

Defense Language Institute
Foreign Language Center
Annual Command History
(RCS CSHIS-6[R3])

1 January - 31 December 1991

by

James C. McNaughton
Command Historian

August 1992
Presidio of Monterey, California

Defense Language Institute

Foreign Language Center

Annual Command History

(ACD-CENT-6181)

1. January - 31 December 1951

James E. McLaughlin

Command Historian

August 1951

Presidio of Monterey, California



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

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF:

ATFL-CMT (870)

3 August 1992

MEMORANDUM FOR SEE DISTRIBUTION

SUBJECT: DLIFLC 1991 Annual Command History

1. The year 1991 was truly historic for the Institute. In January we provided unparalleled support for Operation Desert Storm. That fall we celebrated our fiftieth anniversary. In between we were continuing to teach over twenty languages, develop foreign languages courses for the Special Operations Forces, and project our greatest asset--our instructors--to the field through video teletraining. At the same time we were preparing for changes to come, such as the Learner-Focused Instructional Day.
2. Many readers of the enclosed annual command history will be surprised to learn of the diversity of all that we do here at the Institute. We are continuing to perform our primary mission of teaching foreign languages to nearly 4,000 students each year--and doing it better than ever before. We are developing new proficiency tests, conducting curriculum reviews and modernizing our support operations. In sum, we are building on our strengths to prepare for a not-too-distant future when national security requirements will look very different from today.
3. Looking back on the past year, many of the issues the Command Historian describes have already evolved far beyond where they stood just a few months ago, or have been overtaken by events. Things are moving so quickly in classrooms and offices across the Institute that few of us have the time to write down our memories and impressions as they occur. Thus it is important that we have a record of the recent past, if only to help us realize how far we have come in so short a time. I encourage each of you to read the enclosed history to help us all prepare for an challenging future together.

DONALD C. FISCHER, JR.
COL, USA
Commandant

Encl

DISTRIBUTION:
Special

Preface

By Army policy, the annual command history "forms the agency's institutional memory and serves as a guide for current and future operations," and it should form "a narrative of major developments and events that are historically significant." For DLIFLC, that covers a lot of ground. My intent in writing the following annual command history is somewhat more limited. I hope the pages that follow will give a balanced overview of the whole, with an emphasis on major developments and events. Since most of the actual writing was done between February and June 1992, it necessarily reflects my best guess from the perspective of that time of what would be of lasting significance.

As in past annual command histories, I follow an informal framework that does not always follow the organization chart. In Chapter One, I describe the Defense Foreign Language Program, the policy environment within which the institute operated. This primarily deals with the Executive Agent, the General Officer Steering Committee, user agency requirements and policy guidance. In Chapter Two, I describe the internal management of the institute, to include key initiatives undertaken during the year. In Chapter Three, I describe the diverse work of the schools and the academic programs that form the core of the institute's mission activities. In Chapter Four, I briefly describe the students and troop units. Finally, in Chapter Five, I describe the support operations that kept all the other programs running.

I would like to thank all those who took time out from their jobs during the year to patiently answer my questions and "make me smart" about their areas, and especially the dozens of "unsung historians" who wrote annual historical summaries for their schools and offices that form the bedrock of my work. Special thanks go to Lieutenant Colonel Peter W. Kozumplik, USA, for his very useful comments on my drafts, to Dr. Martha Herzog for her help with Chapter Three, and to Major Mike Gilbert, USA, and Captain Bud Andrews, USA, for their help on Chapter Five. The design on the cover was created by the Visual Productions Branch for the institute's fiftieth anniversary.

James C. McNaughton
Presidio of Monterey, California
August 1992

Contents

Preface.	i
One	The DFLP in 1991 1
	Defense Foreign Language Program 3
	Desert Storm Requirements 5
	Cryptologic Requirements 6
	Special Operations Forces Requirements 7
	Other Human Intelligence Requirements 9
	Reserve Component Requirements 10
	Treaty Verification Requirements 12
	War on Drugs Requirements 13
	Beyond 1991 14
Two	Managing DLIFLC in 1991 15
	Command Group 15
	New Initiatives: LFID 18
	New Initiatives: VTT 20
	New Initiatives: SOF 21
	Initiative Delayed: NPS 23
	Initiative Delayed: BRAC 23
	Initiative Delayed: FLTCE 24
	Resourcing 25
	Operations, Plans and Doctrine 26
	Language Program Coordination Office 28
	DLIFLC Washington Office 28
	Managing for the Future 29
Three	Teaching Foreign Languages in 1991 31
	Asian School 34
	Central European School 35
	Korean School 36
	Middle East School 37
	School of Romance Languages 39
	School of Russian Language I 40
	School of Russian Language II 41
	School of Slavic Languages 42
	Contract Foreign Language Training Program 43
	Academic Support Staff 44
	Program Evaluation, Research and Testing 44
	Distance Education 45
	Plans and Scheduling 47
	Educational Technology 48
	Curriculum 50
	Faculty and Staff Development 51
	Area Studies 52
	Dean for Academic Administration 53
	Conclusion 54

Contents		
Four	Foreign Language Students in 1991	56
	US Army Troop Command	58
	3483rd Student Squadron (ATC)	60
	Naval Security Group Detachment	60
	Marine Corps Detachment	61
	Threshold of Change	62
Five	Supporting DLIFLC in 1991	63
	Human Resources Management	63
	Rource Management	66
	Facilities and Base Operations Support	68
	Security Management	70
	Information Management	71
	Logistics and Audio-Visual Support	73
	Representing the Institute	75
	Supporting Excellence	76
Glossary	78
Document List	80
Index	81

Chapter One

The Defense Foreign Language Program in 1991

In 1991 the United States went to war for the first time in nearly a generation--and so did the Defense Foreign Language Program (DFLP). Hundreds of military linguists were rushed to Southwest Asia to serve as interrogators, voice intercept operators, and liaison personnel. Local commanders quickly discovered that there were not enough linguists to go around, and that many of those they had did not have adequate proficiency or had been trained in other dialects. Linguists with the highest proficiency were in the greatest demand.

In the war's aftermath the services took a hard look at their linguist force structure. The remainder of the year saw a series of re-examinations of the DFLP and the interlocking systems for producing and maintaining linguists in all four services. These came at a time when the services--and their overseers in the Pentagon and on Capitol Hill--were adjusting their plans for the post-Cold War world. How the services could best meet their linguist requirements remained an open question.

Not all the lessons for military linguists were reassuring. Shortly after the war General Schwarzkopf publicly criticized several aspects of the intelligence support he had received. The leaders of Army intelligence, in particular, later admitted that too many of their linguists had been allocated to the tactical signals intelligence role. Those linguists who did play a significant role, interrogators and other human intelligence operators, often fell short of needed proficiency levels, or had not been trained in the Iraqi dialect.¹

Outside the Gulf the rest of the world continued to change in often unexpected directions. The United States had declared victory in the Cold War with the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989, and by 1991 its once-feared adversary, the Soviet Union, was spiralling ever deeper into economic and political chaos. "In the emerging post-Cold War world," declared the authors of the National Security Strategy in August 1991, "international relations promise to be more complicated, more volatile and less predictable." These changes caused the leaders of the American intelligence community to reassess their world-wide requirements. It was clearly time to dismantle the large apparatus directed against our former enemies in Central and Eastern

¹For two unclassified assessments of intelligence operations in Desert Storm, see Operation Desert Storm, The Military Intelligence Story: A View from the G-2, 3d U.S. Army (April 1991) and Conduct of the Persian Gulf War: Final Report to Congress (Apr 92), Appendix C, Intelligence.

The DFLP in 1991

Europe, such as the German Democratic Republic, Czechoslovakia, and Poland. The paralysis of the Soviet armed forces in the face of economic and political instability at home made even the Russian bear seem less a threat than ever before. The planned withdrawal of forward-deployed forces from Europe and East Asia promised further changes.

The Gulf War coupled with the vast changes taking place in other parts of the world led many leaders to take a new look at national foreign language requirements. Some resulted in quick-fix legislation, such as the National Security Education Act sponsored by the Senate Intelligence Committee, which was intended to inject \$180 million into the academic community, much of it for foreign language study, and such as the Global Educational Opportunities Act, co-sponsored by Monterey Congressman Leon E. Panetta in February, which promised to put \$42 million into international education programs, both academic and government. The House Intelligence Committee launched a new study of the language problem under staff counsel Calvin Humphrey and proposed pumping an immediate \$36.6 million into the intelligence community, \$21.5 to go to the Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center (DLIFLC).²

Several internal reviews were initiated within intelligence community and the Department of Defense. Among the various larger studies looking at the lessons of the Gulf War, several were directed specifically at the DFLP. The Office of the Inspector General of the Department of Defense considered initiating a formal investigation of the DFLP as early as February, and Patricia M. Hines, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army for Readiness, Force Management, and Training, began to take an active interest in the program and visited DLIFLC for the first time in September.

A major review conducted for the Deputy Chief of Staff of the Army for Intelligence was very critical, stating bluntly that "the Army Language Program does not adequately support warfighting requirements." The study ascribed this to five basic factors:

²See the fact sheet on Congressional Foreign Language Training Initiatives prepared for DLIFLC Board of Visitors, 27 Aug 91.

- o Not enough
- o Wrong mix
- o Low skill level
- o Poor retention
- o Requirements undefined³

To most who had been involved with the DFLP for any length of time, these were familiar complaints. Nevertheless these studies had little impact on actual operations during the remainder of the year, and few of the changes were reflected in the Structure Manning Decision Review meeting in April that set training requirements for FY 1993-94, except for the Army, which traded off future seats in Czech, German and Polish in favor of more Russian. During FY 1991 student input at DLIFLC actually declined by 13% from the previous year (from 4,250 to 3,698), but this reflected the short-term turbulence of Desert Storm and the precipitous drop in Central European requirements.

Defense Foreign Language Program

The leader of the Defense Foreign Language Program during Desert Storm was the Director of Army Training in the Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations and Plans, Brigadier General Richard F. Keller, USA, who had taken over in July 1990. Keller visited DLIFLC for the first time in late November 1990, just before the commandant, Colonel Donald C. Fischer, Jr., USA, led an assessment team to Saudi Arabia to survey Army linguist training needs in-theater. Keller was also chairman of the DFLP General Officer Steering Committee (GOSC), originally scheduled to meet in Monterey in January 1991. But the onset of Desert Storm forced a postponement. Nevertheless the GOSC principals and their staff action officers remained active in language issues during the feverish days of the war. Keller's action officer, Lieutenant Colonel Sandy Outerbridge, USA, worked intensively with the other action officers.

By spring things were returning to normal. In April Outerbridge circulated a draft revision of the joint service regulation on the management of the DFLP, Army Regulation 350-20, last published in 1987, and began a major study of future language

³ODCSINT, "US Army Language Program Re-Look," briefing presented to DFLP GOSC, 21 Aug 91. In September the Re-Look recommendations for the Army Language Program were deferred for further study.

The DFLP in 1991

requirements. In July the action officers met in Gettysburg, Pennsylvania, for their annual strategy workshop.

By the time the full committee gathered at the Defense Intelligence College on August 21 for their delayed annual meeting, the Soviet Union was in the throws of a coup attempt, and a new GOSC chairman, Brigadier General James M. Lyle, USA, and executive agent action officer, Lieutenant Colonel Michael McKean, USA, had been named. All four service program managers admitted their programs were in flux, and the principals were distracted by the Soviet coup. Colonel William R. Lipke, USA, briefed the committee on the "MI Re-Look" study and its impact on the Army Language Program; the Air Force Assistant Chief of Staff for Intelligence briefed on the personnel management of Air Force linguists; Naval Security Group Command briefed on their Cryptolinguistic Training and Evaluation Program; and the Marine Corps described how they had met their requirements in Desert Storm. The new-comer to the committee, the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations and Low Intensity Conflict, represented by Brigadier General Charles E. Wilhelm, USMC, described what he called "break trail" efforts underway in the special operations community to address their foreign language requirements.⁴

As usual the committee also heard a series of briefings on developments at the institute. The commandant presented a comprehensive update on the institute and the initiatives underway, to include faculty and educational technology issues (see Chapters Two and Three). The committee members paid particular attention to changing the proficiency goals. Some renewed a call for raising the graduation standard to Level 2 in three skills, thus putting speaking proficiency on a par with listening and reading. This idea, which would have far-reaching consequences for the institute, was set aside for further study and cost analysis. The Air Force Assistant Chief of Staff for Intelligence asked for a study of possible alternative language teaching methodologies, which was given to the institute for further study.

Six months after victory in the Gulf War the DFLP leaders declined to strike out in any new directions, although changes were in the air. During the rest of the year the services and the cryptologic and special operations communities continued to

⁴DFLP GOSC briefing book, 21 Aug 91. See also DAMO-TRO, memo, subj: Defense Foreign Language Program (DFLP) General Officer Steering Committee (GOSC) Summary Report for 22 August 1991, 19 Sep 91.

study the problem. Lyle became more knowledgeable in language training issues, making a personal visit to the institute in December. But these issues were embedded in the broader context of the future needs of the Department of Defense and the intelligence community as a whole, which were under thoroughgoing re-examination during the year, as was each separate sub-community of language users.

Desert Storm Requirements

The most urgent language training requirement at the beginning of the year was clearly for Arabic. During the early months of Desert Shield in 1990, DFLP managers and service personnel managers had scrambled to define and meet linguist requirements for deploying units. The institute accelerated training for classes already in session in the 63-week Arabic basic course and started hiring more native speakers to handle an increased input. Video teletraining was used to conduct familiarization and refresher classes for deploying linguists. In December 1990 the commandant led an assessment team into the theater to survey Army military intelligence language training needs in theater. Upon their return the institute developed an Iraqi dialect "crash course" and other quick-reaction training products which were in the mail by mid-January 1991.⁵

By the end of 1990, DLIFLC was working at full capacity to train new Arabic linguists and had increased its Arabic input significantly. But the training cycle for these new linguists, including further technical training, stretched to almost eighteen months. This pipeline lag time caused the Army Deputy Chief of Staff for Intelligence (DCSINT) to look for ways to conduct accelerated 24-week Arabic classes to teach at least some Arabic to military linguists already proficient in other languages, as well as their technical skills. DCSINT ultimately organized programs at five different sites. In October, I Corps began training 20 soldiers at Fort Lewis, WA, through their well-established command language program, and 7 students began training in Colorado with Technical Language Systems, Inc. (TLSI), which had extensive contracting experience with FORSCOM and other agencies. Four more classes began in January 1991: TLSI took another 50 students, and the DLIFLC Washington Office assembled a class of 67 in the Washington, DC, area, drawing

⁵For providing linguists for Desert Shield in 1990 see the DLIFLC 1990 Annual Command History (Jan 92) and James C. McNaughton, "Can We Talk?" Army Magazine (Jun 92), 20-28.

The DFLP in 1991

upon the resources of three separate language contractors. In Europe the US Army Foreign Language Training Center-Europe in Munich started 22 students and, in the most innovative program of all, the DLIFLC Washington Office arranged for 20 students to begin study at the British Defense School of Languages. Each of these programs was unique, depending upon instructor experience levels and the curricular approach they adopted. The bulk of the instruction was in Modern Standard Arabic, with some Iraqi dialect instruction included to varying degrees.

These experimental programs revealed the limits of the crash approach to teaching languages. Although the services had long since set Level 2 in listening and reading as the minimum acceptable level for job performance, barely half these students reached Level 1, even after six months of intensive study in time of war and crisis (42% in listening, 34% in reading, and 52% in speaking).⁶ Of their counterparts in the 63-week Arabic basic course at DLIFLC, fully 65% of all those graduating during FY 1991 achieved Level 2 in two or more skills.

More importantly, the war was already over by the time even the first of the short courses were completed. The first 27 students graduated in April 1991, and the 159 who began in January graduated in June. Just as the Air Force could not wait until the onset of a crisis to start training pilots, the services could ill afford to wait until the last minute to begin producing linguists.

Cryptologic Requirements

Other than the special Desert Storm-related language requirements, traditional requirements for other linguists continued much as in the past. Most military linguists worked in a variety of strategic and tactical assignments as voice intercept operators. The extensive changes in the world situation during the early 1990s, especially the dissolution of the Warsaw Pact and the paralysis of the Soviet Union, were having a major impact on cryptologic requirements. For example, in the spring the Army suddenly eliminated its input to DLIFLC for Russian and Czech LeFox training, an advanced training program.

The cryptologic community, through Whitney E. Reed, Deputy Director for Education and Training of the National Security

⁶See the extensive evaluation by Gordon L. Jackson, Nooria Noor and John A. Lett, Jr., Desert Shield's 24-Week Arabic Programs: An Evaluation (Draft), DLIFLC Directorate of Evaluation and Standardization, Report No. 92-04 (May 1992).

The DFLP in 1991

Within the DFLP several key events bore witness to the renewed importance of language training for the special operations community. During the year the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations and Low Intensity Conflict won a seat on the GOSC, the first expansion of the committee since it was established in 1980. Brigadier General Charles E. Wilhelm, USMC, attended the August meeting as an observer and briefed on a proposed SOF foreign language policy directive and other efforts to "resolve SOF foreign language readiness shortfall." He outlined a multi-year plan that would start with a two-year "program assessment" phase to identify precise requirements and evaluate available training resources. By the next scheduled meeting in February 1992 Wilhelm took his seat as a full-fledged GOSC member.

An important component of the upgrading of the foreign language capabilities of Army Special Forces was a new generation of basic language courses at the John F. Kennedy Special Warfare Center and School. Early in 1991 the school and DLIFLC reached agreement on the development of new courses to replace those in use at the school in Fort Bragg, North Carolina. The institute agreed to develop Basic Military Language Courses in thirteen languages over four years, at a cost of \$8 million, to be funded by the US Special Operations Command. Brigadier General David J. Baratto, USA, the Special Warfare Center commandant, came to Monterey in February to personally oversee the final planning (see Chapter Two).

These plans were almost derailed over the summer by a "quick-reaction" report issued by the Department of Defense Office of the Inspector General, stemming from adverse findings concerning reserve component language training in a training audit of the US Army Civil Affairs and Psychological Operations Command. A draft report in June claimed that the courses were being developed without adequately determining what the requirements actually were. Wilhelm's staff was able to resolve the

(Footnote Continued)

AirLand Battle for the Strategic Army of the 1990s and Beyond (1 Aug 91). For a summary of SOF in Desert Storm see Conduct of the Persian Gulf War: Final Report to Congress (Apr 92), Appendix J, Special Operations Forces.

⁸DFLP GOSC briefing book, 21 Aug 91, Tab J.

Agency (NSA), spoke with a clear voice about the continued need for a cryptologic foreign language capability and expressed concern that the DFLP might not be responding quickly enough to changing requirements. During the year his agency continued to take an active interest in the resident program at DLIFLC, especially those aspects that pertained to its signals intelligence mission such as the final learning objectives, through its liaison officer, Hugh McFarland. NSA also published a new NSA/CSS Circular 40-5, "The Military Linguist Development Program." The agency also took an active interest in the continued close coordination among the service schools that supported it, such as DLIFLC and the Goodfellow Technical Training Center.

In July the agency gave the DLIFLC commandant a first-hand look at several installations where the institute's graduates were performing actual missions. The trip had its intended effect by impressing upon him not only the seriousness of the requirements but also the need for higher levels of language proficiency. In August the provost with several other senior DLIFLC representatives attended the annual Cryptologic Language Training Conference hosted by NSA. It was clear that cryptologic language training requirements would continue to be the largest single category of language requirements for many years to come.

Special Operations Forces Requirements

Desert Storm demonstrated once again that the Special Operations Forces (SOF) had a long way to go to meet their language requirements. SOF personnel had done much important work for which language skills were important, such as coalition warfare support, psychological operations and civil affairs. In the post-hostilities phase they had gone places where less commonly taught languages were needed such as Kurdish. The leaders of the SOF community saw these experiences as validating their growing role in the post-Cold War era. The Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations and Low Intensity Conflict called low intensity conflict "the challenge of the 1990s," and in August the Army published a concept paper for future warfare that highlighted the importance of Special Operations Forces.

⁷James R. Locher III, "Low-Intensity Conflict: Challenge of the 1990s," Defense 91 (July/August 1991), 17-19, and TRADOC Pam 525-5, AirLand Operations: A Concept for the Evolution of
(Footnote Continued)

matter with the inspector general staff so that course development work in Monterey could proceed unhampered.⁹

Other Human Intelligence Requirements

Between them the special operations and cryptologic communities had the clear majority of language training requirements. But there were several other smaller categories of requirements that merit separate examination. Many of the remainder were generally referred to as human intelligence (HUMINT) linguists. This was a diverse group that included attache, liaison, and security assistance personnel, interrogators and counter-intelligence agents, and foreign area officers. Their training was under the general oversight of the Defense Intelligence Agency, whose leaders also predicted that the end of the Cold War would bring about a shift in intelligence--and language--requirements away from listening skills towards more global language proficiency and speaking skill. Most of these linguists received their initial language training at DLIFLC, the major exception being Defense Attache System and security assistance personnel, who were generally trained at the Foreign Service Institute or commercial contractors in the Washington area through the DLIFLC Washington Office.

Lancing J. Blank, Assistant Deputy Director for Training of the Defense Intelligence Agency, at the August 1991 GOSC meeting, spoke in favor of raising the graduation requirement to Level 2 in speaking, along with listening and reading. He called the speaking requirement "critical to the HUMINT community" and said "we're not getting that objective." He predicted that the future would "require the need for more languages with fewer people in each language. Quality, not quantity, will be the answer." He also encouraged the institute to continue developing final learning objectives for non-cryptologic linguists and to spend a portion of each day in small-group instruction. His belief in the continued importance of human intelligence in the era of high tech warfare was echoed by the military intelligence battalion S-3 for the 82nd Airborne Division in Panama, who later wrote that "the big money-maker during Operation Just Cause was HUMINT."¹⁰

⁹DFLP GOSC briefing book (6 Feb 92), Tab F.

¹⁰DAMO-TRO, memo, subj: Defense Foreign Language Program
(Footnote Continued)

The DFLP in 1991

Reserve Component Requirements

Two hundred or more reserve component military linguists were mobilized during Desert Shield and Desert Storm and made valuable contributions in many areas, validating the long-held belief of many that reserve component linguists were a good investment. The 300th Military Intelligence Brigade (Linguist), Army National Guard, and its subordinate battalions sent nearly a hundred linguists to support the build-up and the 1st USAR Linguist Unit sponsored by DLIFLC sent another dozen. But the call-up was not without problems. During the months that followed the services looked closely at their strategies for holding linguists in reserve and for maintaining their proficiency while there. The DLIFLC Washington Office activated Major Andrew H. N. Kim, USAR,¹¹ to research and develop a study of the USAR linguist problem.¹¹

(Footnote Continued)

(DFLP) General Officer Steering Committee (GOSC) Summary Report for 22 August 1991, 19 Sep 91; MAJ Victor M. Rosello, "Operation Just Cause: The Divisional MI Battalion, the Nonlinear Battlefield, and AirLand Operations-Future," Military Intelligence (Jul-Sep 91), 28-31. For vivid first-person accounts by HUMINT linguists in Southwest Asia see the following: "Military Language Instructor: From Teacher to Interrogator," Globe (9 May 91), 12-13; "B Company Linguist Finds Out What His Job Is Really All About," Globe (17 Jun 91), 5, 8; "The Only Iraqi Linguist in Her Company Talks with EPWs," Globe (17 Jun 91), 6, 9; "DLI Graduate, Former Military Language Instructor, Interprets for Gen. Schwarzkopf," Globe (17 Jun 91), 7, 9; "Turkish Language FAO Helps Kurds After War," Globe (28 Jun 91), 9; and SGT Cheryl Stewart, "Joint Interrogation Facility Operations," Military Intelligence (Oct-Dec 91), 36-38;

¹¹ATFL-W, memo, subj: Operation Desert Shield/Desert Storm Initiated Staff Study Project, 8 Sep 91. For a similar analysis see SSG Paul B. King, "The Search for a Linguist: The Desert Shield/Desert Storm Experience and Beyond," Military Intelligence (Jan-Mar 91), 41-42. For contributions to the general discussion on the reserve components in the wake of Desert Storm, see LTG Frederic J. Brown, USA, Ret., "Reserve Forces: Army Challenge of the 1990s," Military Review (Aug 91), 2-19; the special issue of Military Review on reserve components (Oct 91); and Conduct of the Persian Gulf War: Final Report to Congress (Apr 92), Appendix H, Reserve Component Forces.

Some of the problems Kim found were common to reserve component mobilization nationwide, such as the technicalities of getting individual reservists onto active duty. Others were more specific to linguists. No single database existed that could identify reserve linguists nationwide. Within the Army the personnel data systems of the Army National Guard and the Army Reserve were not compatible. Once a linguist had been identified, there was usually no reliable way to measure his level of proficiency without retesting. Dozens of reservists were informally tested by telephone from DLIFLC before being recalled. Since the chain of command was not clear, there was no one office that could balance the demands of competing agencies for linguists. If there were only a small number of linguists in a given language, who had the authority to decide how many went to each agency or headquarters? What if a non-DoD agency such as the Federal Bureau of Investigation requested support? Kim concluded that the problem was personnel management, not training management.

Behind the immediate difficulties of the mobilization process were two more fundamental problems: manning and training. Army Reserve and National Guard units in particular fell far short in filling their authorized requirements for linguists, by some estimates up to three thousand short. The linguist battalions and the 1st USAR Linguist Unit, which grew to over a hundred members in 1991, were only a partial solution.¹²

Three ways of filling these positions had been proposed at one time or another. The first option, recruiting native speakers or those who had acquired foreign language proficiency on their own, was working to a certain extent. But these linguists had to receive further training to perform their technical specialty, and many foreign-born reservists were ineligible for higher levels of security clearances. Furthermore, it was hard to recruit for some languages that were not widely distributed among the American population or immigrant communities.

The second, sending first-term recruits to DLIFLC for basic language training, had been tried to a limited extent for many years. This approach was hampered by a chronic shortage of seat allocations.

¹²"300th Military Intelligence Brigade (Linguist), Army National Guard," Military Intelligence (July-September 1991), "142d Military Intelligence Battalion (Linguist)," Military Intelligence (January-March 1992), and CPT David C. Benton, "Linguist Unit Looking for a 'Few Good Speakers,'" Army Reserve Magazine (fourth issue, 1991), 20-21.

The DFLP in 1991

The third, "capturing" more trained linguists leaving active duty, was the one Kim favored. The Army in particular was not doing a very good job of tracking first-term enlisted linguists leaving active duty. In theory it would be possible to steer them towards linguist positions in the National Guard or Army Reserve. But in practice most were lost to the system.

The training problem was a tough one, and reserve component units varied widely in quality. Some used contract instructors for evening or weekend classes. Others made special arrangements for two-week summer programs. The video teletraining systems being installed at various locations during the year held promise for the future. But in general there was no overall training strategy for reserve component linguists. The Forces Command MISTE (Military Intelligence Special Training Element) program worked well in some areas, but not in others. Linguist slots in other type units, such as civil affairs and psychological operations, were often left vacant, or their assigned linguists left with little support for language maintenance training. A major effort by DLIFLC during 1991 to recruit reserve component linguists to fill training seats at the institute left unfilled by the sudden drop in active duty requirements for German, Czech, and Polish came up with little.¹³

By the end of 1991 the reserve components had seen little change in the way their linguists were handled, despite active discussion. Kim specifically recommended the Army move forward with the establishment of a reserve component linguist MOS for the Army Reserve and National Guard. But this would only be a part of the overall solution. He also recommended the establishment of a National Reserve Component Linguist Control Unit to supervise reserve component language efforts. To effect these changes aimed at maximizing the potential of reserve component linguists would require much additional planning and coordination over the years ahead.

Treaty Verification Requirements

A small but important set of linguist requirements was to support arms control treaty verification efforts through the On-Site Inspection Agency. Before Desert Shield this had been the biggest change to language requirements the Department of Defense had faced in many years. When the first inspection

¹³ATFL-RFO, info paper, subj: Availability of Unprogrammed Language Training Seats at the Defense Language Institute, Foreign Language Center (DLIFLC), 31 Jan 92.

teams had gone into the Soviet Union in 1988, DLIFLC had provided testing services and had hastily prepared advanced training for the Russian interpreters on each team. The Russian faculty had developed a six-month advanced course that was implemented in 1989. Since then dozens of linguists had taken the highly specialized training each year.¹⁴

The field seemed ready to expand. The Conventional Forces in Europe (CFE) Treaty, which would have greatly expanded requirements for military linguists in several Eastern and Central European languages, was signed in November 1990, and was ratified by the US Senate later in 1991. The Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START) was signed in July 1991. The NATO allies expressed new interest arms control verification language training. In March the Bureau for International Language Cooperation (BILC) held a special seminar on this new training mission, and the US representative to the annual meeting in June in Istanbul, Turkey, chaired a study group panel on the subject. But despite this high level of interest, the new requirements were not translated into requirements for the training system, and at DLIFLC student input for the special six-month Russian course declined.

War on Drugs Requirements

By 1991 the Department of Defense was becoming increasingly involved in the War on Drugs. "The international trade in drugs is a major threat to our national security," asserted the authors of the revised National Security Strategy in August 1991. "No threat does more damage to our national values and institutions, and the domestic violence generated by the trade in drugs is all too familiar." Military linguists serving with the intelligence community, especially many graduates of the DLIFLC Spanish basic course, were being thrown into the fight.¹⁵

¹⁴For a brief overview of recent arms control treaties, see Joseph P. Harahan, "Recent US-USSR-European Arms Control Treaties: New Federal Records, New Interpretations," paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Historical Association, Chicago, IL, 28 Dec 91. For the initial impact of OSIA requirements, see the DLIFLC 1988 Annual Command History (October 1990), 1-5 and 35-36.

¹⁵National Security Council, National Security Strategy (Aug 91), 17. For a concise overview of the growing DoD
(Footnote Continued)

The DFLP in 1991

The DFLP was also being drawn into DoD's efforts. During 1991, DLIFLC was paid \$1.1 million for language training and other services, such as testing and instructor training, for various law enforcement agencies, including the Drug Enforcement Administration, US Customs Service, US Marshals Service, and the Orange County (California) Regional Narcotics Suppression Task Force. Contract training was set up in Washington, DC, and elsewhere, and the institute discussed the feasibility of establishing a satellite campus with the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center (FLETC) in Glyncoe, Georgia.

Beyond 1991

The two major events on the world scene in 1991, Desert Storm and the failed Soviet coup, gave clear evidence that the road to President Bush's envisioned new world order would not be smooth or predictable. The point was underscored by the director of the US Army Foreign Military Studies Office, Colonel David M. Glantz, USA, who publicly warned Army officers that "history indicates that, in the past, regional and global changes of this magnitude have not occurred peacefully."¹⁶ The Department of Defense and the DFLP would have to continue to adjust to a new, less certain international environment in the face of declining resources at home.

It was still unclear how these changes would affect the DFLP in terms of requirements or resources. The program's leaders knew that changes were coming, but they were not sure when they would come, or what shape they would take. What they agreed on was the continued need for a permanent DoD foreign language training facility into the indefinite future. Much energy was expended during 1991 to ensure that DLIFLC would continue to be a center of excellence that could support these changing requirements.

(Footnote Continued)

involvement in the War on Drugs, especially since 1989, see Thomas W. Crouch, ed., An Annotated Bibliography on Military Involvement in Counterdrug Operations, 1980-1990, CLIC Papers (Sep 91). ATFL-OPD-LE, memo, subj: Historical Summary, 21 Feb 92.

¹⁶"Challenges of the Future: Developing Security Issues in the Post-Cold War Era," Military Review (Dec 91), 2-9.

Chapter Two Managing DLIFLC in 1991

At the conclusion of their annual meeting in August 1991 the Board of Visitors reported that the Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center (DLIFLC) was "succeeding in fulfilling its mission in a truly exemplary manner," and noted "remarkable progress" since their meeting the year before. Under the chairmanship of General William R. Richardson, USA, Ret., a former commander of US Army Training and Doctrine Command, the board praised the institute, which they called "truly an incomparable national resource and which should be recognized as such."¹ Just as the armed services were enjoying well-deserved public recognition in the wake of their Desert Storm victory, the institute was enjoying a growing reputation for excellence. But just as for the services, that excellence had taken many years to achieve a long-term commitment to excellence at all levels.

By 1991 the institute had been in continuous operation for a half century and in November it celebrated its fiftieth anniversary of continuous operation, with hundreds of its World War II Japanese language graduates in attendance. For such a school, fostering academic excellence and organizational renewal in an uncertain environment was a constant challenge. Its task was to teach the students of the present using the resources of the past to prepare them for the world of the future.

Teaching foreign languages was very different from the kinds of training most service schools offered. The educational process at the institute had four main elements. The academic programs were at the core, from the teaching departments to the supporting academic staff. The students themselves, of course, also had an important role to play. Then, various support services provided the educational equivalent of the "beans and bullets" of Army logistics. Finally, a management structure provided direction to the whole. These several components will each be treated in turn in the chapters that follow, beginning with the senior leadership.

Command Group

The early days of 1991 saw the commandant, Colonel Donald C. Fischer, Jr., USA, and his top subordinates orchestrating the institute's support to Desert Storm. In the months that followed they were once again able to turn back to leading the

¹DLIFLC Board of Visitors, memo, subj: Annual Report of the Board of Visitors, 18 Sep 91, 1.

Managing DLIFLC in 1991

institute down the road of organizational renewal. Fischer had commanded the institute since August 1989. He was assisted by the provost, Dr. Ray T. Clifford, who had gradually transformed the face of the institute's academic programs over the previous decade (see Chapter Three). That summer Fischer saw the departure of both his top military subordinates, the assistant commandant and the chief of staff.

Colonel Ronald I. Cowger, USAF, had been assistant commandant for four years, including nearly a year as acting commandant before Fischer's arrival. He was a widely respected leader who worked closely with the four service commanders on student issues. He also supervised the resource management process and took the lead in negotiations with the faculty union. He retired from the Air Force in July.²

Captain John A. Moore, USN, the institute's first Navy chief of staff, retired a few weeks later after serving at DLIFLC since 1988. The amiable administrator had sought to coordinate a myriad of support functions despite inevitable frustrations. The chief of staff position had first been created in 1987, and each incumbent had approached the job differently. Yet the textbook ideal of a chief of staff who "directs, supervises, and ensures coordination of the work of the staff, ...thereby freeing the commander from routine details" remained an elusive goal for Moore, as it had for his predecessors. The long-standing decentralization of functions and diffuse lines of authority within the institute were major stumbling blocks they all had faced.³

The Navy was unable to provide a replacement for Moore, so his job passed to Colonel William K. S. Olds, USA, the school secretary, and in September Commander Sally S. Robins, USN, was brought over from the Evaluation Division to handle many of the functions of chief of staff and was named deputy chief of staff, thus restoring tri-service balance to the command group. One of the programs Robins brought with her with a new organizational inspection program, called the Command Update Program. During the year this grew into a series of formal inspections of the eight language schools designed to insure the command group and

²"DLI's Assistant Commandant to Retire," Globe (28 Jun 91), 8, 10; Col. Cowger end-of-tour interview, 10 Jul 91.

³Field Manual 101-5, Staff Organization and Operations (25 May 84), 3-1; "DLI's Chief of Staff to Retire," Globe (19 Jul 91), 6, 10.

provost had⁴ firsthand knowledge of each school's successes and challenges.

The new assistant commandant was Colonel Ronald E. Bergquist, USAF, a career intelligence officer and author of a book-length study of the Iraqi air force. He came fresh from his assignment as J-2 of the US task force that conducted air operations against Northern Iraq during the Gulf War. He was no new-comer to the institute, having graduated from the Arabic basic course in the late 1970s. Upon his return, he set himself the long-range goal of reorganizing the staff into a true joint service staff working together under the chief of staff. Together these leaders pushed several key initiatives to make the institute more responsive to the services.⁵

The command group was aided by a small administrative staff. In addition to the commandant's secretary, Carolyn R. Koenig, and the assistant commandant's secretary, Nancy E. Belanger, the commandant used an administrative officer, Captain Christopher T. Combs, USA. The Administrative Support Division under Captain Robin D. Kehler, USA, and Sergeant Major Samuel E. Cardenas, USA, also performed a variety of adjutant functions for the commandant and staff.

Fischer put his emphasis on a handful of command priorities. He was particularly interested in initiatives that first would enable the institute to do a better job of resident instruction and second would project the institute into the wider world, making it an "institute without walls."⁶ Several of these are described below.

⁴DLIFLC Memo 20-1, Organization Inspection Program, 1 Jul 91.

⁵The Role of Airpower in the Iran-Iraq War (Maxwell AFB, AL: Air University Press, 1988). See also historian's notes, Col. Bergquist briefing to "Visions, Goals and Objectives" meeting 2 Dec 91. For biographical information on Fischer, Bergquist, Olds and Robins, see DLIFLC, Command and Staff Biographies (Oct 91).

⁶COL Fischer, "From the Commandant," Globe (24 Apr 91), 4, and DLIFLC Board of Visitors, memo, subj: Annual Report of the Board of Visitors, 18 Sep 91, 3.

New Initiatives: The Learner-Focused Instructional Day

Down through the years many attempts had been made to accomplish the first of these two aims. During the 1970s the prevalent approach was to write new textbooks and place them in the hands of the instructors. In the 1980s emphasis was placed on proficiency testing and improving faculty work conditions, in particular by increasing the staffing ratio, starting team teaching, and pushing teacher in-service training.

During his first two years in command, Fischer wrestled with all facets of the issue. He pushed computer training for instructors and mandatory study hall for students. He stressed teacher accountability through proficiency tests. He worked to add a second GS-11 to each team. He spoke frequently about the role of homework in the learning process. He showed a willingness to make major adjustments to the daily schedule by moving physical training from mornings to afternoons. Each of these changes had some limited effect on student outcomes, but they were mostly tinkering around the edges. He remained convinced that a major jump could still be achieved in student learning by attacking the center of gravity of the problem, daily classroom activities. A small-scale research project by his inspector general's office confirmed that the learning processes were far from optimum from the students' point of view (see Chapter Four).

In the spring of 1991 Fischer began to work with the provost and the deans on a major reorientation of the instructional day to shift from a teacher-centered classroom to a student-focused classroom. Two aspects of the issue struck him as being salient. First, the institute's students were adults, not children. What they needed was not "pedagogy" but "andragogy," meaning "the training of adults." Adults, he reasoned, were more goal-oriented than children and responded better to teachers as facilitators, rather than teachers as drill masters. Second, students and instructors alike needed a more flexible approach to learning, using small-group sessions, computer-assisted study, and more varied classroom activities to speed up the learning process.

⁷For the background to the Learner-Focused Instructional Day, see COL Fischer, "From the Commandant," Globe (19 Jul 91); briefing to the GOSC (21 Aug 91); DLIFLC Board of Visitors, memo, subj: Annual Report of the Board of Visitors, 18 Sep 91; COL Fischer's remarks to the 4th Q FY 91 Quarterly Review and
(Footnote Continued)

By August these ideas were brought together into a comprehensive package Fischer called the "learner-focused instructional day (LFID)." Dr. Martha Herzog, the Dean for Curriculum and Instruction, briefed the General Officer Steering Committee that the program had several goals:

- o Increased student participation and interaction
- o Variety of learner activities
- o Tailored to student's needs and learning style
- o Flexible daily schedule
- o Small group instruction
- o Individual review and feedback
- o Personalized homework assignments

Underlying it all was a sense of urgency to make the student's time more productive. After some discussion Fischer decided to take the most radical step of all, directing the school day be extended from six hours to seven. This move in effect took an hour away from the troop units and gave it to the academic departments to effect the needed changes. The seventh hour was intended as shock therapy for the institute, forcing each department and team to reconsider every aspect of their programs. By this means he hoped to unleash a burst of energy and innovation across the board that would further boost student proficiency levels.

As the end of the year approached Fischer directed all departments to implement the program when the students returned from Christmas break, 6 January 1992. Like all changes, it was bound to be painful for some, but Fischer saw that for the faculty to stand still while the world was changing it would be the height of folly. Making LFID work would become the key challenge in the new year.

(Footnote Continued)

Analysis (29 Oct 91); ATFL-CMT, memo, subj: "Guidelines for Implementation of the Learner Focused Instructional Day" (4 Dec 91); Dr. Neil Granoien, briefing at commandant's staff meeting (10 Dec 91); COL Fischer, briefings to the faculty (17-18 Dec 91); DLIFLC Master Plan, Strategies for Excellence (Jan 92), Strategy 22, "Implement the Instructional Approach of the Learner Focused Instructional Day Throughout DLIFLC;" COL Fischer, "From the Commandant," Globe (10 Jan 92), 4-5; and COL Fischer, oral history interview, 20 Feb 92.

New Initiatives: Video Teletraining

Just as Fischer pushed for a quantum leap in productivity in the resident program, he also saw the chance for a breakthrough in support to command language programs. A revolutionary new technology had appeared on the scene just in time to make a major contribution to Desert Storm, video teletraining (VTT). Using two-way television transmitted via satellite, an instructor in Monterey could teach a classroom full of students on the other side of the continent. Fischer saw its potential at once, and the experience of Desert Storm reinforced his commitment. The institute had in its hands the means to project its language teaching expertise throughout the world without having to reduce the faculty's knowledge to paper (through printed products) or putting the faculty on the road (through mobile training teams), both of which were costly and often ineffective methods. Fischer pushed VTT to the fore as the main effort in the attack on language sustainment training for linguists in the field. This effort had the added benefit of promising to ensure a continued role for the institute's instructors when the overall shrinking of the services would bring fewer students to Monterey for resident training.

Establishing a network of VTT studios around the country proved to be an uphill struggle during 1991. Funding was a major problem, but Fischer pushed ahead, sharing costs with the US Army Training Support Center and, after the beginning of FY 1992, with the National Guard Bureau. The technology was leased from Compression Labs, Inc., for approximately \$80,000 per station per year. Several other people championed the new system, including the commander of the 341st Military Intelligence Battalion (Linguist)(Washington Army National Guard), Lieutenant Colonel David J. Seifert, ARNG, the I Corps language program manager, Yvonne Pawelek, and Pete Lалlos on the DLIFLC staff. They actively lobbied leaders in the Army National Guard and elsewhere to garner commitments and resources. By summer he had studios operational on the Presidio of Monterey, I Corps at Fort Lewis, the Special Warfare Center at Fort Bragg and the Intelligence Center at Fort Huachuca. Before six more months had passed there were additional sites at Fort Meade, Fort Hood, Fort Monmouth, Kelly Air Force Base, and Goodfellow Air Force Base, and a second studio in Monterey. During 1991 the institute broadcast nearly 500 hours of instruction in nine languages and projected a total of 7,000 hours for FY 1992. In early 1992

the institute proposed a mature⁸ program with thirty-two sites at an annual cost of \$3.6 million.

Within the institute the program was placed in the Distance Education Division under the direction of Pete Lallo, who had many years' experience working on educational technology development projects. In August the institute hosted a special video teletraining working group meeting to explore its potential with users and managers. A team of outside educational consultants was assigned to evaluate the program under the auspices of the long-term Educational Technology Needs Assessment research project. The researchers observed video teletraining that spring with Fort Lewis and presented a draft report in November declaring that DLIFLC had "successfully demonstrated the potential and feasibility" of the new technology. They praised the institute for "seiz[ing] the opportunity to demonstrate leadership in the utilization of new technologies for language education." Video teletraining was a booming business, and by the spring of 1992 some two dozen sites were operating, representing a major new capability in the language training business. The institute's⁹ VTT became the pilot project for the Army's TrainingNet (TNET).

New Initiatives: The SOF Project

The third major initiative was a massive course development project intended to support the US Army Special Forces. DLIFLC had assisted the US Army John F. Kennedy Special Warfare Center several years before on a series of contractor-written foreign language courses known as the Special Forces Functional Language Course (SFFLC). In 1990 the Special Warfare Center once again turned to DLIFLC, this time to write entirely new courses called

⁸ATFL-CMT, memo, subj: Fort Lewis VTT Viewing/Coordination, 9-10 May 1991 [Trip Report], 21 May 91; ATFL-OPD-DE-P, memo, subj: DE Input for CY 1991 Historical Summary, 18 Mar 92; and DLIFLC, info paper, subj: Defense Language Institute, Foreign Language Center (DLIFLC) Modernization Plan Initiatives, 9 Jan 92, at Tab D, GOSC briefing book (6 Feb 92). See also DLIFLC Memo 350-11, Video Teletraining Standing Operating Procedures, 1 Nov 91.

⁹"Video Teletraining Conference Looks to Future," Globe (12 Sep 91), 7; William J. Bramble and Cynthia L. Bauer, DLIFLC Computer Assisted Study (CAS) and Video Teletraining (VTT) Pilot Tests, (Orlando, FL: Institute for Simulation and Training, Apr 92).

Managing DLIFLC in 1991

Basic Military Language Courses (BMLC) to be taught to Special Forces personnel at Fort Bragg. In a planning meeting in Monterey in February 1991, Colonel Fischer and Special Warfare Center commandant Brigadier General David J. Baratto, USA, agreed to a "business deal" by which the institute would develop BMLC courses in the thirteen highest-priority languages for the Army Special Forces. In April Fischer flew to Washington to personally brief the Director of Army Training, Brigadier General Keller, on the project.¹⁰

As the Special Operations Forces (SOF) Project began to take shape, it grew into a four-year, \$8 million project that would involve dozens of full-time course developers and over \$1 million in new computers and software. For Category I and II languages such as Spanish and German, BMLC was designed to be sixteen weeks long. For Category III and IV languages such as Russian and Arabic, it was twenty-two. The courses were also designed to be supplemented by a computer-assisted study component using personal computers equipped with the new Windows and Toolbook software, and a CD-ROM drive. The costs, including staff salaries and computer equipment, were to be borne by the US Army Special Operations Command. As a side benefit, the institute would gain valuable experience in computer-based course development and the resulting materials could be integrated into its own basic courses in Monterey. The institute also agreed to revise the SFFLC materials on Macintosh computers for eventual use by BMLC graduates for military-specific training.

Major Thomas Wood, USA, and Dale Purtle, an experienced course developer, were assigned to head up the project under the supervision of the Dean of Curriculum and Instruction, Dr. Martha Herzog. The first team to get started was in German and by the end of the year there were fifty-six personnel on board in nine languages. They set up shop in the Larkin School, a former elementary school located just off post in a quiet residential area of Monterey. Most were experienced classroom teachers, hired out of the resident language departments. The course-developer positions were classified at the GS-11 grade level, a promotion for GS-9 instructors. These new positions enabled the institute to avoid more severe reductions-in-force in languages with declining enrollments such as German, Czech and Polish.

¹⁰Historian's notes, SOF briefing (22 Feb 91); MAJ Wood and Dr. Herzog, SOF briefing to 1992 Annual Program Review (5 Feb 92); DLIFLC Master Plan, Strategies for Excellence (Jan 92), Strategy 8 (first added in the July 1991 edition); historian's notes, SOF Project visit (13 Mar 92).

Over the summer and fall the project assembled the staff and began training the developers in computer applications and the German team developed prototype modules. In August the project received the support of the General Officer Steering Committee and the Board of Visitors. By the end of the year the institute had committed significant resources to the project, and the first complete courses were projected to be ready for classroom trial by the summer of 1992.

Initiatives Delayed: The New Personnel System

Other major initiatives remained elusive. As far back as 1985 the institute had proposed a major overhaul of the personnel management system for its faculty. In 1990 Congressman Leon E. Panetta (D-Monterey) introduced a bill to establish the New Personnel System, but it failed to reach the floor of the House. On April 10, 1991, he introduced a revised version as HR 1685. On July 24 the Civil Service Subcommittee of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee held hearings on the bill. The DLIFLC provost, Dr. Clifford, and the president of the faculty union, Alfie Khalil, both testified concerning the need, but the Office of the Secretary of Defense and the Office of Personnel Management had reservations. On September 18 Panetta submitted a revised version, but this did not settle the issue, and by year's end no further action had been taken.

Unwilling to wait for Congressional action, Fischer pushed for temporary promotions for the coordinator on each six-person team. During the year over a hundred of these team coordinator positions were filled at the GS-11 level, and a new GS-11 position for course and test developer was created for the language departments.¹¹

Initiatives Delayed: The Closure of Fort Ord

Another major initiative that had little immediate impact during 1991 was the threatened closure of nearby Fort Ord, from which the institute drew a wide range of base operations support. The institute had moved to the Presidio of Monterey after World War II in part because of the availability of support from Fort Ord, just as at the peak of the war, it had been moved from isolated Camp Savage, Minnesota, onto Fort Snelling, fifteen miles away. An earlier round of base closings and

¹¹ Fact sheet on the New Personnel System, inserted at Tab O, GOSC briefing book (6 Feb 92).

Managing DLIFLC in 1991

realignments in the early 1970s had forced the institute to merge its Washington headquarters with the West Coast Branch on the Presidio of Monterey in 1974.

Planning for the closing of many military bases nation-wide had begun in 1988 with the first Base Realignment and Closure Commission, known as BRAC I. Fort Ord did not appear to be at risk until 1990, with BRAC II and the Army's internal Quick-silver task force, but even this was overshadowed by the dramatic events in Southwest Asia. Nevertheless in September of that year the institute began informal planning for a hypothetical future life after Fort Ord. Over the fall and winter of 1990-91 the Fort Ord staff provided extensive information to the Department of the Army, while the institute quietly monitored developments. On April 12, 1991, the Department of Defense officially recommended that the post be closed down by 1995.

At this point planning began in earnest. Congressman Panetta established a local task force to examine the ramifications and the institute began to add up what its essential support requirements would really be. In July the institute forwarded its estimates to TRADOC and Forces Command (FORSCOM), to include housing, medical, law enforcement, facilities engineering, finance and accounting, and morale, welfare, and recreation services. In August Fort Ord submitted a draft implementation plan that included a residual enclave, which came to be known as the Presidio of Monterey (POM) Annex, to support the institute.

In November and December survey teams from the US Army Force Integration Support Agency and the Office of the Chief of Engineers validated the support requirements and calculated that the required staff to support DLIFLC and operate the POM Annex would be in the range of four hundred civilian personnel. Estimates of annual operating costs varied, depending on what was counted, anywhere from \$25 to \$40 million. By the end of the year nothing had been settled. Left unresolved were the sticky problems of medical support, area support responsibilities, and the possibility of moving one of the eight separate language schools onto the annex to allow for new construction on the built-out Presidio. No one doubted that the closure of Fort Ord would have a major impact on the institute, but in 1991 the staff had not gone far beyond identifying the problem.

Initiatives Delayed: Foreign Language Training Center-Europe

The extensive reorganization of US forces in Europe in 1991 seemed to present the institute with an opportunity to take control of two other Army-operated language schools, the US Army Foreign Language Training Center-Europe (FLTCE) in Munich and the US Army Russian Institute in Garmisch. Both schools were

facing changes in mission and possibly location, and the institute welcomed the chance to extend its operations to Europe. Serious planning was initiated in the spring for the take-over of FLTCE, and in December two DLIFLC faculty trainers were sent to Munich to teach FLTCE instructors how to use Macintosh computers in foreign language instruction. But by the end of the year it appeared less likely.¹²

Resourcing

For these initiatives, as well as on-going operations, the institute remained fully funded during FY 1991, despite the Desert Storm budget turmoil. The actual dollars for fourth quarter, for example, were not received until the last possible minute. But by the close out of the year, total civilian work-years weighed in at 1,172--little changed from 1989-90 levels. On the non-payroll side of the ledger, spending on contracts and equipment rose by more than twenty percent over the previous three years' average. Much of this was paid for with "hire-lag" money originally programmed for civilian personnel who could not be hired due to the DoD hiring freeze. The institute was able to purchase more than \$2 million worth of computers and software and it received another \$206,000 in computer equipment from other agencies.¹³

Following the trend of recent years the institute was drawing a growing portion of its budget from agencies outside the Defense Foreign Language Program. During FY 1991 it received reimbursements of \$1.2 million for the SOF Project (half of which was spent on computers), \$1.1 million for law enforcement agency training in support of the War on Drugs, and \$682,000 for support to Desert Shield/Desert Storm.

The resource management process within the institute, directed by Lieutenant Colonel Matthew H. Fleumer, USA, was a

¹² IAOPS-FM-TR, memo, subj: US Army Russian Institute/ Foreign Language Training Center, Europe (USARI/FLTCE) Transfer Conference, 10 Jul 91; US Army TRADOC Permanent Orders 100-3, 5 Aug 91, assigning FLTCE to DLIFLC; and DLIFLC Master Plan, Strategies for Excellence (January 1992), Strategy 23, "Integration of Foreign Language Training Center Europe (FLTCE) into the DLIFLC Mission (FY93)," which projected that the institute would assume command on 1 Oct 92.

¹³ ATFL-RMB, FY 1991 Cost Review (2 Mar 92) and ATFL-RM, memo, subj: Annual Historical Summaries for 1991, 27 Mar 92.

Managing DLIFLC in 1991

perennially contentious one. For many years the institute had allocated unprogrammed funds through a Resource Advisory Subcommittee (RASC), on which all deans and division chiefs had seats, and a smaller Resource Advisory Committee (RAC) that made final recommendations. For example, the last RASC meeting for FY 1991 held in June recommended the allocation of \$758,000 in year-end money. The chief of staff, in the last such meeting before his retirement, urged the institute to reexamine the entire RASC/RAC process to see if it could be made more effective in setting priorities, especially for computer equipment. But for now the process continued as before.¹⁴

Meanwhile at echelons far above the institute a battle royal was brewing over resourcing for FY 1992 and subsequent years. At one point the TRADOC commanding general intervened to tell his superiors bluntly, "TRADOC is broken and cannot accomplish its assigned missions.... We have long passed the nice to have¹⁵ need to have stage. We are down to must have or we cannot do." In faraway Monterey, the institute began the new fiscal year under the usual continuing resolution authority and could only hope for the best. Fleumer retired in the fall and the Resource Management staff continued the work into the new fiscal year (see Chapter Five.) In the final analysis the institute's funding remained at substantially the same level as in previous years in an era of seriously diminished resources, a clear statement of the institute's continued importance in the eyes of the Defense Department and Army leadership.

Operations, Plans and Doctrine

Fischer had long sought a way to put a single officer in charge of all external mission taskings, similar to a S-3/G-3 in a tactical unit. In the fall of 1990 he established a Directorate of Operations, Plans and Doctrine (OPD), headed by Lieutenant Colonel Richard A. Magno, USA, under the operational control of the school secretary. When the changes were officially put into effect early in the new year, Magno took control over the Language Program Coordination Office, Plans and Scheduling Division, support to law enforcement agencies for the War on Drugs, and the Distance Education Division (described in

¹⁴ATFL-CS, memo, subj: Minutes of the Resource Advisory Subcommittee (RASC) Meeting, 26 Jun 91.

¹⁵TRADOC Commander's Statement, FY 92-93 Resource Management Update, undated [Apr 91?].

Chapter Three). During 1991 the office remained in flux as Magno tackled new tasks and built his staff. For example, his principal assistant, Major Randy Hill, USA, was posted to South-west Asia for the first half of the year, and Chief Warrant Officer Bill Hogan, USA, who had overseen the automation of many of the division's functions, retired in August.¹⁶

One key responsibility was to control the programmed student load and monitor the fill rate in close coordination with the Executive Agent, the four service program managers, and the DLIFLC Washington Office. This mission, which included scheduling classes, managing quotas, and enrolling students, was handled by the Plans and Scheduling Branch. The office also was responsible for planning changes in student load, to include the annual Structure Manning Decision Review. Early in the year Plans and Scheduling was split from the Academic Records Division (which was transferred to the Dean for Academic Administration), and it proceeded with the computerization of its functions. For example, in January 1991 it automated the entire student enrollment process.

To work as program coordinator of the law enforcement agency programs, which grew to over \$1 million during the year, Magno brought in Lieutenant Commander Linell McCray, USN. The Spanish departments taught a special twelve-week "narco Spanish" course to eighty-seven students, most from the Drug Enforcement Administration and the US Customs Service. Another twenty-four week course was set up for thirty DEA agents in Monterey and another twenty in Washington. A contract training program was set up in Washington, DC, for an in-service training program for customs agents working in Florida and along the Mexican border.

Magno retired in September and was replaced by Lieutenant Colonel David C. Shehorn, USA, who continued to expand the office's staff and functions, taking over responsibility for major documents and events such as the institute's master plan, master calendar, the quarterly review and analysis, the annual program review, and the annual meeting of the General Officer Steering Committee. In the fall the office was reassigned to the assistant commandant.

¹⁶ATFL-RMM, memo, subj: Organizational Changes, 15 Feb 91; Historian's notes, LTC Shehorn briefing to "Visions, Goals and Objectives" meeting, 2 Dec 91; ATFL-OPD, memo, subj: CY 1991 Historical Summary for Directorate, Operations, Plans and Doctrine, 4 May 92.

Managing DLIFLC in 1991

Language Program Coordination Office

The Language Program Coordination Office had a dual mission. As the Language Proficiency Office it served as the institute's main point of contact with field on policy issues such as the linguist life-cycle, working closely with Distance Education, Evaluation, and other offices within the institute. The commandant charged them with aggressively looking for ways DLIFLC could help the field. For example, they were one of the focal points for DLIFLC support to Desert Storm, and Gunnery Sergeant Michael Snell, USMC, an Arabic linguist, deployed to Southwest Asia in January. Another step they took was to revive the LingNet computer bulletin board. Within the institute they served as the managing office for about ninety military language instructors from all four services.

In the fall of 1991 Major Gary N. Chamberlin, USA, left as office chief to work in the Information Management directorate, leaving Chief Warrant Officer Robert Higgins, USA, in charge. He was aided by Sergeant Major Roland A. Petrin, USA, and Command Master Sergeant Charles D. Jewell, USAF. The office was realigned physically and organizationally as well. They moved into office space in the headquarters building near the command group and were shifted from Operations, Plans, and Doctrine to directly under the new assistant commandant.¹⁷

DLIFLC Washington Office

Ever since 1974 when the Defense Language Institute headquarters had moved to the Presidio of Monterey, the institute had maintained an office in Washington, DC. Since 1987 this had been headed by Lieutenant Colonel Peter W. Kozumplik, USA. He was aided by a small staff that helped him carry out his extensive liaison activities and administer a \$2 million contract foreign language training program (see Chapter Three). During 1991 he augmented his staff by bringing four Army Reserve officers onto extended active duty for Desert Shield and Desert

¹⁷ MAJ Chamberlin, "The Language Program Coordination Office: The Changing Jobs of MLIs," Fifty Years of Excellence, special commemorative edition of the DLIFLC Globe (1 Nov 91), 38-39; historian's notes, CW3 Higgins briefing to "Visions, Goals and Objectives" meeting, 2 Dec 91; oral history interview with CW3 Higgins, 30 May 91; "New Electronic Bulletin Board Helps Military Linguists, Foreign Language Teachers," Globe (7 Mar 91), 9.

Storm. He brought on board Captain Ryan Whittaker, USAF, in June to fill a new operations officer position. Whittaker had previously worked as the Air Force service program manager action officer. His responsibilities also included the small branch that provided training and other language services to the Washington-Moscow Communications Link (MOLINK), the famous "Hot Line," and providing assistance to the 1st Linguist Unit, US Army Reserve.¹⁸

During Desert Storm, Kozumplik took the lead in establishing contract Arabic training in Washington and elsewhere in the United States and with the British Defense School of Languages abroad. Because of his proximity to key policy makers and his long experience in the DFLP, he continued to play an active role in several committees, such as the Intelligence Community Staff Foreign Language Committee (ICSFLC) and the Federal Interagency Language Roundtable (FILR). In June he flew to Istanbul as acting head of the US delegation to the annual meeting of the NATO Bureau for International Language Coordination (BILC). In September he was appointed management committee chairman of the FILR.

Kozumplik's most important role was as principal point of contact with the Executive Agent and DFLP action officers. Through daily contact at the action-officer level he served as the primary conduit of information between the institute and the agencies it served. With a seemingly endless stream of faxes, PROFS notes, and phone calls from his Crystal City office, he kept Fischer and the institute's staff up to date on a bewildering variety of activities in all the areas that touched on DLIFLC and the DFLP. He also handled a number of sensitive policy initiatives for the commandant, such as the New Personnel System legislation and maintaining liaison with the Board of Visitors. Only by dint of such aggressive liaison activities could the institute overcome its geographic isolation and continue to be responsive to the user community.

Managing for the Future

On November 1, 1991, the institute celebrated fifty continuous years of service to the nation. The uncertainties about the future in the months leading up to the event were briefly laid aside as hundreds of World War II graduates of the Military

¹⁸For a description of the routine functions of the office, see "DLI's Washington Office," Globe (30 Jan 91), 14-15. See also his monthly significant activities reports.

Managing DLIFLC in 1991

Intelligence Service Language School gathered for banquets and speeches. Congressman Norman Mineta (D-San Jose), a member of the House Intelligence Committee, spoke of the great importance of language capability to national security. The founding father of the joint-service Defense Language Institute, Brigadier General James L. Collins, Jr., USA, Ret., described the role of military linguists in an increasingly uncertain world. Colonel Fischer proudly compared the achievements of the Arabic and other linguists who had served under General Schwarzkopf in the Persian Gulf to the achievements of the Nisei linguists who had served under MacArthur and Nimitz a half century before. The celebration¹⁹ paid homage to a glorious past and an equally bright future.

To guide such an institute through such challenging times was the task of the commandant and his key staff, and Desert Shield had shown they were adept at doing so. For many tense months DLIFLC had supported the services in their largest deployment since Vietnam. The commandant had then rebuilt and reorganized his management team in the months that followed, adapting the organization to meet the needs of the future. By the end of 1991 the institute was well on the way to the future, building upon the great strengths of its academic programs, as the following chapter will show.

¹⁹ATFL-DRO, memo for record, subj: DLI 50th Anniversary After Action Report, 1 Mar 92. See also "50 Years of Excellence," a special commemorative edition of the Globe (1 Nov 91).

Chapter Three Teaching Foreign Languages in 1991

More than a few of the high school foreign language teachers who visited DLIFLC with their students on Language Day, May 17, 1991, must have detected a certain restlessness at the institute that must have puzzled them. What they could see going on inside the classrooms on the Presidio of Monterey far surpassed anything they could dream of in a high school or college. Instead of 25-30 students to a class, DLIFLC never had more than 10. Instead of the usual one hour of class a day, at the institute classes were in session six hours a day, five days a week. Instead of the standard offerings of French, Spanish, and German, the institute offered courses in more than twenty languages and dialects. Instead of using languages labs for rote drill, the institute was experimenting with interactive computer and video programs and live television broadcasts. The institute was clearly in a class of its own.

The institute was not content to rest on its laurels, for it did not measure itself against the academic world. The Gulf War had shown that the institute was training linguists for a very serious business, and its leaders had to measure their effectiveness against a very different standard from those of secondary school educators. In the mid-1980s the user community had evaluated its foreign language needs and determined that the minimum entry-level proficiency required for military linguists in most specialties was Level 2 as measured on the Interagency Language Roundtable scale. In 1989 the General Officer Steering Committee (GOSC) had challenged the institute to bring 80% of its basic course graduates to that level over a five year period. When they provided that guidance, the overall rate stood at just over 50% (almost double what it had been in 1985). By 1991 the overall rate had climbed to 67.2%. In some languages the rate already stood at 100%, while in others such as Russian it had climbed over 80%.

The academic leadership driving those changes remained relatively stable during 1991. The provost, Dr. Ray T. Clifford, had been the senior academic official for a decade. Under him the vice provost, Dr. Vu Tam Ich, retired in January 1991 after twenty-seven years on the staff, and Dr. Martha Herzog assumed many of his duties when she stepped up from her position of dean of the Central European School to the newly created position of Dean for Curriculum and Instruction (DCI) in an office adjacent to the provost's. The provost was further aided by his military assistant, Lieutenant Colonel Helen Brainerd, USAF, whose position was redesignated dean of students. The eight language schools in Monterey and the contract foreign language training program in Washington retained the same leadership during the year, except for the Central European School, where Herzog was

Teaching Foreign Languages in 1991

replaced by Dr. Neil Granoien. The story was different on the academic support side, which saw a major reorganization early in the year when the old Training and Doctrine directorate was split in two (see below).

Many of the changes were specific to each school, but many were institute-wide. The evidence of success cut across all programs: rising average proficiency scores on the end-of-course Defense Foreign Language Proficiency Tests (DLPT). The leaders were also encouraged by another trend: rising numbers of students scoring in higher ranges above Level 2, which led some to speculate that a new goal might be set at Level 2+/2+/2. Since the student proficiency statistics first began to be widely reported in the mid-1980s they were coming to be used as an index of success for departments, schools and the institute as a whole. By 1991 the provost developed a secondary measurement to make them more accurately reflect the underlying reality. He called this the Academic Performance Success Index (APSI), to compensate for the statistical effects of any changes in student aptitude or academic attrition.¹

The intense scrutiny of the institute's programs continued, with curriculum reviews during the year in two of the largest language programs, Korean and Arabic, and another in Russian planned for the spring of 1992 (see below). The National Security Agency and Defense Intelligence Agency both maintained a lively interest in the implementation of their final learning objectives (FLOs) into language courses, a multi-year course development effort begun several years before. Over the summer the Air Force Inspector General urged the General Officer Steering Committee to take a fresh look at ways to meet new language training requirements for treaty verification and interoperability with our allies. The courses under development for the Special Operations Forces promised to bring major changes over the next few years to over half of the languages taught in

¹ATFL-P, info paper, subj: Proficiency Enhancement Plan (PEP) Update, 3 Dec 91, included as Tab N to GOSC read ahead book, 6 Feb 92. For a general overview of academic developments see the annual BILC report (Jun 91). The APSI is derived by dividing the number of students meeting the 2/2/1 goal by the number of completions plus the number of student academically attrited, then multiplying the total by the ratio of expected DLAB to actual DLAB. Thus if the number of students dropped from the course for academic reasons goes up, the APSI would go down. Likewise, if the students have lower than expected DLAB scores, the index would be adjusted upward.

Monterey (see Chapter Two). During the fall, planning continued for the conversion to the learner-focused instructional day in January 1992 (see Chapter Two).² Thus the institute in 1991 was a hotbed of curricular reform.

The key factor for carrying out these changes was the institute's unique faculty, most of them native speakers of the languages they taught.³ In many ways the faculty had changed their classroom habits since the mid-1980s. Extensive in-service training had been conducted, including a master's degree program in teaching foreign languages for a small number of teachers, paid for in part by the institute. They had been reorganized into teaching teams of six instructors each, and during 1990-91 more than a hundred had been awarded temporary promotions to GS-11 as mentors and team coordinators. Nearly ninety military language instructors (MLIs) taught side by side with the civilians. It was this experienced faculty with their unmatched body of teaching expertise that the provost and commandant hoped to preserve from the coming downsizing of the services. In 1991 alone, the input of new students declined by 13% from the previous year (much of that in Central European languages) and the faculty staffing ratio was closely tied to the student load. But the institute's top leaders were able to argue successfully for retaining what was in many ways a unique national asset. They argued that their programs had a strength and vitality unmatched by any other foreign language program, inside or outside the federal government.

²For a detailed summary of course development work from 1988 to 1991, see DLIFLC Master Plan, Strategies for Excellence, Parts I-III, pages II-14A-1 thru II-14A-5 (Jan 92). On the various teaching methodologies in use see ATFL-P, info paper, subj: Foreign Language Teaching Methodology, 2 Dec 91, included at Tab P, GOSC briefing book (Feb 92).

³On the diverse faculty, see especially two profiles in Fifty Years of Excellence, special commemorative edition of the DLIFLC Globe (1 Nov 91): Ben De La Selva, "The Faculty and Languages: Changing and Growing," 12-13, and SSgt. Richard Tatum, USAF, "The Instructors: Creating, Developing, Teaching for Proficiency," 14-17. On the MLIs see "Middle East School MLIs Accomplish Mission at DLI and at the Front," Globe (24 Apr 91), 11.

Teaching Foreign Languages in 1991

Asian School

The Asian School was in the midst of wide-ranging re-evaluation of its programs in 1991 under its dean, Dave Olney, associate dean, Major Ana Howard, USAF (later⁴ Major Paul Scott, USA), and academic coordinator, Andy Soh. It continued to share office and classroom space with the Korean School, from which it had been separated two years before. Its largest language program was Chinese-Mandarin, which took in 171 new students in FY 1991. The original department had split in December 1990, with Chinese A under Harry Olsen and Chinese B under Victor Wen. The first curriculum review at DLIFLC had been in Chinese in June 1990, and the following year had been marked by extensive efforts to implement the review's forty major recommendations. By the end of the year they had implemented or otherwise resolved three-quarters of the recommendations. Nevertheless the percentage of basic course students graduating at the 2/2 level in fiscal years 1990-91 held steady at the 40% level, more than double the percentage of three years before.⁵ The recommendation to extend the length of the basic course to 63 weeks was postponed until the results of the extended Arabic basic course could be evaluated. The recommendations of the Chinese Technology Task Force, which had met concurrently with the curriculum review, were also pursued during 1991. Work continued on Macintosh computers, and three course developers were committed to developing computer-assisted study materials. Work began in January 1991 on the Chinese-Mandarin DLPT IV.

The Persian-Farsi Department continued to graduate students with around 60% reaching the 2/2 goal, little changed from recent years. K.Z. Sadeghi retired as chairman after twenty-five years in the department and Jamshid Cyrus took his place.

The Multi-language Department saw many changes during the year. Student proficiency seemed to slump in Japanese, and Olney held an internal program review in July. Student

⁴Annual Program Review (5 Feb 92); historian's notes, Dave Olney briefing to "Visions, Goals and Objectives" meeting, 2 Dec 91; [ATFL-ESE], info paper, subj: Status of Curriculum Reviews [9 Jan 92], included at Tab I, GOSC Briefing Book, 6 Feb 92; "1991 Teachers of the Year," Globe (16 Dec 91), 8-9.

⁵The commonly used shorthand, 2/2, refers to Level 2 on the FILR scale in listening, and a second skill as determined by the user agency, with the third skill no lower than Level 1.

Teaching Foreign Languages in 1991

proficiency had peaked in FY 1989-90 at 59-64%, but when the new DLPT IV was implemented in 1991, scores dropped to 13%. Minoru J. Onomoto, the new branch chief, moved swiftly to make major changes.

The Tagalog Branch, one of the newest at the institute, was still having growing pains. The year saw a doubling of student input, but also saw a sharp drop in basic course student proficiency. As a result the branch chief was reassigned and two instructors were sent to Cornell University for in-service training. Upon their return the entire curriculum was abolished and a new one developed by a Cornell professor adopted. Much hope was placed on an interactive video program then under development and on the SOF course, projected to begin in early 1992.

Basic course student proficiency also remained low in the Thai Branch, which also received a new branch chief in 1991. A new interactive video program and the SOF course offered hope here as well for future improvement. The instructor of the year award for the Asian School went to Thai instructor Jamlong Busadee. In the Vietnamese Branch basic course student proficiency also declined significantly below that of previous years. A Vietnamese version of the SOF course was also on the way to replace the Vietnam War-era basic course.

Central European School

When Dr. Neil F. Granoien took over the Central European School from Dr. Martha Herzog in January 1991, the school was in the midst of rapid change.⁶ Granoien, who had been chief of the Faculty and Staff Development Division since 1985, continued Herzog's emphasis on faculty professional development. He was aided by his associate dean, Lieutenant Colonel Daniel Cervone, USAF, and academic coordinator, Dr. Patricia C. Boylan. The biggest challenge they faced was the abrupt shift in the German program, which saw the virtual elimination of cryptologic requirements, until recently three-quarters of the demand. Administrative attrition also rose as the services no longer needed to train linguists for billets that had disappeared. The number of departments shrank from three to two, and 40% of the

⁶Annual Program Review (5 Feb 92); historian's notes, Neil Granoien briefing to "Visions, Goals and Objectives" meeting, 2 Dec 91; ATFL-DCE, memo, subj: Annual Historical Summary for 1991, 20 May 92; "1991 Teachers of the Year," Globe (16 Dec 91), 8-9

Teaching Foreign Languages in 1991

instructors were laid off over the summer. Despite the turmoil, the proficiency of the students who stayed on remained steady. The remaining teachers seized the opportunity to make major changes in the classroom, and the new DLPT IV came into use. The school's instructor of the year was the German team coordinator Heide B. Wilson.

The Polish Department also faced declining enrollments, but was clearly on the move. Development had begun on a new basic course at the end of the previous year, and the department had moved back onto campus from the Larkin School, a leased former elementary school just off post, where it had been housed for several years. The new DLPT IV was implemented and basic course student proficiency rose to 64% 2/2 for FY 1991 and a remarkable 92% 2/2 in the first two quarters of FY 1992.

Korean School

While East German and Polish threats to US national interests were evaporating, the North Korean threat continued as strong as ever. Training linguists to meet this was the job of the Korean School under its dean, Charles E. Cole, together with his associate dean, Major Claude E. Hunter, USA, and academic coordinator, Joe Kwon. Student input for the basic course grew slightly to 398. Frankly acknowledging the difficulty of teaching Korean to young Americans, Cole jokingly referred to it as a "Category V" language and pressing for the extension of the basic course to 63 weeks. Nevertheless he pushed basic course student proficiency levels to 46% 2/2 during the year, but results slumped again in the first half of FY 1992.

In February the Korean Curriculum Review gave the program a thorough examination and made sixty-six formal recommendations. By the end of the year all but twelve had been addressed or implemented. The departments tried new approaches and materials, including a new set of Listening/Reading/Speaking materials and

⁷ Annual Program Review (5 Feb 92); historian's notes, Charlie Cole briefing to "Visions, Goals and Objectives" meeting, 2 Dec 91; ATFL-DKO, memo, subj: DKO Annual Historical Summary for 1991, 22 May 92. See also the extensive school profile by JO1 Jayne Duri, USN, in the Globe (9 Apr 91), 5-12. For a linguistic argument, see John Y. Sohn, "Why Korean is Difficult for English Speakers to Learn," in Proceedings of Second Korean School Seminar on Learning Problems, ed. by John Y. Sohn, published as Vol. 2, Dialog on Learning Korean: Korean School Journal (1991), 70-108.

revised tests. The Korean DLPT IV was under development, and a major interactive video project was nearing completion. The instructor of the year was Bo Yang Park.⁸

Middle East School

In 1990-91 the Middle East School stepped onto center stage as a truly national asset: the commandant called it "the school that went to war." Virtually all the Arabic linguists the US deployed for Desert Shield and Desert Storm had learned their first Arabic in Nisei Hall, and through the tense months of Desert Shield the school provided extensive assistance to its graduates in the field, such as video teletraining and special course development projects. The Arabic faculty had produced in short order an Iraqi-English military dictionary and an Iraqi "crash course" with audio and video components. Meanwhile the school kicked into high gear to train the next generation of linguists for that volatile region in Arabic, Greek, Turkish, and Hebrew (the Persian-Farsi Department was shifted to the Asian School in 1989).⁹

Under the leadership of its dean, Benjamin De La Selva, associate dean, Lieutenant Colonel Dennis Doroff, USAF, and academic coordinator, Dr. Giselle Yonekura, the school saw the rapid expansion of the Arabic program during 1991.¹⁰ Student input to the Arabic basic course jumped by one quarter to 409.

⁸[ATFL-ESE], info paper, subj: Status of Curriculum Reviews [9 Jan 92], included at Tab I, GOSC Briefing Book, 6 Feb 92; "1991 Teachers of the Year," Globe (16 Dec 91), 8-9.

⁹Historian's notes, COL Fischer, opening remarks, Arabic Curriculum Review, 6 Aug 91. For support of Desert Shield/Desert Storm see the DLIFLC 1990 Annual Command History (Jan 92); James C. McNaughton, "Can We Talk?" Army Magazine (June 1992), 20-28; "Arabic Linguists," Soldiers (May 91), 18-19; and the school profile in the Globe (7 Mar 91).

¹⁰Annual Program Review (5 Feb 92); historian's notes, Ben De La Selva briefing to "Visions, Goals and Objectives" meeting, 2 Dec 91; ATFL-DME, memo, subj: Middle East School History 1991, 22 May 92; Arabic Curriculum Review Read Ahead Materials (May 1991), especially for detailed descriptions of the new 63-week course; John Neff, "Arabic Program Praised After Curriculum Review," Globe (25 Nov 91), 6-7; "Middle East School Garners

(Footnote Continued)

Teaching Foreign Languages in 1991

They used special hiring freeze exemptions to hire 25 new Arabic instructors, bringing the total of 112, and established a new department in Munakata Hall in space borrowed from the School of Romance Languages. Only the shortage of qualified instructors prevented the school from growing even further, and the services turned to other sources to meet short-notice requirements that exceeded the school's training capacity. Despite the rapid growth, De La Selva managed to complete the conversion of all of his faculty into permanent positions.

In August 1991, one year after the start of Desert Shield, DLIFLC convened the Arabic Curriculum Review. Several of the service representatives came fresh from serving in the Gulf. They saw a school that had been transformed, not so much by the war, but by the efforts of dozens of faculty members over the previous several years to reform every aspect of the curriculum. The most important change had been the start of a 63-week basic course in late 1989 to replace the previous combination of a 47-week Modern Standard Arabic course and 16-week dialect extension courses. The first students to go through the new program graduated in January and February of 1991. The new course was a mix of the Abdel Malek course, originally developed in the early seventies as an aural comprehension course, and the Gulf to the Ocean, originally a text and film-strip course produced commercially in the 1970s and remastered onto laser disks for video applications. A liberal dose of authentic listening, reading and speaking activities were also built in. Dialects were integrated from the start, rather than waiting until after the students had mastered Modern Standard Arabic as in the past.

The effects of the crisis on the school were electric: students and instructors alike went about their work with new intensity. The results were equally dramatic: fully 65% of graduates from the 63-week course scored 2/2/1 or higher, compared to only 20% for the older 47-week course in years past. Best of all, the higher proficiency results continued long after the shooting had stopped. For the first two quarters of FY 1992 graduate proficiency remained at nearly the previous year's level, at 59%. The result had come not from any single "magic bullet," such as a rewritten textbook, but from a wide range of curricular innovations, skillfully applied by involved instructors with the full support of their academic leadership. One Arabic instructor, Joseph Kallu, received the Achievement Medal for Civilian Service and was named the school's instructor of

(Footnote Continued)

Excellence Award," Globe (30 Jan 92), 7; "1991 Teachers of the Year," Globe (16 Dec 91), 8-9.

the year, and an Arabic military language instructor, Master Sergeant William H. Moon, USAF, won the Air Force Association's national Hoyt S. Vandenberg Award. In November the provost awarded the school his annual Award for Academic Excellence.

The three languages in the Multi-language Department also scored important gains during the year. The Greek Branch brought 100% of its graduates to the 2/2/1 level for the first time, and kept up the pace into the next year. The Hebrew Branch saw 73% of its students reach the goal based on the new DLPT IV. The Turkish Branch continued to teach basic and Gateway courses, and an interactive video program was in production. Turkish instructor John Varosh was named one of the two DLIFLC instructors of the year by the Pacific Grove Kiwanis Club. Using the new DLPT IV, 100% of the basic course graduates scored 2/2/1 or better, a dramatic improvement over historical levels. When the Multi-language Department was shifted to the Central European School at the end of the year the better to balance the size of the two schools, this made the Middle East School a purely Arabic school.

School of Romance Languages

The School of Romance Languages continued to teach Spanish and four other languages in intensive, 27-week basic courses and intermediate, advanced and other special-purpose courses. The school was headed by its dean, Peter J. Armbrust, associate dean, Major Gregory L. Robinson, USA, and academic coordinator, Ani Frazier.¹¹ Student input for Spanish, the highest volume course offering, was up 18% over the previous year. The Spanish faculty added authentic materials to the curriculum and developed new computer courseware. Basic course student proficiency upon graduation was already close to the 2/2/1 goal in the 75% range. One of the three Spanish departments changed hands during the year when Deanna Tovar took over as chair of Spanish B. The school also took the lead in several institute-wide events during the year, including Language Day, Hispanic Heritage Month and the fiftieth anniversary celebration.

The fastest growing requirement for Spanish language instruction was to support the War on Drugs. Many of the military

¹¹Annual Program Review (5 Feb 92); historian's notes, Peter Armbrust briefing to "Visions, Goals and Objectives" meeting, 2 Dec 91; ATFL-DRO, memo, subj: Annual Historical Report of the School of Romance Languages for 1991, 27 Mar 92; "1991 Teachers of the Year," Globe (16 Dec 91), 8-9.

Teaching Foreign Languages in 1991

students in Spanish were slated to go into intelligence support functions, and the school also provided special training to civilian law enforcement agencies, including the Drug Enforcement Administration, US Customs Service, US Marshals Service and Orange County Regional Narcotics Suppression Program. These courses required intensive course development work and research into the scenarios and vocabulary most likely to be encountered by law enforcement personnel working on drug interdiction missions. Other course development work was underway in Spanish on the SOF project, the nonresident Proficiency Improvement Course, and an interactive video program filmed in Costa Rica.

Spanish was not the only show in town. The Multi-language Department taught four additional languages: Dutch, French, Italian, and Portuguese. Faculty from all branches were active in developing computer-assisted courseware and bringing new authentic materials into the classroom. The Dutch branch managed to bring 100% of its students to the 2/2/1 level for the second year in a row. The French branch saw its proficiency levels drop back to 63% after a one-year peak. A Proficiency Improvement Course and a SOF course were also under development in French. The Italian branch had seen little change in its student proficiency rates in recent years, which hovered around 65-70%. A new basic course was under development, and Cesare Paci was named the school's instructor of the year. The Portuguese branch in contrast brought 100% of its students to the 2/2/1 for the first time, and also had a new basic course under development.

School of Russian Language I

The Russian language continued to be the largest program at the institute, representing some 36% of student input during FY 1991, roughly the same level as the previous year. The students were assigned to three schools, the School of Russian I, the School of Russian II, and the Slavic School, which also taught Czech. The schools cooperated extensively among themselves and, by the end of the year, were involved in jointly preparing for the biggest curriculum review yet, scheduled for March 1992. Student input remained at the level of the previous year at 1,411, despite indications that intelligence collection requirements directed against the swiftly collapsing Soviet Union might be on the decline. The August coup attempt, witnessed by several DLIFLC faculty members who were visiting Moscow as tourists at the time, gave dramatic force to the assertion that the Soviet Union was in its death throws. While Russian language requirements might not occupy as dominant a position in the Department of Defense in the future, the languages of the former

Soviet republics, who by the end of the year were calling themselves the Commonwealth of Independent States, would grow in importance. The institute began to make plans to teach several of the languages of the Commonwealth and the Baltic states using Russian instructors who were also native-born speakers of Ukrainian, for example.

The School of Russian Language I occupied the original 1902 barracks at the base of the Presidio hill. Under its dean, Luba Grant, associate dean, Major Mark D. Stotzer, USMC, and academic coordinator, Randy Love, the school provided Russian instruction to approximate six hundred students during the year in both the 47-week Russian basic course and the 37-week intermediate and advanced courses. The school graduated 89% of its basic course students at the 2/2/1 level, and in the first two quarters of FY 1992 pushed this to an unprecedented 97%. Most of this was a direct result of curricular innovations, including the trial of portions of the new proficiency-oriented basic course and computer-assisted programs. The school's instructor of the year was Elana Makarovsky.¹²

School of Russian Language II

The School of Russian Studies, also known as the School of Russian Language II, headed by Dr. Alex Vorobiov, maintained its high proficiency levels, with 83% of the basic course graduates achieving the 2/2/1 goal. During the year the academic coordinator, David Burns, left for the Distance Education division, and was replaced by Peter R. Aikman, and Major George Stachiw, USA, served as associate dean.¹³ The school taught Russian to over 500 students from all four services at any given time in the

¹²Annual Program Review (5 Feb 92); historian's notes, Luba Grant briefing to "Visions, Goals and Objectives" meeting, 2 Dec 91, ATFL-DR1-AD, memo, subj: School of Russian Language One (DR1) 1991 Historical Summary, 16 Mar 92; "1991 Teachers of the Year," Globe (16 Dec 91), 8-9. For an extensive description of the school's programs see "Dean's Program Overview," Tab A, Section 1, Russian Curriculum Review Read Ahead Packet (Mar 92). For computer courseware see Jack Franke, "Russian School 1 Moves Forward into the Twenty-first Century," Globe (12 Sep 91), 6.

¹³Annual Program Review (5 Feb 92); historian's notes, Alex Vorobiov briefing to "Visions, Goals and Objectives" meeting, 2 Dec 91; "1991 Teachers of the Year," Globe (16 Dec 91), 8-9.

(Footnote Continued)

Teaching Foreign Languages in 1991

basic course and three smaller programs, the Foreign Area Officer program, the LeFox extended program and the On-Site Inspection Agency course. Frank Klahn, a team coordinator in Russian B, was named one of the two DLIFLC instructors of the year by the Pacific Grove Kiwanis Club, and Sofia Rappoport was named the school's own instructor of the year. During the year Vorobiov reorganized the school from five departments to four and at the end of the year transferred the On-Site Inspection Agency program, whose input dropped by 40% to 54 students, to the Slavic School.

School of Slavic Languages

Betty Lou Leaver continued to lead the School of Slavic Languages, where Russian, Czech and Slovak were taught. She was aided by Major Chester J. Phillips, Jr., USA, as associate dean and Dr. Maurice Funke as academic coordinator.¹⁴ The Czech program suffered a serious setback during 1991 as student input dropped by half to 123. Leaver was forced to reduce the number of instructors from 62 to 28, losing many promising new teachers in the process, and she merged the three Czech departments into one. Despite the turmoil, the instructors kept basic course student proficiency up at 60% 2/2/1 for classes graduating in FY 1991, for the third year in a row. The instructors brought more authentic materials into the classrooms and began to try out many of the new methods they were learning in the school's intensive in-service training programs. Work also began on the Czech SOF course and the Czech DLPT IV. Leaver was named by the DLIFLC Federal Women's Program as "Woman of the Year."

The school's Russian program expanded. A third department was added, and then at the end of the year a fourth was

(Footnote Continued)

For extensive descriptions of the school's programs, see ATFL-DR2, Annual Historical Summary for Calendar Year 1991, 31 Mar 92, and "Dean's Program Overview," Tab A, Section 2, Russian Curriculum Review Read Ahead Packet (Mar 92).

¹⁴Annual Program Review (5 Feb 92); historian's notes, CPT Ann Lew, USA (XO, DSL) briefing to "Visions, Goals and Objectives" meeting, 2 Dec 91; School of Slavic Languages, memo, subj: Annual History 1991 [21 May 92]; "1991 Teachers of the Year," Globe (16 Dec 91), 8-9. For a description of the school's Russian programs see "Dean's Program Overview," Tab A, Section 3, Russian Curriculum Review Read Ahead Packet (Mar 92). See also the school newsletter.

provisionally established under Major Phillips for the On-Site Inspection Agency course. Basic course student proficiency continued to close the gap with the two older Russian schools, reaching 71% 2/2/1 during FY 1991. The school's instructor of the year was Russian instructor Zhanna Leydiker.

Contract Foreign Language Training Program

Not all language training requirements could be met at the Presidio of Monterey campus. For military personnel selected for the Defense Attache System, the Defense Intelligence Agency preferred that they receive their training in Washington, where the classes were smaller and they could learn alongside their future State Department counterparts. To meet these requirements, and requirements for more than fifty less-commonly taught languages not available in Monterey, the institute used the Foreign Service Institute and five different proprietary language training schools. Managed by Ivy Gibian at the DLIFLC Washington Office under Lieutenant Colonel Peter W. Kozumplik, USA, these programs during FY 1991 cost \$1.1 million for training at the Foreign Service Institute and \$952,300 for contract training, for nearly five hundred students.

The Washington Office also set up special contract Arabic training programs in January 1991 to meet urgent Desert Storm requirements and sent 23 Army and Marine Corps students to the British Defense School of Languages in Beconsfield, UK, another first. Back in Washington the staff continued to improve the quality of contract training. For years the contract program had ridden contracts issued by the US Information Agency and the US Agency for International Development. Solicitations were issued in September for much improved DLIFLC contracts that ensured a tight statement of work and full DLIFLC control over the technical review prior to award. The office also gained the capability to pick up SCOLA foreign language television broadcasts and also in October began reporting average proficiency results for students graduating from contract training at the Quarterly Review and Analysis meetings.¹⁵

¹⁵ATFL-W, memo, subj: Contract Training Performance, 3 Sep 91, and JO1 Jayne Duri, USN, "The Washington Office: The Voice in the Capital," Fifty Years of Excellence, special commemorative edition of the DLIFLC Globe (1 Nov 91), 40. See also the ATFL-W monthly significant activities reports.

Teaching Foreign Languages in 1991

Academic Support Staff

Nor were all of the institute's academic programs located within the eight language schools. A large number of academic support functions were consolidated into separate divisions organized under several directorates. The Evaluation, Testing and Research divisions reported to the Dean of Evaluation and Standardization. Three others, Curriculum, Educational Technology and Faculty and Staff Development, were under the direction of the Dean of Curriculum and Instruction. The new Directorate of Operations, Plans and Doctrine (OPD) oversaw two divisions: Distance Education and Plans and Scheduling. The Dean of Academic Administration controlled Academic Records, Program Management and the Aiso Library. Another division, Area Studies, reported directly to the provost.¹⁶

Program Evaluation, Research and Testing

The Program Evaluation, Research and Testing Directorate continued to support the institute under the leadership of the dean, Dr. John L.D. Clark, and associate dean, Lieutenant Colonel William Oldenburg, USAF. Dr. Dariush Hooshmand continued to push the Testing Division into a new era of foreign language testing. Test batteries in the Defense Language Proficiency Test (DLPT) IV series were completed in German, Hebrew, Persian-Farsi and Polish, and work continued in several other languages. A new DLPT IV familiarization guide was published in the spring, and by the end of the year nine tests were available in the new format. The division renovated its two testing labs in Bldg. 631 to include thirty IBM-compatible 386-based computer stations to administer the DLPT listening component using high-quality CD-ROM rather than traditional audio cassette. Work also began on a computer-administered test for the listening and reading components of the final learning objectives for Russian. In addition to the regular workload of tape scoring, the division continued telephonic testing for law enforcement agencies such as the Drug Enforcement Administration and the US Customs Service and conducted a pilot of oral proficiency testing using video teletraining facilities.

The Evaluation Division under the leadership of Dr. John A. Lett, Jr., continued to revise the system of student feedback during the year. A new interim feedback procedure was

¹⁶"Defense Language Institute Anticipates Changes," Globe (14 Jan 91), 6.

implemented and plans progressed to revise the Student Opinion Questionnaire. One option the division was actively pursuing was to replace the paper-and-pencil system with a computer-administered system. Curriculum reviews expanded to include two in 1991, Korean in February and Arabic in August, and plans were laid for the most extensive one yet, in Russian, in March 1992.

The Research Division, also under Lett, continued to supervise two multi-year research projects being conducted by the Institute for Simulation and Training. In the spring the Educational Technology Needs Assessment (ETNA) project published the proceedings of a symposium held on the presidio in October 1990 and continued with two other major projects, the assessment of computer-assisted study and video teletraining mentioned above and a study of the use of educational technology in the resident program at DLIFLC. The second major contract research project, the Language Skill Change Project, moved into its final phase with data collection and the analysis of results. A major in-process review was scheduled for February 1992. The division also conducted a major study, sponsored by the Army Deputy Chief of Staff for Intelligence, of the special 24-week Arabic courses held at several locations early in the year.

By fall the workload in Evaluation and Research had increased to the point where joint management was no longer possible, especially after Commander Sally S. Robins, USN, left to become deputy chief of staff in September. In November Clark appointed Oldenburg acting director of Evaluation, and Lett¹⁷ retained the Research Division and the curriculum reviews.

Distance Education

At the beginning of 1991 the Nonresident Training Division took a new name, Distance Education, and distance was certainly a major challenge in supporting linguists deployed to Southwest Asia. The division coordinated the creation, reproduction, and transportation of thousands of pounds of language training

¹⁷ Defense Language Institute Directorate of Program Evaluation, Research and Testing (Evaluation and Standardization), Annual Historical Summary, [26 Jun 92]; historian's notes, Lt. Col. Oldenburg, briefing to "Visions, Goals and Objectives" meeting, 2 Dec 91; DLI Pam 350-14, DLPT IV Familiarization Guide (1 Mar 91); William J. Bramble and David L. Hosley, eds, Improving Foreign Language Teaching through Technology, Conference Proceedings, 29-30 Oct 90 (Orlando, FL: Institute for Simulation and Training, Mar 91).

Teaching Foreign Languages in 1991

materials in support of Desert Storm. For the remainder of the year the commandant continued to push the division into the forefront of his efforts to make the institute a "school without walls," providing language instruction to the services around the world in whatever form and place it was needed.

The division, the largest under OPD, was led by Jawdat Y. Yonan, the former dean of the Middle East and East European schools. Together with his associate dean, Major Bernardo Nuño, USAF, he directed a wide range of activities, including traditional nonresident missions such as providing training materials and mobile training teams, to the rapidly expanding video tele-training program (described in Chapter Two). They also directed Dr. Gerd Brendel, the DLIFLC Language Training Detachment in Heidelberg, who was charged with supporting the US Army-Europe command language program.¹⁸

Traditional nonresident support operations continued apace. The division kept in touch with some eight hundred unit command language programs world-wide by means of a quarterly newsletter and frequent phone calls. During FY 1991 the division sent out thirty-nine mobile training teams in ten languages for a total of sixty-five instructor-weeks. The General Officer Steering Committee approved new resourcing procedures for mobile training teams to permit the institute to load them into ATRRS, the Army Training Requirements and Resourcing System, for scheduling. The division also shipped out some \$960,000 in materials. To assist units the division published a revised DLIFLC Pamphlet 350-5, Catalog of Instructional Materials (Jan 91), DLIFLC Pamphlet 350-13, Distance Education Services and Materials (1 Jan 92), and a new publication, DLIFLC Training Circular 350-15, Training Resources for Low-Density Foreign Languages (1 Dec 91). With the assistance of the Evaluation Division and the Language Program Coordination Office, the division also published a "how-to" manual for command language program managers, DLIFLC Pamphlet 350-9, Guidelines, Policies and Procedures for DoD Command Language Programs (1 Nov 91), that gave common-sense advice and detailed instructions on everything from ordering training materials to hiring contract instructors and rapidly became a best-seller in the field.

¹⁸ Annual Program Review (5 Feb 92); ATFL-OPD-DE-P, memo, subj: DE Input for CY 1991 Historical Summary, 18 Mar 92; DLIFLC Master Plan, Strategies for Excellence, Parts I-III, pages II-5 and II-6 (Jan 92). For Distance Education in Desert Storm see the DLIFLC 1990 Annual Command History (Jan 92).

Teaching Foreign Languages in 1991

New nonresident course materials were under development in five languages. Contractor-written Proficiency Improvement Courses in Czech, Polish and Russian were sent to US Army Institute for Professional Development for world-wide distribution, and similar French and Spanish courses being written in the Curriculum Division. The interactive video courses and SOF courses under development would also be made available to the field.

The growing video teletraining program described in Chapter Two held great promise for the future of DLIFLC support to command language programs. During 1991 under the day-to-day supervision of Pete Lallo the institute learned how to adapt itself to new ways of thinking about delivering language instruction. Teachers had to be detailed from the resident departments and then trained. Space for the studios had to be found. Funds had to be identified to bring other locations on-line. Units had to be encouraged to try it out. Through a process of trial and error the institute slowly learned how to exploit the potential of the new technology and how to sell it to the customers, who quickly grew to like what they saw.

Plans and Scheduling

Also under OPD was the Plans and Scheduling Division, which was separated from Academic Records during the year. The chief, Major Randy Hill, USA, returned in June from temporary duty in the Persian Gulf. In the months that followed, Hill rebuilt his staff. Captain James Laughlin, USA, joined as plans officer; Captain Robert Terselic, USMC, came in as operations officer; Master Sergeant John Sims, USAF, became the operations noncommissioned officer, Art Gebbia was brought in as the scheduling program analyst; and two schedulers were hired.

In addition to continuing to manage the critical area of student input and class scheduling, the office became involved in several new areas, including the semi-annual DLIFLC master plan (formerly published by Resource Management) and contract training. The office also pushed aggressively to expand office automation for managing student enrollment and tracking.¹⁹

¹⁹DOPD-PS, memo, subj: CY91 Plans and Scheduling Input (OPD-PS) [4 May 92]. On automation, see DLIFLC Master Plan, Strategies for Excellence, Parts I-III, pages II-19-1 thru 3 (Jan 92).

Teaching Foreign Languages in 1991

Educational Technology

During 1991 Colonel Fischer continued to push the institute into the forefront of educational technology, using the 1990 High Technology Plan as his road map. As submitted to TRADOC in December 1990 (as an Information Mission Area Modernization Plan), his vision had two main thrusts. The first was expanding the video teletraining network. The second was a bold initiative to expand the use of computers for foreign language study at the institute and in the field. He presented his plan to the General Officer Steering Committee in August 1991 and provided detailed costing information at their meeting in February 1992.

The Educational Technology Division had been experimenting with computers in foreign language teaching for a decade. By 1991 the division, headed by Lieutenant Colonel Sharon D. Richardson, USAF, was managing a variety of projects.²⁰ Video teletraining outgrew the experimental stage and was shifted to Distance Education early in the year. A series of contractor-developed interactive video programs in ten languages, modeled on the pioneering German VELVET program, were nearing completion. The first three (in Turkish, Tagalog and Thai) were

²⁰Background information on educational technology at DLIFLC is extensive. The following give an overview: ATFL-DCI-ET, memo, subj: History Input for 1991, 20 May 92; ATFL-DCI-ET, memo, subj: Update of Technology Projects at DLIFLC, 12 Nov 91; "Ed Tech Helps Fort Riley with Language Training Software," Globe (14 Feb 91), 13; historian's notes, Lt. Col. Richardson briefing to "Visions, Goals and Objectives" meeting, 2 Dec 91; High Technology Plan briefing, included as Tab D of GOSC briefing book (6 Feb 92); DLIFLC Master Plan, Strategies for Excellence, Parts I-III, pages II-12-1 thru 5 (Jan 92); Applied Language Learning, Vol. 2, No. 2 (1991). The complete conference proceedings were published in March 1991: William J. Bramble and David L. Hosley, eds, Improving Foreign Language Teaching through Technology, Conference Proceedings, 29-30 Oct 90 (Orlando, FL: Institute for Simulation and Training, Mar 91). For a retrospective survey of educational technology at the institute, see SSG Eugene Hill, "The Technology: The Institute Moves Ahead," Fifty Years of Excellence, special commemorative edition of the DLIFLC Globe (1 Nov 91), 30-33. See also William J. Bramble and Cynthia L. Bauer, DLIFLC Computer Assisted Study (CAS) and Video Teletraining (VTT) Pilot Tests, (Orlando, FL: Institute for Simulation and Training, Apr 92) for an assessment of several pilot projects conducted in FY 1991.

delivered to Tobyhanna Army Depot for reproduction and distribution to the field, and five more (in French, German, Italian, Korean and Spanish) were well underway. Richardson tried to ease the division slowly out of the course development business so its small staff could serve as consultants to instructors developing their own courseware in their departments.

Work also continued with the EIDS interactive video computer systems, such as the Russian Aural Comprehension Exercise (ACE), completed in April 1991, and Arabic listening and reading comprehension exercises. The institute had procured over two hundred of these machines several years before, but they suffered from limited capability to input and edit audio and had other technical shortcomings that made them less than optimal for foreign language instruction.

In 1989-90 the institute had purchased 85 Macintosh computers, especially for their audio capabilities and foreign language fonts and had launched a large-scale in-service training program to introduce the faculty to the system's potential. The Chinese departments in particular had begun extensive courseware development on the Macintosh, and dozens were installed in student labs in schools and student areas.

Desert Storm allowed the institute to demonstrate the value and flexibility of computer-assisted study. For example, in December-January 1990-91 a small team in the Educational Technology Division developed a special Arabic program for the Macintosh. In just two weeks Captain Philip C. Faris, USAF, Mohammad Al-Haise and Milan Herben were able to develop a 12-hour course for Arabic linguists in the 101st Military Intelligence Battalion at Fort Riley, Kansas.

But Fischer's high technology plan called for the institute to place its emphasis on the IBM-compatible 386-based Desktop III computers, the new DoD standard. With commercially available Windows and Toolbook software, the machines promised to do everything that the Macintosh could, including the popular graphic-user interface and expanded audio capabilities. Furthermore, the expected widespread availability of these machines in the field would make the distribution of computer-assisted study courseware far more convenient than the earlier EIDS and Macintosh platforms. No longer would a linguist have to use a unique stand-alone system for refresher training. At DLIFLC Fischer envisioned having one computer for every two students, so they would be available in every barracks and classroom. To this end he purchased about 450 of the new systems in 1991-92, of which about 150 were on hand by the end of the year. The specialists in the Educational Technology Division were confident that most of the courseware developed for EIDS and the

Teaching Foreign Languages in 1991

Macintosh over the previous several years could eventually be converted to run on the 386-based machines.

By the end of 1991 the modernization plan was gathering momentum. The Public Broadcasting Service television series "Computer Chronicles" produced a half-hour program on the institute's state-of-the-art initiatives. The institute began to receive large shipments of the new systems and the National Security Agency even contributed an additional \$105,000 for a one-time buy of equipment to outfit a student lab for the Naval Security Group Detachment and the Marine Corps Detachment. The institute's academic journal, Applied Language Learning, published a special issue containing six papers originally presented at the educational technology symposium at the institute the previous fall. The institute laid plans to host the February 1992 meeting of CALICO, the Computer-Assisted Language Learning and Instruction Consortium. The avalanche of technology was growing, and Whitney Reed of the National Security Agency reflected the feelings of many when he sounded a cautionary note in February 1992. The number one problem at the institute, he cautioned, was managing this influx of new technology well.

Curriculum

In January 1991 Dr. Mahmood Taba Tabai left the Curriculum Division, which he had led since 1983, for a new position as Dean for Academic Administration. Erika E. Malz, who had been a German department chairperson since 1979, joined the division to oversee the Visual Productions and Publications branches as well as to perform a variety of administrative duties related to the management of the institute's diverse curriculum. Preparation of programs of instruction (POIs) and course administrative documents (CADs) for every course and the general catalogue continued to create a major workload even though most course development projects had moved to the language schools. In general Curriculum Division staff served as consultants to help language departments develop their own materials. In one exception, Christa Rutsche managed Proficiency Improvement Courses (PICs) in French and Spanish for Distance Education. Also, Dale Purtle started the large-scale Special Operations Forces project in a separate office at Larkin School. The Visual Production Branch made major contributions to the Desert Shield course development efforts over the winter and continued to provide general support to other departments throughout the rest of the year. The division continued to support the school with technical assistance and training for the Xerox Star desktop publishing systems. In March the two academic journals edited by Dr. Lidia Woytak, Applied Language Learning and Dialog on Language Instruction,

were shifted from Faculty and Staff Development to Curriculum and one issue of each appeared during the year.²¹

Faculty and Staff Development

In-service faculty training remained an important component in the provost's plan to maintain the institute's vitality. It appeared as Strategy 1A in the institute's master plan: "Develop a professional development program for training and graduate level education in foreign language teaching." In fact a wide range of in-service training was conducted throughout the year through several offices. The Civilian Personnel Office Training Branch offered a variety of courses (see Chapter Five). Both the Curriculum Division and the Information Management Directorate taught formal and informal classes in their respective areas. Several teachers were enrolled in the DLIFLC-sponsored masters program at the Monterey Institute of International Studies, the Masters of Arts in Teaching Foreign Languages (MATFL). Several dozen faculty members attended professional conferences each year such as the annual meeting of the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL). With the encouragement of the commandant and provost, much more in-service training was taking place in the eight language schools.

The Faculty and Staff Development Division had primary responsibility for most types of formal faculty professional development, from the basic two-week instructor certification course to more tailored courses and team-building workshops. Dr. Alan Smith became division chief in January and oversaw its move in April out of the Lighthouse School in Pacific Grove first to the Larkin School in Monterey and then in June into two newly renovated buildings on post, the former International Cookery building (Bldg. 341) and the former Credit Union building (Bldg. 263).

The division adapted its offerings to the changing needs of the institute in 1991. The instructor certification course was retooled in March to cover a more relevant range of

²¹ATFL-DCI-C, memo, subj: Annual Historical Summary for 1991, 30 Mar 92. For a summary of DLIFLC's experience with the Xerox Star desktop publishing system since 1985, see DLIFLC Master Plan, Strategies for Excellence, Parts I-III, pages II-10-1 thru 4 (Jan 92). For a summary of overall course development work 1988-91, see pages II-14A-1 thru 5 in the same document. See also "DLI's Visual Production Branch Helps Offices and Division to Help Themselves," Globe (28 Jun 91), 12-13.

Teaching Foreign Languages in 1991

administrative and pedagogical topics. In December the division assisted John Lasagne, an outside management consultant, in conducting a planning and goal-setting program he called the "PACC" process (which stood for planning, accountability, communication and control).

The division also continued to be active in teaching the faculty how to use new technologies in the classroom. The Macintosh workshops continued, as did courses on how to make effective use of "low tech" classroom aids such as overhead projectors. The Instructional Technology Branch developed a workshop on using a multimedia computer such as the 386-based computers the institute was purchasing. The branch also taught a special course to help instructors use the video teletraining system for teaching languages.²²

Area Studies

Several other programs were directed by the Area Studies office under Lieutenant Colonel Terry D. Johnson, USA. Johnson, a military intelligence officer with experience in both Turkey and Israel, was levied for Desert Storm, where he served with the VII Corps G-2. Upon his return he resumed his duties while on convalescent leave. The institute chaplain, Chaplain (Major) John M. Babcock, USA, who was replaced during the year by Chaplain (Major) Gene Ahlstrom, USA, continued to expand the role of area studies within the language courses. The two worked to develop standardized cultural instruction in each course, and area studies grades were included for the first time on student transcripts that fall. They also taught introductory classes on world religions and published several articles on cultural and religious topics in the Globe. The office also supervised the Pancultural Orchestra, composed of DLIFLC students and members of the local community.

Johnson also directed the Foreign Area Officer program, much of which was directly funded by the Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations and Plans. The program at the institute included semi-annual iterations of a week-long Foreign Area Officer Orientation Course, a mentoring program, and a guest speaker program for over a hundred students a year. With

²²[ATFL-DCI-FS], memo, subj: Annual Historical Summary for 1991: Faculty Professional Development [9 Apr 92]; DLIFLC Master Plan, Strategies for Excellence, Parts I-III, pages II-1A-1 thru 2 (Jan 92); "Faculty Members Earn Master's Degrees," Globe (16 Mar 92).

the assistance of Major Erik K. Polcrack, USA, he also helped the students in arranging for their graduate schooling and managed the FAONet computer bulletin board.

In 1990 the School Secretary's office had supervised the conversion of the old officers club into a conference center. When renovations were complete the International Language and Culture Center opened its doors in November 1990. During its first full year of operation the center blossomed under the supervision of Area Studies and its new director, James J. Broz, Jr., who worked with Johnson and the School Secretary's staff to overcome the obstacles associated with the start-up of a new function, in this case a unique new training facility. An average of three thousand people each month used it for seminars, workshops, student language clubs and International Cookery. Over \$160,000 was spent on much-needed repairs, renovations and furniture, and a design contract was awarded to plan further remodelling. Evaluators from the TRADOC Community of Excellence program gave the center a special award. By the end of the year it had established itself as a major contributor to the institute's missions.²³

Dean for Academic Administration

During the year Dr. Taba Tabai built his new organization. In his capacity as Dean for Academic Administration he directed two related divisions, Academic Records, Program Management, as well as the Aiso Library. John Dege, a former German department chair, was named associate dean. During the same period Academic Records and Program Management moved from Bldg. 234, where they had been housed for three years, to Bldg. 277. Academic Records "continued to perform registrar functions for resident foreign language students, to include maintaining enrollment rosters, graduation bulletins, and monthly, quarterly, and annual statistical reports." They were also responsible for the frequent formal graduation ceremonies. The position of registrar was civilianized during the year.

²³ATFL-AS, memo, subj: Area Studies 1991 Annual Historical Summary, 26 May 92. For the FAO program see the profile by MAJ Polcrack, "Regional Experts: Foreign Area Officers," Fifty Years of Excellence, special commemorative edition of the DLIFLC Globe (1 Nov 91), 34-37. James J. Broz, "ILCC Becomes a Popular Spot," Globe (7 Mar 91), 8, and "DLI Takes Five TCOE Awards," Globe (13 Feb 92), 11.

Teaching Foreign Languages in 1991

Program Management "continued to collect, organize, analyze, validate, and provide data essential for management of residential training and training development." This included preparing the statistical reports for the quarterly review and analyses, the annual program review, and meetings of the General Officer Steering Committee. The chief of this office was civilianized during the year as well.

The Aiso Library continued to serve the institute by providing books, periodicals and audio-visual materials in over twenty languages. This was no easy task, with rising costs and declining budgets. Civil unrest in some countries, such as the Soviet Union, disrupted the supply of periodicals. Gary D. Walter, the chief librarian, sought to adapt to a rapidly changing world, among other ways, by establishing a new systems librarian position to automate the collection. In January his staff published a users guide, and in November he hosted a DoD-wide workshop at the Asilomar Conference Center in Pacific Grove that brought over two hundred military librarians to the institute.²⁴

Conclusion

By the end of 1991 the dramatic days of the Gulf War had already slipped almost a year into the past. But the push for academic change continued. It stood on the threshold of yet more changes, especially the Learner-Focused Instructional Day, set to begin on January 6, 1992. This the commandant hoped would propel the institute onto a new level of productivity. Together with computer-assisted study, video teletraining and the New Personnel System, the projected changes promised to put DLIFLC in the forefront not just of foreign language education, but of the national educational reform movement at large. That fall the provost was elected president of ACTFL for a three year term and in January 1992 the National Advisory Council on Educational Research, a high-ranking panel involved in drafting a national education strategy, "America 2000," visited the institute. By the end of the year the General Officer Steering Committee was considering setting even higher standards, a higher mark on the wall for the institute to reach for. Three years before, the committee had set the goal of having 80% of

²⁴[ATFL-DAA], memo, subj: Dean for Academic Administration History for CY 1991 [Mar 92]; "35th Annual Military Librarians Workshop Held, Globe (16 Dec 91), 6; "The Aiso Library: A User's Manual" (11 Jan 91).

all basic course graduates reach Level 2 in listening and reading and Level 1 in speaking. By early 1992 they were ready to raise this to Level 2 in listening and reading and Level 2 in speaking (given two more years and additional resourcing). And the institute was ready to try.²⁵

²⁵COL Fischer briefing to National Advisory Council on Educational Research, 14 Jan 92.

Chapter Four Foreign Language Students in 1991

Despite the end of the Cold War, Desert Storm demonstrated the undiminished need for soldiers, sailors, airmen and Marines who were proficient linguists as well as capable of taking care of themselves on the battlefield. Military linguists had to be ready to live and work in austere conditions, never far from the threat of violent combat. Students at the Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center (DLIFLC) had "to understand that they're soldiers first," Staff Sergeant Daniel M. Tully, USA, an Arabic and Persian-Farsi interrogator, later recalled. "After living in a tent and eating MREs for a few months, I have a much better understanding of what is expected of me in this career field."¹

Understanding what was expected of its graduates strengthened the resolve of those at DLIFLC who considered the student as the critical component in the learning process. After all, the students would be expected to put their newly acquired skills to use as soon as they reached their new assignments. Many thus sought to make the educational process more learner-focused, unlike traditional education which tended to be teacher-focused. Colonel Fischer openly advocated moving teachers "to the back of the classroom," where they could assist students as coaches and facilitators. In 1991 he paid increased attention to student evaluation reports and directed the schools to establish interim reporting procedures for quicker feedback during each course.

During 1991 two small research projects provided ammunition to those who wanted a more learner-focused education. One study was conducted by Master Sergeant Cheryl L. Shirley, USAF, under the auspices of the Inspector General's office beginning in the summer of 1990. Shirley collected data on fifty randomly chosen students and interviewed them at several points during their studies. She found that the learning environment at the institute was far from optimal. Those students who failed to establish good study habits in the first six weeks of a course often fell into a trap of stress and discouragement. "Stress and not knowing how to deal with it effectively is a major problem," she reported. Another danger point came mid-way in the course when many became bored and disillusioned. Based on her research Shirley identified a "closed-loop cycle of failure:" an initial feeling of being lost in training or distracted by outside

¹"B Company Linguist Finds Out What His Job Is Really All About," Globe (17 Jun 91), 5. After the war SSG Tully returned to his position at DLIFLC as a platoon sergeant.

interests produced stress for many students, and this created feelings of being frustrated or overwhelmed, producing a depressed or anxious mood, which led to procrastination or feelings of hopelessness. This increased stress and decreased motivation, resulting in reduced academic performance and, ultimately, attrition from the course. Shirley concluded that the institute could easily take steps to improve the learning environment from the student's perspective, and Fischer cited her work in support² of his plans for the Learner-Focused Instructional Day.

A second study, the Learning Strategies Project, was directed by the Research Division. Dr. Patricia C. Boylan, academic coordinator in the School of Romance Languages, had started in 1988 by inviting academic experts on student learning strategies to come to Monterey to share their ideas. By 1991 the project had grown to include two full-time staff members and a rich network of support within and without the institute. The team decided to focus its attention that year on students in the Chinese basic course, where other work was already underway as a result of the Chinese Curriculum Review and the Chinese Technology Task Force the previous year. In addition to individual student counselling, the team felt they had "contributed to an overall raising of the corporate consciousness with respect to the importance of learner styles and strategies, and thus [had] helped to lay the foundation for the command-directed Learner-Focused Instructional Day." Together these empirically based studies encouraged the institute's leaders to seek out more ways to make the learning environment more effective.³

Changing the classroom was only a part of the solution. Students spent six hours each day in the classroom, but the balance of their time was spent in the troop units to which they were assigned. These troop units had traditionally been responsible for the "care and feeding" of the students and their required military and physical training. Colonel Cowger, who retired in July 1991 after four years as assistant commandant, felt that the units had expanded their roles during his tenure:

²Interview with MSgt Shirley, 4 Mar 92, and "Longitudinal Study Trends - (3rd Report)," 6 Apr 91; COL Fischer, "From the Commandant," Globe (19 Jul 91), 4.

³John W. Thain and John A. Lett, Jr., The Learning Strategies Project Status Report and CY92 Plan, Evaluation and Research Division Report No. 92-01 (January 1992), 21; ACTFL presentation (Nov 91).

Foreign Language Students in 1991

"Each of them has now seen that they can more directly support the academic efforts of the school than they were before," he reported shortly before his departure. "Efforts varied all the way from actually providing some pre-class enrollment training for people who are waiting for their classes to start,... to peer tutoring within the dorms using the students who are more advanced in the course... to help the brand-new ones, to setting up study halls,... to a number of different issues, and even just more sensitivity to the academic side." The Board of Visitors noted the same thing when they visited in August, declaring "such continuous contact to resolve issues pertaining [to] their common concern--the student--is having salutary effects."⁴

US Army Troop Command

The largest of the four service troop units at the institute was the US Army Troop Command, commanded by Lieutenant Colonel Harry K. Lesser, Jr., USA. Command Sergeant Major George W. Kopf, USA, served as his senior enlisted advisor. During FY 1991, 2,411 Army students (89% of them enlisted) began language instruction. On any given day about 2,100 Army students were in training, most of them living in the barracks on post. They were organized into eight companies: six for enlisted students, one for officers and senior NCOs, and the headquarters company. The scale of Lesser's leadership challenge can be appreciated by noting that⁵ all eight of his companies changed command during the year.

Lesser continued to push active programs in language development and soldierization training. While ensuring that soldiers, especially first-term enlisted soldiers, received the

⁴Col. Cowger, end-of-tour oral history interview, 10 Jul 91; DLIFLC Board of Visitors, memo, subj: Annual Rport of the Board of Visitors, 18 Dep 91, 8.

⁵ATFL-TPC-O, memo, subj: S3 Input to the 1991 Annual Historical Summary, 24 Feb 92; CPT Joseph Burlas, "Soldierization: Military Training at the Institute," Fifty Years of Excellence, special commemorative edition of the DLIFLC Globe (1 Nov 91), 43-44; historian's notes, LTC Lesser briefing to "Visions, Goals and Objectives" meeting, 2 Dec 91; ATFL-TPC-O, memo, subj: Command Training Guidance for Fiscal Year 92, 26 Jul 91; DLIFLC Master Plan, Strategies for Excellence (Jan 92), II-17-1 thru 2.

necessary common skills training, he also moved to reduce conflicts between military training and language instruction. For example, for those students who met the standards, he reduced organized physical training activities from five days a week to three. He also turned the Language Olympics competition into a quarterly event. Troop Command continued to support a high tempo of athletic and community support-type activities. Personnel administration tasks were handled by the Military Personnel Center. Lesser's headquarters supported many institute-wide functions. His S-4 section, for example, supervised the contractor-operated dining facilities on post. The newest one of these, in the Russian Village, had won awards from the TRADOC Community of Excellence program each year.⁶

Troop Command also contained hundreds of Army Reserve and National Guard students. By one estimate about 290 Army reserve component students began language training in FY 1991, better than ten percent of all Army students. They were assisted by the Reserve Forces Office staffed by two Active Guard and Reserve (AGR) personnel, the Reserve Forces Advisor, Lieutenant Colonel Ronald C. Galasinski, USAR, and the TRADOC Liaison NCO, Sergeant Major Frank Moreno, USAR. The office was realigned under the school secretary in February and in October it was returned to the assistant commandant. Most of their day-to-day work involved dealing with individual students on administrative matters unique to the Army Reserve and National Guard, or on general academic counselling, but in the spring a TRADOC position review committee recommended eliminating both positions. Moreno left the office on medical leave in May, retired in August and was not replaced. Their secretary also left for another position during the year and was not replaced, leaving the office a much less mission capable shop than ever before.

The commandant nevertheless remained very interested in providing better service to the reserve components in general. One part of his strategy for this was video teletraining (see Chapter Two). Another was increasing the number of reserve component students in resident training. To this end he tasked Galasinski with bringing in more reserve component students, particularly to fill seats being left empty by the active components, but with only limited success.

⁶"DLI Takes Five TCOE Awards," Globe (13 Feb 92), 11.

⁷ATFL-RFO, memo, subj: Annual Historical Summaries for 1991, 5 May 92, with enclosures.

Foreign Language Students in 1991

3483rd Student Squadron (ATC)

The next largest group of students came from the US Air Force. During FY 1991, 810 airmen began language instruction (91% of them enlisted). These airmen were assigned to the 3483rd Student Squadron, which fell under the 3480th Student Group, Goodfellow Air Force Base, Texas, and the Air Training Command. In the spring the squadron turned over both its top leadership positions. The squadron commander Major Bruce L. Betts, USAF, passed the flag on May 31 to Major Lance J. Tomei, USAF, a three-time graduate of DLIFLC courses. The following month the squadron first sergeant, Master Sergeant Dale A. Weber, USAF, was transferred out, to be replaced in August by Master Sergeant Frederick L. Augustus, USAF.

The squadron commanded an average of 640 students at any given time and provided them the necessary military training to supplement their language instruction. Squadron members were active in community events, including a student drill team and choir, and intramural athletics. Permanent party Air Force personnel on the DLIFLC staff were supported by the Air Force Element, headed by Captain John D'Auria, USAF, under the command of the assistant commandant. Both students and permanent party received administrative support from Operation Location A, 323rd Mission Support Squadron.

Naval Security Group Detachment

US Navy students at the institute were assigned to the Naval Security Group Detachment Monterey under officer-in-charge Lieutenant Commander Kent H. Kraemer, USN. During FY 1991, 414 Navy students began language instruction (84% of them enlisted), giving an average student load of 340. Kraemer was aided by Command Master Chief CTICS Richard A. Crim, USN, who deployed to Southwest Asia in January.

Navy students participated actively in athletic programs and community events such as the Adopt-a-Beach program, an annual event on the California coast. In June Army inspectors under the TRADOC Community of Excellence program rated their barracks the best Navy barracks in TRADOC. The detachment pioneered in establishing a computer study hall in the fall of

⁸3483rd Student Squadron annual historical input [Mar 92]; historian's notes, Maj. Tomei briefing to "Visions, Goals and Objectives" meeting, 2 Dec 91. On 1 Feb 92 the unit was redesignated the 3483rd Military Training Squadron.

On the presidio itself, support operations were directed by the garrison commander in close coordination with the institute's school secretary. For the first half of 1991 the garrison commander was Lieutenant Colonel William L. Moore, USA. In August he was replaced by Lieutenant Colonel John A. Hamilton, USA. These men in effect served as city managers for a town of 5,000. They were aided by Sergeant Major Suatiama Io, USA, who came in as garrison sergeant major in January and served until he was replaced in October by Master Sergeant Loren L. Brown, USA.

Routine maintenance for the buildings and grounds on the presidio remained a major challenge for the staff of the Directorate of Engineering and Housing. Much of the grounds maintenance was handled by contractors, as was janitorial service, the costs of which were split by Fort Ord and the institute. Water, gas, electric, telephone and sewage service was provided by local utilities, as was fire and emergency medical protection. These costs were also borne by Fort Ord. The garrison staff worked closely with the troop units in the spring to prepare for the annual TRADOC Community of Excellence evaluation, and Troop Command routinely provided an average of twenty soldiers for grounds maintenance and work in the gyms and library.

A variety of other activities and services were also supervised by the garrison commander. These included two fitness centers, the child development center, post chapel, education center and recreation center. Some of these really stood out. The post library, for example, won a TRADOC Community of Excellence award as the best library of its size in TRADOC. The garrison commander also coordinated with the post exchange system, which operated a mini-mall, three snackbars, a movie theater, a gas station, and the military clothing sales store on post. Medical and dental support was provided by the PRIMUS clinic on post and the Silas B. Hays Army Community Hospital at Fort Ord. The post office was relocated in May to Bldg. 517, closer to the center of campus, and an automated teller machine was installed in the same building. The NCO club came under new management during the year when Don Beaudean took over as club manager from Jan Hacking. The financially troubled club eliminated its cover charge and monthly membership dues and according

⁸AFZW-DC-PM, memo, subj: Annual Historical Summary, 31 Mar 92; "New Garrison Commander for POM," Globe (25 Nov 91), 5. Although not a member of the DLIFLC staff, LTC Hamilton joined in COL Fischer's "Visions, Goals and Objectives" process. See the historian's notes on his briefing on 2 Dec 91.

Supporting DLIFLC in 1991

to the garrison commander, "rebounded almost immediately to become a social focal point for students" under its new name, the Student and Faculty Club.⁹

The institute ran its own facilities management program in the school secretary's office under Jerry J. Abeyta. This included a \$1.1 million remodeling program. Some projects were designed to adapt older facilities to new uses, such as computer-assisted learning labs in three schools, the Navy-Marine study center in Kendall Hall, a video teletraining studio and electrical upgrades in fourteen other buildings. Two new computer-assisted testing labs were installed in Bldg 631 and extensive work was begun to convert the former officers club into the International Language and Culture Center. Two smaller buildings, the former credit union building and International Cookery, were converted into office and classroom space to allow the Faculty and Staff Development Division to move out of leased facilities in the Lighthouse School in Pacific Grove in April. A total of \$169,000 was spent on new carpeting in six classroom buildings.¹⁰

Several other major construction projects included in the Army's construction budget were in various stages of planning through the Sacramento District of the Army Corps of Engineers, including a new instructional media center and print plant. However the most recent construction project, a 68-room student dormitory in the Russian Village area, was left only 40% completed when the contractor went bankrupt. Funding to complete this and other items on the institute's construction priority list remained uncertain through the end of the year.

Security Management

Another function shared between DLIFLC and Fort Ord was security operations. The Fort Ord Law Enforcement Command provided Federal Police and other types of support to the presidio every day, but the institute maintained its own security office

⁹AFZW-DC-PM, memo, subj: Annual Historical Summary, 31 Mar 92; "The Education Center Helps Service Members Earn College Degrees," Globe (12 Sep 91), 8; "POM NCO/EM Club in Dire Straits," Globe (28 Jun 91), 16; "Reestablishing Ownership of the NCO/EM Club," Globe (19 Jul 91), 7; "Old NCO Club Gets Face Lift, New Name, New Menu, Entertainment," Globe (30 Jan 92), 4.

¹⁰See ATFL-RMB, Fiscal Year 1991 Cost Review (2 Mar 92), 7, for a breakdown of spending on these projects.

to handle the personnel security needs of its students and staff, as well as to serve as overall security manager for the institute. In January the office was shifted from the school secretary to the deputy chief of staff.¹¹

Desert Storm kicked the year off to a dramatic start when the Army directed heightened security measures to deter potential attacks on US government facilities. Federal Police patrols were increased and in November 1990 the 7th Infantry Division (Light) provided a forty-four man platoon from the 9th Infantry Regiment (1st Brigade) to control access to the post, which had always been an open post. For five months they were billeted in the Lewis Gym and maintained tight security on the gates and perimeter fence. For several weeks cars were forbidden to park within fifty feet of any building, disrupting normal parking patterns. In April, after the war had ended, these security measures were eased and the guard force stood down, its mission successfully accomplished.¹²

The security office was plagued by personnel shortages and turnover during the year. For the first half of the year the chief's position was vacant. From January through April Captain Ann Lew, USA, headed the office as acting chief, and then the assistant chief, Helen Hill. The senior noncommissioned officer in the office left in August and was not replaced for eight months. The new chief, Steven W. Comerford, finally arrived in August.

Despite this the office kept up a high tempo. In addition to normal vehicle registration responsibilities, a complete re-issue of faculty and staff parking stickers was carried out. Hundreds of actions were taken on individual security clearances and an extensive new security awareness training program was started. A new program of physical security inspections was also begun, and a major operations security survey was conducted in December.

Information Management

The Directorate of Information Management continued to help the institute absorb the growing number of personal computers, even though the position of director remained vacant and the

¹¹ATFL-SEC, memo, subj: Historical Summary for the Security Division 1991, 30 Mar 92.

¹²CPT Christopher Combs, "Combatting Terrorism at DLI," Globe (7 Mar 91).

Supporting DLIFLC in 1991

chief of the automation division continued to serve as acting director. For the first half of the year this was Frank McReynolds, who left in June for another job. In July his place was taken by Betty Jackson. The issue of a possible consolidation of information management functions with Fort Ord under a single Directorate of Information Management (DOIM) continued to hang over the institute, but this was put on hold with the likely closure of Fort Ord by 1995.¹³

The bulk of the directorate's workload involved installing more than five hundred computers that came in during the year, almost doubling the number of computers on board. Most were 386-based PCs purchased from UNISYS or Everex through the DoD Desktop III contract. The institute's managers had reason to be concerned about their ability to absorb such large numbers. The staff was small, numbering only thirty-three (including the print plant). The influx of computers in previous years had overwhelmed the ability of the Logistics Division to maintain proper accountability, according to a report of survey completed that spring. A top-to-bottom inventory of computer equipment was conducted by the Logistics Division, and better accountability was established for software. The job of prioritizing new requirements was delegated to the Technology Coordinating Committee. Later in the year Jackson implemented a new information systems security program that involved training collateral-duty information systems security officers and accrediting individual machines. Training the individual users how to operate the new systems and their software became a major concern.¹⁴

Most of the new computers were destined for student use, but many were going for office automation. As early as 1988 in the Information Systems Plan the institute had foreseen the need for connectivity for its senior leadership and staff, internally and externally. In 1991 the institute took the first major step in this direction by installing 30,000 feet of fiber-optic cable to link twenty-three buildings with a local area network (LAN) (also known as a facilities area network [FAN]). Using existing systems the Information Management staff linked sixty more managers to the PROFS system, bringing the total to over one

¹³ATFL-IM, memo, subj: 1991 Historical Input, 25 Mar 92.

¹⁴ATFL-SS-RA, memo for record, subj: Findings and Recommendations, Report of Survey, ATFL-05-91, 2 Apr 91. New computer security measures are described in ATFL-IM, memo, subj: Addition to the 1991 IM Historical Report, 10 Apr 92, and DLIFLC Master Plan, Strategies for Excellence (Jan 92), II-21D-1.

hundred fifty. Connectivity to the Army Standard Information Management System (ASIMS) was completed in September, and three other offices were provided on-line support. Work continued on building a distributed corporate database and in December the student database first became operational on a stand-alone PC.¹⁵

Another aspect of information management was printing. The DLIFLC print plant worked overtime during December 1990 and January 1991 to reproduce Iraqi dialect materials for Desert Storm and other requirements were handled through contract. During 1991 the print plant continued to support the institute, but plans were afoot at DoD-level to transfer it to a new agency, the Defense Printing Service. This finally took place early in 1992.¹⁶

The endless flow of requirements for printing and other reproduction was controlled by the Production Coordination Office under Lester D. Turpin, who reported to the school secretary. During Desert Storm, Turpin supervised \$396,000 in reproduction of Arabic language materials, much of it contracted out for audio cassettes and binders beyond the capacity of the institute's own audiovisual contractor. During the rest of the year the office worked to keep the schools supplied with training materials in more than twenty languages.

Logistics and Audio-Visual Support

The year also saw a complete changing of the guard in the Logistics Division with a new division chief, Ralph Brooks, a

¹⁵These are detailed in ATFL-IM, memo, subj: 1991 Historical Input, 25 Mar 92, and DLIFLC Master Plan, Strategies for Excellence (Jan 92), II-21B-1 thru II-21C-1. Logistics was connected to the Standard Army Intermediate-Level Supply System (SILS) and the Army Medical Department Property Accounting System (AMEDDPAS); the Budget Division was connected to the Standard Finance System (STANFINS)(also known as SRD-1); and the Military Personnel Branch was provided on-line support for the Standard Installation/Division Personnel System (SIDPERS).

¹⁶"DLI Print Plant Supports Linguists in Gulf War," Globe (14 Feb 91), 9.

¹⁷ATFL-SS-PC, memo, subj: Production Coordination Office FY '91 Historical Summary, 13 Mar 92; "Production Coordination Office: The Hub of DLI's Publishing Operation," Globe (9 May 91), 9, 16.

Supporting DLIFLC in 1991

new property book officer (PBO), Gay Gandia, and a new warehouse supervisor, Eugenio Rivera. Desert Storm had a major impact on this division as well, as unprecedented quantities of language materials were received or had to be shipped on short notice. During the rest of the year Brooks and his staff worked to support the institute in every way possible. Gandia conducted a complete inventory change-of-PBO inventory, and a special team conducted a 100% inventory of computer equipment. Several basic policy documents were rewritten.¹⁸

Another aspect of logistic support was providing audio-visual services. The Source AV, Inc., continued to hold the \$883,000 contract for audio-visual services at the institute, providing a wide range of audio and video recording, tape duplication, photographic, and maintenance support under the supervision of the Audio-Visual Management Office, headed by Allen M. Merriman. During Desert Storm, contractor personnel worked closely with the Arabic instructors and the Curriculum Division to produce the "Iraqi Crash Course" on video and audio cassettes in a very short time. Later that spring audio-visual technicians helped the public affairs office produce a ten-minute video program on the institute's support to Desert Storm. All this was in addition to the normal workload in support of instruction in other languages. In the fall The Source AV also helped the public affairs office produce another ten-minute video, this one a retrospective on fifty years of the institute's history for the anniversary celebration on November 1.¹⁹

The audio-visual needs of the institute were slowly shifting, driven in part by the expansion of video teletraining programs. The military construction budget for FY 1991 contained funds for the design of a new instructional media center. The

¹⁸ATFL-SS, memo, subj: 1991 Historical Summary, 24 Mar 92, with Logistics Division enclosure. DLIFLC Memo 700-1, Logistical Support (1 Oct 91), Logistics SOP (1 Oct 91), DLIFLC Pamphlet 700-3, Textbook Warehouse Operations (1 Jan 92), DLIFLC Pamphlet 735-1, General Principles, Policies and Basic Procedures (1 Dec 91), and DLIFLC Pamphlet 735-2, Command Supply Discipline Program (1 Jan 92).

¹⁹ATFL-SS-AV, memo, subj: Annual Historical Summaries for 1991, 7 Mar 92; DLIFLC, Desert Shield - 1990 (video, RT 10:51, March 1991); DLIFLC, Defense Language Institute Fifty Years of Excellence: Past, Present, Future (video, RT 10:35, October 1991); Audio-Visual Management Office, briefing slides on FY 1991 contractor workload, 5 Oct 91 (FOUO).

institute's contracting arrangements had to be adapted as well. As the year progressed the Audio-Visual Management Office undertook the first major rewriting of the requirement specifications since audio-visual functions were first contracted out in 1986. The contractor filed four protests (although three were dismissed), and the Fort Ord contracting office extended the contract through January 1992. In the end The Source AV, Inc., won the award in January once again with a bid that was 30% lower than the previous year's level.

Representing the Institute

Three other offices under the deputy chief of staff had the job of telling the institute's story, representing the institute to various audiences within and without its walls: the public affairs office, protocol office and command historian. Each approached the task from a different direction, and each spoke to a different audience. All three were dedicated in their own ways to helping the institute meet its primary mission, producing proficient military linguists.

Public Affairs Office

The year posed special challenges to the public affairs office and its new chief, James F. Davis III.²⁰ Desert Storm brought new taskings, not only in increased public interest, but also when Davis was tasked to produce a special video to document the institute's support to the war effort. Media contacts increased significantly. The planned closure of Fort Ord made community relations a command priority for the institute, which was slated to pick up area support responsibilities when the Fort Ord public affairs office eventually closed. In the fall the office made major contributions to the fiftieth anniversary celebration, including media relations, a ten-minute historical video and a special historical issue of the Globe. Throughout the rest of the year the office published the biweekly newsmagazine, the Globe, and handled routine media and community relations. Davis also began detailed planning and coordination for using the cable television capability already installed in the

²⁰ATFL-PAO, memo, subj: PAO Annual Historical Summary for 1991, 31 Mar 92; Fifty Years of Excellence, special commemorative edition of the DLIFLC Globe (1 Nov 91); ATFL-DRO, memo for record, subj: DLI 50th Anniversary After-Action Report, 1 Mar 92, Tab I, Public Affairs Office and Publicity.

Supporting DLIFLC in 1991

dormitories to deliver foreign language programming such as SCOLA news broadcasts and foreign language films, set to begin in early 1992.

Protocol Office

The protocol office under Pierette Harter continued to handle a steady stream of high-ranking visitors and special events.²¹ During the year the office sponsored a total of 1,250 visitors, including numerous flag officers, congressmen, diplomats and other visiting dignitaries. Although the usual annual meeting of the General Officer Steering Committee was cancelled due to the Gulf War, two curriculum reviews, the annual Board of Visitors meeting and the fiftieth anniversary celebrations more than made up for it.

Command Historian

The command historian, Dr. James C. McNaughton, continued to support the institute by collecting and preserving important information and publishing historical reports. Annual command histories were his priority during the year. In September he published the 1989 history and by January 1992 had completed the 1990 history. He also wrote several articles and research papers, collected oral history interviews and contributed to the fiftieth anniversary celebration, as well as collecting data for the 1991 history. With Desert Storm at the start of the year and the fiftieth anniversary celebration at the end, 1991 was truly historic.

Supporting Excellence

During the Desert Storm awards ceremony in April 1991 the commandant praised the entire staff for helping him "make history" during the tense months of Desert Shield and Desert Storm. They had been ready to react when the call came, with ideas on the drawing boards, such as video teletraining, that they brought quickly into play, and they were ready to respond in ways that no one had foreseen. He singled out the "can do" mentality he saw in the support staff and urged them to continue to be ready to respond to future contingencies. He knew that a

²¹[ATFL-PRO], memo, subj: Protocol Office 1991 Historical Summary [6 Mar 92]; ATFL-DRO, memo for record, subj: DLI 50th Anniversary After-Action Report, 1 Mar 92, Tab H, Protocol.

Glossary

ACE	1) American Council on Education; 2) Aural Comprehension Exercise (Russian)
ACPERS	Army Civilian Personnel System
ACTFL	American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages
AGR	Active Guard/Reserve
APSI	Academic Performance Success Index
ASIMS	Army Standard Information Management System
ATC	Air Training Command
ATSC	Army Training Support Center
ATRRS	Army Training Requirements and Resources System
BILC	Bureau for International Language Coordination
BMLC	Basic Military Language Course
BRAC	Base Realignment and Closure
CAD	Course Administrative Document
CALICO	Computer-Assisted Language Learning & Instruction Consortium
CFE	Conventional Forces in Europe Treaty
CPO	Civilian Personnel Office
CTS	Cryptologic Training System
DAA	Dean for Academic Administration
DCI	Dean for Curriculum and Instruction
DCSINT	Deputy Chief of Staff for Intelligence (Army)
D'ECOLE	Defense Executive Committee on Language Efforts
DFLP	Defense Foreign Language Program
DIA	Defense Intelligence Agency
DLAB	Defense Language Aptitude Battery
DLI	Defense Language Institute
DLIFLC	Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center
DLPT	Defense Language Proficiency Test
DoD	Department of Defense
DOIM	Directorate of Information Management
EEO	Equal Employment Opportunity
EIDS	Electronic Information Delivery System
ETNA	Educational Technology Needs Assessment
FAN	Facilities Area Network
FAO	Foreign Area Officer
FECA	Federal Employees Compensation Act
FILR	Federal Interagency Language Roundtable
FLETC	Federal Law Enforcement Training Center
FLO	Final Learning Objective
FLTCE	Foreign Language Training Center, Europe
FORSCOM	Forces Command (Army)
FSI	Foreign Service Institute
FY	Fiscal Year
GITS	General Intelligence Training System
GOSC	General Officer Steering Committee
HR	House Resolution

HUMINT	Human Intelligence
ILCC	International Language and Culture Center
INF	Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces
LAN	Local Area Network
LEA	Law Enforcement Agencies
LFID	Learner-Focused Instructional Day
MATFL	Master of Arts in the Teaching of Foreign Languages
MCB	Managing the Civilian Workforce to Budget
MI	Military Intelligence
MISTE	Military Intelligence Special Training Element
MLI	Military Language Instructor
MOLINK	Moscow-Washington Communications Link
NFFE	National Federation of Federal Employees
NSA	National Security Agency
ODCSINT	Office of the Assistant Chief of Staff for Intelligence (Army)
ODCSOPS	Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations and Planning (Army)
OPD	Operations, Plans and Doctrine
OSIA	On-Site Inspection Agency
PBO	Property Book Officer
PIC	Proficiency Improvement Course
POI	Program of Instruction
POM	Presidio of Monterey
PROFS	Professional Office System
RAC	Resource Advisory Committee
RASC	Resource Advisory Subcommittee
RIF	Reduction-in-Force
SCOLA	Satellite Communications for Learning
SFFLC	Special Forces Functional Language Course
SOF	Special Operations Forces
STARCIPS-R	Standard Army Civilian Payroll System-Redesign
STARS	Standard Time and Activity Reporting System
START	Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty
TCOE	TRADOC Communities of Excellence
TLSI	Technical Language Systems, Inc.
TNET	Training Net
TRADOC	US Army Training and Doctrine Command
TRAMEA	TRADOC Management Engineering Activity
USA	US Army
USAF	US Air Force
USAR	US Army Reserve
USMC	US Marine Corps
USN	US Navy
VELVET	Video Enhanced Learning, Video Enhanced Testing
VTT	Video Teletraining

Document List

1. Defense Foreign Language Program General Officer Steering Committee briefing book (21 Aug 91).
2. DAMO-TRO, Memo, Subj: Defense Foreign Language Program (DFLP) General Officer Steering Committee (GOSC) Summary Report for 22 Aug 91 (19 Sep 91).
3. Board of Visitors, Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center, Annual Report of the Board of Visitors (18 Sep 91).
4. ATFL-DAA-PM, Recapitulation of Student Input for FY 1991 (13 Feb 92).
5. DLIFLC Annual Program Review 1992 (5 Feb 92).
6. BILC 1991 National Report - USA - Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center (Jun 91).
7. DLIFLC Directory (Nov 91).
8. DLIFLC Master Plan: Strategies for Excellence, Vol. 1 (Parts I-III) and Vol. 2 (Part IV)(Jan 91).
9. DLIFLC Master Plan: Strategies for Excellence, Vol. 1 (Parts I-III) and Vol. 2 (Part IV)(Jul 91).
10. DLIFLC Fiscal Year 1991 Cost Review (22 Mar 92).

Index

- Abeyta, Jerry J, 70.
Academic Records, 27, 44, 53.
ACTFL, 51, 54.
Administrative Support, 17.
Ahlstrom, CH (MAJ) Gene, 52.
Aikman, Peter R, 41.
Air Force, 4, 32, 60, 63.
Aiso Library, 44, 53-54.
Al-Haise, Mohammad, 49.
Arabic, 1, 5-6, 17, 22, 29,
32, 37-39, 43, 45, 49,
64, 73, 74.
Area Studies, 44, 52-53.
Armbrust, Peter J, 39.
Army, 2-3, 4, 6, 7, 12, 43,
58-59, 63.
ATSC, 20.
Audiovisual Management, 74-
75.
Augustus, MSgt Frederick L,
60.
Babcock, CH(MAJ) John M, 52.
Baratto, BG David J, 8, 22.
Beaudean, Don, 69.
Belanger, Nancy E, 17.
Bergquist, Col Ronald E, 17,
27, 28.
Betts, Maj Bruce, 60.
BILC, 13, 29.
Blank, J Lancing, 9.
BMLC, 8, 21-23.
Board of Visitors, 15, 23,
58, 76.
Boylan, Dr Patricia C, 35,
57.
BRAC, 23-24, 68.
Brainerd, LtCol Helen, 31.
Brendel, Dr Gerd, 46.
Brooks, Ralph, 73.
Brown, MSG Loren L, 69.
Broz, James J, Jr, 53.
Burns, David, 41.
Burwell, F Kathryn, 66.
Busadee, Jamlong, 35.
CALICO, 50.
Cardenas, SGM Samuel E, 17.
Cervone, Lt Col Daniel, 35.
Chamberlin, MAJ Gary N, 28.
Chinese, 34, 49, 57.
Clark, LTC Douglas F, 66.
Clark, Dr John L D, 44-45.
Clifford, Dr Ray T, 7, 16,
18, 23, 31, 32, 33, 39,
44, 54.
Cole, Charles, 36.
Collins, BG James L, Jr, 30.
Combs, CPT Christopher T, 17.
Comerford, Steven W, 71.
Commandant, see Fischer.
Congress, 1, 2, 13, 23, 30,
65-66.
Contracting, 21, 28-29, 31,
43, 46, 66.
Counternarcotics require-
ments, see LEA.
Cowger, Col Ronald I, 16, 57.
CPO, 51, 63-66.
Crim, CMC Richard A, 60.
Cryptologic requirements, 1,
4-5, 6-7, 35.
Curriculum, 44, 50-51, 64.
Customs Service, 40, 44.
Cyrus, Jamshid, 34.
Czech, 2, 3, 6, 12, 22, 42,
47.
DAA, 27, 44, 50, 53-54.
D'Auria, Capt John, 60.
Davis, James F III, 75.
DCI, 19, 41-44.
DCSINT, 2, 5, 45.
DEA, 14, 40, 44.
Defense School of Languages
(UK), 6, 29, 43.
Dege, John, 53.
De La Selva, Ben, 37-38.
Desert Storm, 1-14, 15, 17,
20, 25, 27, 28-29, 31,
37-38, 45, 45-46, 47,
49, 50, 54, 56, 60, 63,
65, 67, 70, 73, 75, 76.
DIA, 9, 32, 43.
Dillard, MSG Ronald L, 66.
Distance Education, 26, 28,
41, 44, 45-47, 48, 50.

Index

- Doroff, LtCol Dennis, 37.
Dutch, 40.
Educational Technology, 20-
21, 22-23, 25, 31, 34,
44, 45, 48-50, 52, 54,
60-61, 61-62, 70, 72.
EEO, 66.
Estep, John A, 67.
Evaluation, 6n, 16, 28, 44-
45.
Executive Agent, 3-5, 22, 27,
29.
Facilities Management, 63,
70.
Faculty & Staff, 35, 51-52,
65, 70.
FAO, 42, 52-53.
Faris, Capt Philip C, 49.
FBI, 11.
Fischer, COL Donald C, Jr, 3,
7, 15-30, 33, 46, 48,
49, 54, 57, 68, 76.
Fleumer, LTC Matthew H, 25-
26, 67.
FLTCE, 6, 24-25.
FLOs, 7, 9, 32.
Ft Lewis, see I Corps.
Ft Ord, 23-24, 68-69, 70-71,
72, 75.
Frazier, Ani, 39.
French, 31, 40, 47, 49, 50.
FSI, 43.
Funke, Dr Maurice, 42.
Galasinski, LTC Ronald C, 59.
Gandia, Gay, 74.
Gebbia, Art, 47.
German, 2, 3, 12, 22, 31,
35-36, 44, 48, 49, 64.
Gibian, Ivy, 43.
Glantz, COL Davis M, 14.
Goodfellow AFB, 7, 60.
GOSC, 3, 8, 9, 19, 23, 27,
31, 32, 46, 48, 54, 76.
Granoien, Dr Neil F, 32, 35.
Grant, Luba, 41.
Greek, 37.
Hackling, Jan, 69.
Hamilton, LTC John A, 63, 69.
Harter, Pierette, J, 76.
Hebrew, 37, 44.
Henson, MGSgt Aubrey O, 61.
Herben, Milan, 49.
Herzog, Dr Martha, 19, 22,
31, 35.
Higgins, CWO Robert, 28.
Hill, Helen, 71.
Hill, MAJ Randy, 27, 47.
Hines, Patricia M, 2.
Hogan, CWO Bill, 27.
Hooshmand, Dr Dariush, 44.
Howard, Maj Ana, 34.
HUMINT Requirements, 1, 9.
Humphrey, Calvin, 2.
Hunter, MAJ Claude E, 36.
I Corps, 5, 20.
Ich, Dr Vu Tam, 31.
ILCC, 53, 70.
INF, see OSIA.
Information Management, 51,
63, 71-73.
Inspector General, 56-57, 66.
Io, SGM Suatiana, 69.
Italian, 40, 49, 64.
Jackson, Betty, 72.
Japanese, 34.
Jewell, CMSgt Charles D, 28.
John F. Kennedy Special War-
fare Center & School,
see Special Operations
Forces.
Johnson, LTC Terry D, 52.
Kallu, Joseph, 38-39.
Kehler, CPT Robin D, 17.
Keller, BG Richard F, 3, 22.
Khalil, Alfie, 23.
Kim, MAJ Andrew H N, 10-12.
Klahn, Frank, 42.
Koenig, Carolyn R, 17.
Kopf, CSM George W, 58.
Korean, 32, 34, 36-37, 45,
49.
Kozumplik, LTC Peter W, 28,
43.
Kraemer, LCDR Kent H, 60-61.

- Kurdish, 7.
 Kwon, Joe, 36.
 Lagle, LTC Carl, 66.
 Lallo, Pete, 20-21, 47.
 Lasagna, John B, 52.
 Laughlin, CPT James, 47.
 LEA, 13-14, 25, 26-27, 39-40,
 44, 67.
 Leaver, Betty Lou, 42.
 Lesser, LTC Harry K, Jr, 58-
 59.
 Lett, Dr John A, 44.
 Lew, CPT Ann, 71.
 Leydiker, Zhanna, 43.
 LFID, 18-19, 33, 54, 56-58,
 62.
 Lipke, COL William R, 4.
 Logistics, 63, 64, 72, 73,
 73-74.
 Love, Randy, 41.
 LPCO, 26, 28, 46.
 Lyle, BG James M, 4, 5.
 Macintosh, 25, 34, 49.
 McCray, LCDR Linell, 27.
 McFarland, Hugh, 7.
 McKean, LTC Michael, 4.
 McNaughton, Dr James C, 76.
 McReynolds, Frank, 72.
 Magno, LTC Richard A, 26-27.
 Makarovsky, Elana, 41.
 Malz, Erika E, 50.
 Marine Corps, 4, 43, 50,
 61-62, 64.
 Merriman, Alan M, 74.
 Mineta, Norman, 30.
 MLIs, 28, 33.
 MOLINK, 29.
 Monreal, Maj Richard, 61.
 Moon, MSgt William H, 39.
 Moore, Capt John A, 16, 26,
 63.
 Moore, LTC William L, 63, 69.
 Moreno, SGM Frank, 59.
 National Guard, see Reserve
 Components.
 Navy, 4, 16, 50, 60-61, 63.
 NFFE, 16, 23, 65.
 Nonresident Training, see
 Distance Education.
 NPS, 23, 54, 65.
 NSA, 6-7, 32, 50.
 Nuño, Maj Bernardo, 46.
 Oldenburg, Lt Col William,
 44-45.
 Olds, COL William K S, 16,
 26, 63.
 Olney, Dave, 34.
 Olsen, Harry, 34.
 Onomoto, Minoru J, 35.
 OPD, 26-27, 28.
 OSIA, 12-13, 32, 42-43.
 Outerbridge, LTC Sandy, 3.
 Paci, Cesare, 40.
 Panetta, Leon E, 2, 23, 24,
 65.
 Park, Bo Yang, 37.
 Pawelek, Yvonne, 20.
 PCO, 73.
 Persian-Farsi, 34, 37, 44.
 Petrin, SGM Roland A, 28.
 Phillips, MAJ Chester J, Jr,
 42-43.
 Plans & Scheduling, 26-27,
 44, 47.
 Polcrack, MAJ Erik K, 53.
 Polish, 2, 3, 12, 22, 36, 44,
 47.
 Portuguese, 40.
 Print Plant, 73.
 Program Management, 53-54.
 Protocol, 63, 76.
 Provost, see Clifford.
 Public Affairs Office, 63,
 74, 75.
 Purtle, Dale, 22, 50.
 Rappoport, Sofia, 42.
 Reed, Whitney E, 6-7, 50.
 Research, 44-45, 57.
 Reserve Components, 10-12,
 20, 28-29, 59.
 Resource Management, 25-26,
 47, 63, 66-68.
 Richardson, Lt Col Sharon D,
 48-49.

Index

- Richardson, GEN William R, 15.
RIF, 20, 22, 35-36, 42, 64-65.
Rivera, Eugenio, 74.
Robins, CDR Sally S, 16, 45, 63.
Robinson, MAJ Gregory L, 39.
Rutsche, Christa, 50.
Russian, 3, 6, 13, 22, 31, 32, 40-43, 44, 45, 47, 49.
Sadeghi, K Z, 34.
School Secretary, 16, 53, 63, 69, 70, 71.
Schwarzkopf, GEN H Norman, 1, 30.
Scott, MAJ Paul, 34.
Security, 63, 70-71.
Seifert, LTC David J, 20.
SFFLC, 21-22.
Shehorn, LTC David C, 27.
Shirley, MSgt Cheryl L, 56.
Sims, MSgt John, 47.
Smith, Dr Alan, 51.
Snell, GSgt Michael, 28.
Snow, Robert S, 64.
Soh, Andy, 34.
Source AV, 74-75.
Sowl, Maj Marcus E, 61.
Spanish, 13, 22, 27, 31, 39-40, 47, 49, 50.
SOF, 4-5, 7-9, 20, 21-23, 25, 32, 35, 40, 42, 47, 50, 64, 67.
Stachiw, MAJ George, 41.
Stotzer, Maj Mark D, 41.
Taba Tabai, Dr Mahmood, 50, 53.
Tagalog, 35, 48.
Terselic, Capt Robert, 47.
Testing, 44.
Thai, 35, 48.
TLSI, 5.
TNET, see VTT.
Tomei, Maj Lance J, 60.
Tovar, Deanna, 39.
TRADOC, 15, 24, 26, 48, 53, 59, 60, 61, 62, 67, 69.
Treaty Verification, see OSIA.
Troop Command, 58.
Tully, SSG Daniel M, 56.
Turkish, 37, 48.
Turpin, Les, 73.
Union, see NFFE.
USARI, 24-25.
Varosh, John, 39.
Vietnamese, 35.
Vorobiov, Dr Alex, 41.
VTT, 5, 20-21, 47, 54, 59, 70, 76.
Walter, Gary D, 54.
War on Drugs, see LEA.
Washington Office, 5-6, 10, 27, 28-29, 43.
Weber, MSgt Dale A, 60.
Wen, Victor, 34.
Whittaker, Capt Ryan, 29.
Wilhelm, BG Charles E, 4, 8.
Wilson, Heide B, 36.
Wood, MAJ Thomas, 22.
Woytak, Dr Lidia, 50.
Yonan, Joe, 46.
Yonekura, Dr Gisella, 37.

1990, using the former dining facility, Kendall Hall. The facility, which they shared with the Marine Corps Detachment, was manned by student advisors 24-hours a day and featured computer courseware and other language training materials. Their pride was reflected in their winning an award from the TRADOC Communities of Excellence evaluation as the best Navy barracks in TRADOC.

Marine Corps Detachment

During FY 1991, 162 Marine students began language instruction (90% of them enlisted). They were assigned to the Marine Corps Detachment, which also had administrative responsibility for over a hundred Marine officers attending classes at the Naval Post-Graduate School. For the first half of the year the detachment was commanded by Major Richard Monreal, USMC, who was selected for promotion to lieutenant colonel and reassigned to National Security Agency headquarters. On July 27 his place was taken by Major Marcus E. Sowl, USMC, a 1988 graduate of the Korean basic course. The senior Marine NCO was Master Gunnery Sergeant Aubrey O. Henson, USMC.¹⁰

The Marines were active in intramural athletics and were a frequent sight at community events with their color guard and silent drill team. They joined with the Naval Security Group Detachment in forming and staffing the Kendall Hall learning

⁹Naval Security Group Detachment Monterey, memo, subj: Command History 1991, 26 Feb 92; CTIC Kirk J. Hine, "The Navy: Its Language Training Roots," Fifty Years of Excellence, special commemorative edition of the DLIFLC Globe (1 Nov 91), 46-47; "NSGD Sets Up High-Tech Study Hall," Globe (9 Apr 91), 17; NSGD Wins 1991 TCOE Award, Globe (13 Feb 92), 18. The award was for the best Navy barracks among four TRADOC activities on non-TRADOC installations.

¹⁰[Marine Corps Detachment], Command Chronology, [Jan 92]; SSgt. Rick Sanchez, USMC, "Marines at DLI: A Reach for Quality," Fifty Years of Excellence, special commemorative edition of the DLIFLC Globe (1 Nov 91), 49; historian's notes, Maj. Sowl briefing to "Visions, Goals and Objectives" meeting, 2 Dec 91; "Marine Corps Detachment Takes TCOE Award for Best Marine Barracks," Globe (13 Feb 92), 7. The award was for the best Marine barracks out of five TRADOC activities on non-TRADOC installations.

Foreign Language Students in 1991

center. They also won an award for the best Marine barracks in the TRADOC Communities of Excellence evaluation.

Threshold of Change

Through the years the institute had taken many approaches to improving its programs. New instructors had been hired, and others had been given in-service training. New courses had been written, in-house and under contract. New standards had been set, and curriculums had been reviewed. Schools and departments had been reorganized. New classroom buildings had been built, language labs installed, computers bought, and satellite antennas erected. But by 1991 it was clear that more attention had to be paid to the students themselves, who had to become more active learners. The new year would bring the Learner-Focused Instructional Day, a major change designed to make the students more effective foreign language learners. The institute--and the services--could afford to do no less.

Chapter Five Supporting DLIFLC in 1991

Just as the Desert Storm victory was built on the foundation of an unprecedented logistics effort, instruction at the Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center (DLIFLC) was built on a solid foundation of support to provide and manage the needed personnel, facilities, and other resources. In an era of diminishing resources, 1991 proved to be extremely challenging. The support staff, in spite of budget austerity, made valuable contributions to accomplishing the institute's mission and preserving resources for the future.

The senior leadership concerned with non-academic support functions saw major changes during the year. At the outset, support functions were managed by three people. The chief of staff, Captain John A. Moore, USN, directed several of the larger directorates such as the civilian personnel office, information management, and resource management, as well as several smaller offices such as the public affairs office, protocol and the command historian. The school secretary, Colonel William K.S. Olds, USA, supervised several others, such as the logistics division, facilities management, and the security office. He also coordinated the institute's operations with the garrison commander, Lieutenant Colonel William L. Moore, USA, who managed all base operations support such as the facilities engineers.

When Captain Moore retired in July, Colonel Olds filled in as acting chief of staff. In September Commander Sally S. Robins, USN, was designated deputy chief of staff, and she took responsibility for coordinating the daily functions of the command group and supervising several of the smaller offices that formerly reported to the chief of staff. The job of garrison commander also changed hands over the summer, as Lieutenant Colonel John A. Hamilton, USA, took over from Lieutenant Colonel Moore. Thus by the fall the senior leadership in the support areas had turned over almost completely. Nevertheless the operators continued to deliver uninterrupted support.

Human Resources Management

The institute's human resources were its greatest strength; administering this diverse population of military and civilian personnel was one of its greatest challenges. Each of the four services represented at the institute managed their own uniformed personnel. The personnel service support needs of Army soldiers were handled through the Military Personnel Branch. Airmen were serviced by Operating Location A, 323rd Mission Support Squadron. Sailors were supported either by the Naval Security Group Detachment-Monterey or the Naval Post-Graduate School.

Supporting DLIFLC in 1991

Marines were administered by the Marine Corps Detachment (see Chapter Four).

The day-to-day task of managing the institute's 1,200 civilian staff members fell to the Civilian Personnel Office (CPO) under Robert S. Snow, who sought to infuse his staff with the spirit of superior customer service. A listing of the several offices into which his staff of twenty-six was organized reflects the diversity of functions covered: recruitment and placement, position management & classification, training and development, management-employee relations and technical services. They also supported the small US Army Research Institute, which shared the Presidio with DLIFLC.¹

Their principal challenge was to shape the workforce to fit the mission. Some programs were growing, such as Arabic, video teletraining and the new Special Operations Forces project. New staff had to be recruited and hired for these and other functions, but in 1991 this was unusually difficult because of the Department of Defense-wide hiring freeze imposed in early 1990. The institute used the two-for-five rule, which allowed the hiring of two new employees for every five who left. On top of this, the institute won hiring freeze exemptions for an additional nineteen Arabic instructors and fifty-four other instructors. In the language departments more than one hundred instructors were promoted to temporary GS-11 positions as team coordinators, and a new GS-11 position for course and test developer was created for the language departments. In 1991 the institute funded an unusually large summer hire program, which temporarily added ninety-three employees to the staff, more than double the previous year's total.

The other side of the coin was reduction in force (RIF) where staff was no longer needed.² During 1991 a major RIF was conducted in German, and smaller RIFs in Italian, Logistics and Curriculum, affecting in all thirty-two employees. With the

¹ATFL-CP, memo, subj: Calendar Year 1991 Input to the DLIFLC Annual Historical Summary, 11 Mar 92; DLIFLC Civilian Personnel Management Program Evaluation, Fiscal Year 1991; historian's notes, Bob Snow briefing to "Vision, Goals and Objectives" meeting, 2 Dec 91. See also the extensively revised DLIFLC Pam 690-2, Civilian Employee Handbook (Jun 91) for further information on personnel policies and procedures.

²For current RIF procedures, see DLIFLC Civilian Personnel News, Special Bulletin: Reduction in Force (Dec 90).

help of the CPO staff only five were involuntarily separated from federal service.

Routine personnel management tasks continued apace, much of it supported by new computer programs. The office continued to operate with ACPERS, installed the previous year. A new system for personnel resourcing, Managing the Civilian Workforce to Budget (MCB) was begun (see below). For position management and classification the office began to use ProClass Plus to provide managers a single-source document that contained a job description, evaluation statement, knowledge, skills and abilities (KSAs), and performance standards. The worker's compensation program received new attention with the announcement that in 1994 the Department of Labor would begin assessing the costs directly to the affected organizations. During FY 1991 compensation costs at the institute ran over \$315,000, of which 82% was for just fourteen cases of long-term disability, and Snow established a Federal Employees' Compensation Act (FECA) Reduction Plan. Meanwhile the Handicapped Individuals Program was revitalized under a new manager and the Monterey County Committee for Employment of People with Disabilities named the institute "Employer of the Year."

The Civilian Personnel Office continued to share in-service training responsibilities with the Faculty and Staff Development Division and the language schools. The Training and Development Branch spent \$116,000 during the year in contract and travel costs to provide an average of 1.23 "instances of training" for each civilian employee. Forty courses were brought on-site and the first live two-way training session via satellite was held.

The number of incentive awards rose by 20% to 544 in 1991, many of them stemming from the exceptional efforts in support of Desert Storm. Monetary awards topped \$300,000, and thirty-four employees received quality step increases. The commandant also began awarding DLIFLC commemorative coins.

Relations with the faculty union, Local 1263 of the National Federation of Federal Employees, continued to be good in first year of the new contract. For the second year in a row the union filed no unfair labor practices complaints, and only one grievance was filed, compared to nine the previous year.

Other changes were in the wings, complicating future planning. Monterey Congressman Leon E. Panetta introduced the New Personnel System into the House of Representatives in April as HR-1685, but the House failed to take action before the year was out. Snow remained committed to rapid implementation of the rank-in-person scheme upon approval, which would require a re-writing of much of the institute's personnel management procedures. Late in 1990 Congress did pass the Federal Employee's Pay Comparability Act. Although the institute's employees

Supporting DLIFLC in 1991

missed out on the act's immediate 8% raise for civil service employees in the San Francisco area, they were projected to begin closing the gap with non-federal salaries in 1994. Meanwhile litigation continued over the elimination of ten low-density language departments in 1989. In December the Federal Labor Relations Authority ruled that the institute should have first conducted a commercial activities review, but the Department of the Army continued to appeal the case.

Another office that provided service to the civilian staff was the Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) Office headed by F. Kathryn Burwell, who reported directly to the commandant through the chief of staff. Burwell managed a diverse set of programs and advised the commandant and staff through the Commandant's EEO Advisory Committee. An important part of the job was managing the discrimination complaint system. During 1991 seventeen complaints were made, nine of which went formal (five made by one person). But by the end of the year all formal and informal complaints had been resolved, the first time in since the office had been established in the 1970s. Through some fifty collateral-duty counsellors and special emphasis program managers Burwell coordinated a series of programs and events during the year, such as Women's History Month, Hispanic Heritage Month and Asian-American Heritage Month. In the fall she was recognized by the Federal Executive Board of San Francisco as the outstanding EEO manager in Northern California.³

The Inspector General Office was another yet staff office that served a personnel management function, a tradition as old as the Army itself. In early 1991 Lieutenant Colonel Douglas F. Clark, USA, left for an assignment in Panama, and his senior noncommissioned officer, Master Sergeant Ronald L. Dillard, USA, retired. In July, Clark was replaced by Lieutenant Colonel Carl Lagle, USA.

Resource Management

The Directorate of Resource Management was responsible for managing the institute's \$51 million annual budget, its table of distribution and allowances, and numerous other resource-related

³ATFL-EEO, memo, subj: Annual Historical Summaries for 1991, 24 Mar 92; DLIFLC, Multi-Year Affirmative Employment Program Plan, 1991 Accomplishment Report and 1992 Update (6 Apr 92); historian's notes, Kathryn Burwell briefing to "Vision, Goals and Objectives" meeting, 2 Dec 91; "EEO Officer Cited as Outstanding Manager," Globe (25 Nov 91), 32.

functions, with about twenty staff members. For the first half of the year the directorate was led by Lieutenant Colonel Matthew H. Fleumer, USA. When he retired in the fall after one year on the job, his staff continued to work into the new fiscal year under the leadership of acting director John A. Estep.⁴

Managing the budget continued to be a major challenge during the year. The resource uncertainties caused by Desert Storm and the downsizing of the services made it hard to do more than operate from day to day. But the institute was eventually reimbursed \$682,000 for its Desert Storm-related work, and the hire-lag monies generated by the hiring freeze enabled it to spend half again as much on supplies and equipment as in the previous year. Other reimbursables included \$1 million for law enforcement agency language training and \$1.2 million for the Special Operations Forces project. The office also wrote a new policy memo to help manage these reimbursable programs, which were gradually becoming a large part of the annual budget. The institute was eventually fully funded and closed out the fiscal year with a 99.9995% obligation utilization, including \$325,000 in contributions from other agencies.⁵

Funding for future years looked even shakier. In the spring the FY 1992 funding was set for 26% below necessary levels, which would have had a "catastrophic" impact. This was averted, but by the end of the year it looked like FY 1993 funding was still "broken" by \$6-8 million, and funding up to FY 1997 was set to decline by as much as \$17 million unless further changes were made.

On the management side the Resource Management staff continued to adjust the organization to meet shifting mission requirements.⁶ This required close coordination with the TRADOC staff and the TRADOC Management Engineering Activity (TRAMEA). Manpower staffing standards were reviewed or updated in several

⁴ATFL-RM, memo, subj: Annual Historical Summaries for 1991, 27 Mar 92; historian's notes, John Estep briefing to "Vision, Goals and Objectives" meeting, 2 Dec 91.

⁵DLIFLC, Command Operating Budget Fiscal Year 1992, 1 Jun 91; ATFL-RMB, Fiscal Year 1991 Cost Review, 2 Mar 92; DLI Memo 11-3, "Reimbursement for Foreign Language Training Provided by DLIFLC, 1 Nov 91.

⁶For a detailed list of organizational and staffing standard changes during the year see ATFL-RM, memo, subj: Annual Historical Summaries for 1991, 27 Mar 92.

Supporting DLIFLC in 1991

areas during the year in several key areas, including evaluation and standardization, troop command, school secretary, civilian personnel, and resource management.

The Resource Management staff also continued to administer several overlapping systems of management controls. The MCB (Managing the Civilian Workforce to Budget) program, implemented in the fall of 1990, delegated more authority to deans and directors, but also was used to measure their performance in new ways. Another program, the Internal Management Control program, was designed "to ensure that government resources are effectively and efficiently managed" in accordance with the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act of 1982. Deficiencies identified under this program were briefed each month at the commandant's staff call. The office also administered the locally developed master plan, Strategies for Excellence, published twice a year. The milestones in this plan were also briefed at the monthly staff calls. On a more mundane level, the Resource Management staff also kept track of employee time through STARS (Standard Time and Activity Reporting System), which was changed during the year to an easier-to-use PC-based system, and served as the staff point of contact for the new automated payroll bookkeeping system scheduled for implementation early in 1992, STARCIPS-R (Standard Army Civilian Payroll System-Redesign). All these control mechanisms were in addition to the procedures used by the provost to track academic performance, such as the quarterly review and analysis briefings and the annual program review, and the commandant's "I will" process for setting goals and objectives through the chain of command.

Facilities and Base Operations Support

Because the Presidio of Monterey was a sub-installation of Fort Ord the installation staff there provided a large measure of the institute's support. During planning for the projected closure of Fort Ord the school secretary estimated that up to 350 civilian employees would be needed to provide the same level of base operations support DLIFLC had received from Fort Ord in the past (see Chapter Two).

⁷ MCB performance was reported in the Review and Analysis Quarterly Reports. The procedures for the Internal Management Control program were revised by DLIFLC Memo 11-2, Internal Management Control, 1 Apr 91; responsibility for the master plan after the January 1992 edition was shifted to OPD.