Historical Input, and the Directorate of Program Evaluation, Research and Testing (Evaluation and Standardization), Annual Historical Summary - CY87, 4. See also DLI Memorandum 5-20, "Commercial Activities Program (CAP)," 1 January 1987.
16. DLI Memorandum 10-1, 1 January 1987, para. 6-6.
17. ATFL-IM, Decision Paper, Subject: Functions of the Production Coordination Office, 6 August 1987.



## Glossary

|                     |  |
|---------------------|--|
| AAFES               | Army-Air Force Exchange System   |
| ACE                 | American Council on Education  |
| ACTFL               | American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages  |
| ADIRNSA             | Assistant Director National Security Agency  |
| AIDS                | Acquired Immune Deficiency Disease   |
| ALP                 | Army Language Program  |
| APR                 | Annual Program Review  |
| ASD(C3I)            | Assistant Secretary of Defense for Command, Control, Communications and Intelligence                   |
| ATC                 | Air Training Command   |
| ATRRS               | Army Training Requirements and Resources System  |
| BILC                | Bureau for International Language Coordination   |
| CALICO              | Computer Assisted Language Learning & Instruction Consortium   |
| Cat. I, II, III, IV | Categories of language difficulty  |
| CATS                | Comprehensive Authoring Template System  |
| CNET                | Chief of Naval Education and Training  |
| CPO                 | Civilian Personnel Office  |
| CTICS               | Cryptologic Technician (Interpretive) Senior Chief   |
| CTS                 | Cryptologic Training System  |
| CTM                 | Cryptologic Training Manager   |
| CY                  | Calendar year  |
| DA                  | Department of the Army   |
| DAS                 | School of Asian Languages  |
| DCSOPS              | Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations and Planning (Army)   |
| DCST                | Deputy Chief of Staff for Training (TRADOC)  |
| D'ECOLE             | Defense Executive Committee on Language Efforts  |
| DFLP                | Defense Foreign Language Program   |
| DIA                 | Defense Intelligence Agency  |
| DLAB                | Defense Language Aptitude Battery, designed to measure a student's ability to learn a foreign language |
| DLI                 | Defense Language Institute   |
| DLIFLC              | Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center   |
| DLPT                | Defense Language Proficiency Test  |
| DoD                 | Department of Defense  |
| DTM                 | DIA Training Manager   |
| EEO                 | Equal Employment Opportunity   |
| EIDS                | Electronic Information Delivery System   |
| FAO                 | Foreign Area Officer   |
| FERS                | Federal Employees Retirement System  |
| FLO                 | Final Learning Objective   |
| FLPP                | Foreign Language Proficiency Pay   |
| FSI                 | Foreign Service Institute  |

## Glossary

|                 |  |
|-----------------|--|
| FY              | Fiscal year, 1 October to 30 September   |
| GTTC            | Goodfellow Technical Training Center, San Angelo, Texas  |
| GOSC            | General Officer Steering Committee   |
| GS-9, etc.      | General Schedule, covers professional, administrative, technical and clerical positions            |
| HIV             | Human Immuno-deficiency Virus  |
| IG              | Inspector General  |
| ILR             | Interagency Language Roundtable  |
| IMC             | Instructional Media Center   |
| KSAs            | Knowledge, skills and abilities  |
| Le Fox          | An advanced language course for selected cryptologic students                                      |
| L-1, etc.       | Listening comprehension level on ILR scale   |
| MISLS           | Military Intelligence Service Language School (1941-47)  |
| MOLINK          | Moscow-Washington Direct Communication Link; the famous "Hotline"                                  |
| NAVSECGRUCOM    | Naval Security Group Command, the naval element that supports NSA/CSS                              |
| NCO             | Noncommissioned officer  |
| NFFE Local 1263 | National Federation of Federal Employees, DLIFLC faculty union                                     |
| NSA/CSS         | National Security Agency/Central Security Service  |
| NSGD            | Naval Security Group Detachment - Monterey   |
| OACSI           | Office of the Assistant Chief of Staff for Intelligence (Air Force)                                |
| OASA(MRA)       | Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Manpower and Reserve Affairs                     |
| OASD(C3I)       | Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Command, Control, Communications and Intelligence |
| ODCSINT         | Office of the Assistant Chief of Staff for Intelligence (Army)                                     |
| ODCSOPS         | Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations and Planning (Army)                             |
| OSD             | Office of the Secretary of Defense   |
| PCO             | Production Coordination Office   |
| PRIDE           | Professional Indoctrination and Development Program  |
| Ret.            | Retired  |
| ROTC            | Reserve Officer Training Corps   |
| R-1, etc.       | Reading comprehension level on the ILR scale   |
| SAT             | Systems Approach to Training   |
| SES             | Senior Executive Service   |
| SOF             | Special operations forces  |
| SOQ:IE          | Student Opinion Questionnaire: Instructional Effectiveness   |
| SOQ:PE          | Student Opinion Questionnaire: Program Effectiveness   |
| SPM             | Service Program Manager  |
| SSRS            | Standardized Student Record System   |
| S-1, etc.       | Speaking proficiency level on the ILR scale  |

|        |  |
|--------|--|
| TDA    | Table of Distribution and Allowances; the official Army authorization document for personnel and equipment |
| TRADOC | US Army Training and Doctrine Command  |
| USA    | US Army  |
| USAF   | US Air Force   |
| USMC   | US Marine Corps  |
| USN    | US Navy  |
| 2/2    | Level 2 in listening and reading comprehension on the ILR scale  |





## Document List

1. DoD Directive 5160.41, Defense Language Program (DLP), April 7, 1988.
2. AR 350-20/OPNAVINST 1550.7B/AFR 50-40/MCO 1550.4D, Management of the Defense Foreign Language Program, 15 March 1987.
3. Defense Foreign Language Program (DFLP) General Officer Steering Committee (GOSC) Summary Report for 26 March 1987.
4. DLI Memorandum 10-1, Organization and Functions: Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center, 1 January 1987.
5. DLIFLC Table of Distribution and Allowances, TC0387, effective 3 October 1986.
6. DLI, *Recapitulation of Student Input for Fiscal Year 1987*, Standardized Student Record System (SSRS), 16 February 1989.
7. DLI 2000 [February 1987].
8. Defense Language Institute FY 87-FY 88 Long Range Plan [no date].
9. DLI, *A Strategy for Excellence*, DLI Master Plan (March 1987).
10. DLI, *A Strategy for Excellence*, DLI Master Plan (October 1987).
11. US Army TRADOC, Training Evaluation Report, 8 May 1987.
12. Letter, COL Monte R. Bullard to Commander, TRADOC, Subject: Commander's Annual Assessment, 6 October 1987.
13. DLIFLC, *Fiscal Year 1987 Cost Review*, 4 March 1988.
14. DLIFLC Memorandum 600-2, Management of the Military Language Instructor Program, 7 January 1988.
15. DLIFLC Staff Directory, September 1987.

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



## Index

- Abeyta, Jerry J., 43.  
Academic Library, 22-23, 39.  
Administrative Support Division, 39.  
Afghani, 29.  
AIDS, 14, 34.  
Air Training Command, 6  
Allen, Major General James B., Jr., USA, 4, 7.  
Allen, Master Sergeant James H., USA, 40.  
American Council on Education, 19.  
Arabic, 1, 9, 20, 26, 27, 33.  
Area Studies Office, 22.  
Arnold, Brigadier General Steven L., USA, 4, 5.  
Autio, Major General Clyde F., USAF, 5.  
Boxer, Barbara (US Representative), 14.  
Brainerd, Lieutenant Colonel Helen A., USAF, 26.  
Brashears, Brigadier General Bobby F., USA, 4, 12.  
Bulgarian, 29.  
Bullard, Colonel Monte R., USA (Commandant), 4, 6, 11-15, 19, 22, 24, 30.  
Burwell, F. Kathryne, 40.  
Byrd, Master Gunnery Sergeant Richard, USMC, 36.  
Chinese, 30, 33.  
Civilian Personnel Office, 40.  
Clark, Dr. John L.D., 26.  
Clemens, CTICS Ronald L., USN, 36.  
Clifford, Dr. Ray T. (Provost), 3-4, 5-6, 19, 31.  
Cochran, Major Ron, USA, 11.  
Coffin, CTICS Richard J., USN, 36.  
Cowger, Colonel Ronald I., USAF (Assistant Commandant), 4, 5, 11, 16-17.  
Cryptologic Training System, 2-3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 23, 25.  
Curriculum Division, 6, 24-25, 26, 44.  
Currie, Captain Daniel L., USN, 5.  
Curry, Gunnery Sergeant Willie, USMC, 36.  
Czech, 19, 20, 25, 33.  
Defense Attache System (see Defense Intelligence Agency).  
Defense Foreign Language Program, 2-9, 23, 27, 29.  
Defense Intelligence Agency, 5, 6, 23.  
Defense Language Proficiency Tests (DLPTs), 11, 20, 27, 29, 33, 37.  
Dellums, Ron (US Representative), 14.  
DePhilippis, Colonel Robert M., USAF (Chief of Staff), 5, 11, 13, 22, 28.  
Devine, Colonel William S., USA, 13-14, 35.  
Educational Technology, 11, 12, 21, 25-26, 39, 47.  
Equal Employment Opportunity Office, 40.  
Evaluation & Standardization, 7, 26-28.  
Executive Agent, 2, 4, 17.  
Facilities Management Division, 39, 42-43.  
Faculty & Staff Development Division, 12, 13, 20-21, 31.  
Feinstein, Dianne, 14.  
Final Learning Objectives (FLOs), 6.  
Foreign Area Officer (FAO) Program, 21, 28, 47.  
Fort Ord, 34, 40, 41, 43, 44.  
French, 33.  
General Officer Steering Committee (GOSC), 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 15, 20, 22, 47.  
German, 13, 19, 20, 25, 26, 33, 34.  
Gildersleeve, Lieutenant Colonel James L., USA, 34.  
Golphenee, Lieutenant Colonel Jack, USA, 24.  
Goodfellow Technical Training Center, 7, 28.  
Gorsby, Sergeant First Class Willy L., USA, 35.  
Graduation requirement, 5-6, 47.  
Greek, 25, 26.  
Guenther, John J., 5.  
Guerra, Chaplain (Lieutenant Colonel) Joseph L., USA, 22.  
Hanneke, Lieutenant Commander Thomas W., USN, 36.  
Hansen, Lieutenant Colonel Howard K. "Tip", USA, 4, 17.  
Hebrew, 29.

## *Index*

- Historical Office, 41.  
Hooten, Major Thomas F., USAF, 27.  
Hungarian, 25, 29.  
Indonesian, 29.  
Information Management, 40, 43-45.  
Inspector General, 40-41.  
Instructional Media Center, 39, 44.  
Italian, 25, 26.  
Japanese, 1, 29.  
John Paul II, 33-34.  
Keating, Lieutenant Colonel Kenneth C., USA, 4, 23.  
Khalil, Alfie, 30.  
Koch, Fred W., 41.  
Kozumplik, Lieutenant Colonel Peter W., USA, 4, 17, 23-24.  
Korean, 13, 26, 33, 35.  
Kramer, Major Robert C., USA, 40.  
Lackland Air Force Base, 35-36.  
LaJoie, Brigadier General Roland, USA, 1.  
Landry, Colonel Gerard, USA, 41.  
Lehowicz, Colonel Larry G., USA, 4, 5, 17.  
Lett, Dr. John A., Jr., 26.  
Logistics Division, 39, 41-42.  
Manning, William E., 5.  
Martin, Robert E., 5.  
Martines, Jack A., USAF (Assistant Commandant), 11, 12-13.  
McClure, Lieutenant Colonel William S., USAF, 25.  
McNaughton, Dr. James C., 41.  
McNerney, Colonel David A., USA, Ret., 34, 42.  
McReynolds, Frank L., 44.  
Meyer, Lieutenant Colonel Alan, USA, 4.  
Military Intelligence Service Language School, 1-2, 47.  
Military Language Instructors, 6, 12, 21-22.  
National Security Agency/Central Security Service (see the Cryptologic Training System).  
Nethery, Major Robert C., USAF, 36.  
New Personnel System, 12, 29-30, 47.  
Nicholson, Major Arthur D., Jr., USA, 1, 21.  
Nonresident Training, 7-8, 14, 24.  
O'Dawe, Lieutenant Colonel Nick, USA, 4.  
O'Guin, Lieutenant Colonel Gerald T., USAF, 25.  
Olney, Charles D., 7, 24  
Painter, James H. (CTSRepDLIFLC), 3.  
Panetta, Leon F. (US Representative), 2.  
Persian, 9, 25.  
Plackett, Master Chief Petty Officer William H., USN, 36.  
Poch, Colonel Todd Robert, USA (Commandant), 4, 5, 7, 8-9, 11, 15-17, 22, 30, 47.  
Polish, 20.  
Powers, Colonel Richard J., Jr., USA, 5, 6.  
Presidio of San Francisco Branch, 13-14, 30, 34-35, 37.  
Price, CTI3 Patrick R., USN, 1.  
Printing Division, 14, 24, 39, 44-45.  
Production Coordination Office, 44.  
Proficiency pay, 7.  
Protocol Office, 41.  
Public Affairs Office, 41.  
Reed, Whitney E., 4, 5, 9.  
Research Division, 27.  
Resource Management, 14-15, 16-17, 40.  
Rickard, Major James, USMC, 36.  
Ringo, Sergeant Major Clarence E., USA, 34.  
Rowe, Major A. Allen, USAF, 25.  
Rudolf, CTI2 Craig R., USN, 1.  
Russian, 1, 3, 9, 12, 13, 19, 20, 21, 23, 25, 27, 28-29, 33, 36, 42.  
Schneider, Lieutenant Colonel Ralph R., USA, 40.  
School of the Asian Language, 1, 29.  
School of East European Languages, 29, 43.  
School of Germanic Languages, 19, 29, 43.  
School of Middle East Languages, 29.  
School of the Russian Language, 19, 20, 28-29.  
School of Russian Studies, 28.  
Schwartzkopf, Sally J., 5.  
Security Division, 39, 41.  
Serbo-Croatian, 25, 29.  
Sharp, Lieutenant Colonel Everett R., USAF, 35-36.  
Shoemaker, David J., 43-45.  
Slovak, 25.  
Snow, Robert S., 40.  
Solgalow, Luba, 28.  
Spanish, 6, 9, 13, 20, 26, 33, 36.

Special Operations Forces (SOF), 8, 25, 34.  
Taeuber, Gisela, 19.  
Tagalog, 29.  
Team Teaching, 11, 19-20, 29, 30, 31, 47.  
Testing Division, 27-28.  
Thai, 29.  
Thornton, Commander Sydney D., USN, 13,  
39.  
Thurman, General Maxwell R., USA, 4, 17.  
TRADOC, 3-4, 6, 11, 14-15, 16, 19, 20, 22, 25,  
27-28, 34, 40, 43, 44.  
Trost, Admiral Carlisle A.H., USN, 36.  
Turkish, 26, 27, 29.  
Union, 12, 30.  
US Air Force, 5, 12, 15, 22, 35-36, 39.  
US Army, 5, 6, 8, 11, 12, 14, 15, 22, 34-35,  
43-44.  
US Marine Corps, 5, 22, 36-37.  
US Navy, 1, 3, 5, 15, 22, 36.  
Vorobiov, Alex, 28.  
Vuono, General Carl E., USA, 4.  
Washington Liaison Office, 4, 8, 17, 23-24.  
Webster, Lieutenant Colonel Russell J.,  
USAF, 27.  
Weinberger, Caspar W., 11, 17.  
Weinstein, Lieutenant General Sidney T.,  
USA, 6.  
Williamson, Lieutenant Colonel John S.,  
USA, 35.  
Wilson, Colonel Bruce E., USA, 41.  
Wilson, Craig L., 5.  
Wilson, Pete (US Representative), 14.  
Wyraz, Colonel Edward M., USAF (Assist-  
ant Commandant), 4, 13, 39.  
Zeltser, Vladimir, 19.  
Zink, Lieutenant Annette M., USN, 44.

